

As a member of the Michigan legislature, I remember that we attempted to "help" people in a similar manner by restricting lending practices and interest rates to what we consider a "fair" rate. The result wasn't that interest rates were lowered. Instead, the borrowers came to us and asked us to remove the restrictions because they couldn't get loans any more. Mr. Speaker where there is competition, rates of interest are best left to the marketplace rather than to the notions of politicians.

Second, I find it odd that we in Washington need to tell the states how they should handle what are traditionally local measures. We certainly have no greater understanding of these issues than our counterparts at the state level.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 312, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 312, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT THE OHIO MOTTO IS CONSTITUTIONAL

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 494) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Ohio State motto is constitutional and urging the courts to uphold its constitutionality.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the official motto of the State of Ohio—"With God All Things Are Possible"—has been the State motto for 41 years, since October 1, 1959;

Whereas the motto is a powerful expression of hope and humility for all the people of Ohio;

Whereas the motto does not establish, promote, endorse, advance, or discriminate against any specific set of religious beliefs;

Whereas the motto is consistent with the American tradition of seeking spiritual guidance in matters of public affairs;

Whereas faith in God was a founding principle of the Nation and the State of Ohio;

Whereas the motto helps promote positive values and citizenship in the youth of Ohio;

Whereas several States or territories and the United States have mottoes or seals making explicit reference to God or Providence;

Whereas the Declaration of Independence and the constitutions or preambles of 45 States make explicit reference to a divine power;

Whereas since 1864, United States coins have borne the motto "In God We Trust", which Congress made mandatory on all gold and silver coins in 1908 (35 Stat. 164, Chap. 173) and on all United States coins and currency in 1955 (69 Stat. 290, Chap. 303);

Whereas in 1956, Congress declared the national motto of the United States to be "In God we trust" (70 Stat. 732, Chap. 795); and

Whereas Members of Congress take an oath to uphold the Constitution and vigilantly do so in the performance of their legislative duties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(A) the Ohio State motto and other longstanding mottoes which make reference to God or Providence do so as long-accepted expressions consistent with American tradition and rooted in the sentiments of the American people;

(B) such mottoes are "those references to God that we accept in ceremonial phrases or in other contexts that assure neutrality", *Lynch v. Donnelly*, 465 U.S. 668, 717 (1984) (Brennan, J., dissenting), and State and Federal courts should uphold them as such; and

(C) the decision of a three-judge panel of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit striking down the Ohio State motto is a misinterpretation and misapplication of the United States Constitution; and

(2) the House of Representatives—

(A) finds repugnant all misinterpretations and misapplications of the Constitution by Federal courts which disregard those references to God which are well within the American tradition and within the Constitution;

(B) supports the decision of the Governor and the Attorney General of the State of Ohio to appeal the ruling; and

(C) affirms its support for the Ohio State motto and other State mottoes making reference to a divine power.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 494.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 494, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Ohio State motto is constitutional. I would

like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), who will be speaking shortly, for introducing this legislation.

"With God, all things are possible." Those are the offending words, words that the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, in a 2 to 1 vote, held to be unconstitutional because, according to the majority judges, they constitute a government endorsement of religion.

Mr. Speaker, 41 years ago the State of Ohio was looking for a new motto, one that expressed both the unbending optimism and quiet humility of the people of our State. A 10-year-old schoolboy submitted his choice, a passage that said simply, with God, all things are possible. The selection was easy; and in 1959, the new Ohio motto was adopted.

Mr. Speaker, 38 years passed without controversy until 1997 when then Governor GEORGE VOINOVICH, decided to place the motto carved in stone in front of the State House, in Columbus, our capital. This apparently caused a great deal of alarm. The Sixth Circuit has ruled that this passage comes directly from the Gospel according to Matthew and therefore must be stricken as Ohio's creed. Other scholars in Ohio dispute this and have traced its non-Christian origins back to Homer's epic poem "The Odyssey" and point out its prevalence as an inspirational catch phrase throughout the history of Western literature, before Christ and after.

The official motto of the United States is, "In God We Trust." We have it right up there in front of us. As I am looking here today it says, in very large letters, "In God We Trust," here on the floor of the House of Representatives. The Supreme Court of the United States heralds the beginning of every session with the words, "God save this honorable court." We in Congress pause each morning for a prayer that calls upon guidance from God.

Like these other reflections upon faith, the Ohio motto does not seek to promote a certain religion or endorse one set of religious beliefs over another.

□ 1115

Ohio's Secretary of State, J. Kenneth Blackwell, has said and I quote, "The motto implies a challenge for self-betterment, and that solid ethics must be at the root of all our actions as individuals and communities. It inspires and instructs that with faith and hard work, any challenge can be met." That is what our Secretary of State, J. Kenneth Blackwell, said.

George Washington said, and I quote, "Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

I am inclined to agree with the father of our country, the man who, against

all odds, led an army of untrained farmers to victory against the most powerful army in the world. I am also inclined to think that he would certainly approve of our motto.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just note, Mr. Speaker, that I am here at the request of the ranking minority member. This particular resolution, while it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, was not acted on by the committee. I am here in the absence of the ranking minority member to express the fact that he has no objection to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and others.

Mr. Speaker, this bill expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the Ohio State motto is constitutional, and urges the courts to uphold its Constitutionality.

Earlier this year, a three-judge panel of the Sixth United States Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that Ohio's State motto "With God all things are possible" was unconstitutional. The two-to-one decision was based on a belief that that motto expressed a particular affinity towards Christianity.

I find it a real stretch to interpret the Ohio State motto as supporting a specific religion. In one instance the Koran reads, "Know you not that God is able to do all things?" Mr. Speaker, the United States has been using the phrase "In God we trust" on all our coins since 1864, and Congress made this saying, which has been held constitutional which by the courts, mandatory on all gold and silver coins in 1908 and on all U.S. currency in 1955. Clearly, legal precedents in these cases support the conclusion that Ohio's State motto should be upheld.

On a personal note, God can do all things. I would urge all Member to support this resolution.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the principal sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, while I am proud to join my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), and 54 of our colleagues on both parties in supporting this resolution, I want to particularly thank my good friend, the gentleman from Cincinnati (Mr. CHABOT), for his work as well. I am troubled by the misinterpretation of the Constitution that has compelled us to introduce it and bring us here today.

Two months ago, with a 2-to-1 decision, a three-judge panel in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals struck down Ohio's official State motto, "With God all things are possible." The court sided with the ACLU in declaring that the motto expresses a particular affinity towards Christianity and thus violates the establishment clause of the Constitution.

While the phrase does appear in the Gospel according to Matthew, it actually predates Christianity by almost 1,000 years. The line "With the gods all things are possible" appears in Homer's *Odyssey*. Similar lines appear throughout other ancient Greek works and in the writings of Cicero, all of which were written before Matthew's counsel. According to the Council on American-Islamic relations, a similar phrase appears throughout the Koran.

Mr. Speaker, certainly this simple phrase of optimism and faith is not offensive to anyone. These six words make no reference to Jesus Christ in this context, and cannot be said to promote the Christian faith in any way. The court's action is nothing more than political correctness run rampant.

Four other States and American Samoa mention God in their mottos. Ohio's expression of faith in God is no different from any of these references. Together with "In God we trust," these mottos stand as a testament to the religious foundation of this great country.

While the courts have upheld the biblically-based "In God we trust" as the Nation's motto time and time again, the Sixth Circuit panel ignored precedent and struck down Ohio's similar expression of faith. In fact, the 10-year-old boy who suggested the phrase as Ohio's motto more than 40 years ago was not even aware of its Biblical origin. He said it was something his mother and grandmother would say to him all the time. Despite the ACLU's position, I doubt that this 10-year-old set out to establish Christianity as Ohio's official religion.

Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters on this issue from my constituents in Ohio and from all across the Nation, each one supporting Ohio's right to keep the motto as it is. People around the country are tired of having their religious freedom squelched by fringe groups in the name of separation of church and State.

As one of my constituents noted, "Ours is a government of the people and by the people, not of the ACLU and by the ACLU." To paraphrase another of my constituents, "We would be a very fortunate Nation if the biggest threat our society had to face was a saying attributed to Jesus Christ."

I would urge my colleagues to vote for this bipartisan resolution supporting Ohio's appeal of the court ruling, and upholding the right of every State and Territory to affirm the

Founders' faith that, with God, all things are, indeed, possible.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Something bothers me, Mr. Speaker. In America, the courts have ruled that we can burn our flag, communists can work in our defense plants, murderers are entitled to cable television, including the Playboy Channel, pornography has been ruled to be allowed not only on television but now on the Internet, because we just cannot prove that kids may watch it and adults may miss an opportunity to see such tangos.

What is next? Will the Supreme Court allow students to trade in their baseball cards for Playboy Magazines, Mr. Speaker? I think if these decisions are not enough to make the Founders pray, something is really wrong.

Think about it, the court ruled that school prayer is illegal. Prayer before a football game is unconstitutional. That is getting heavy. God is not even allowed to be mentioned on television. Some of the television shows that refer to God, Touched by Angels, they want to remove that. My God, America is talking about God.

Now we hear about the fact that the Ohio motto "With God all things are possible" is the real killer. That is unbelievable to me. The court allows students to learn about the devil, but not Jesus. The court allows students to study devil worship, but not religion.

This bunch of overeducated nincompoops on the courts have not interpreted the Constitution. They have become so politically correct they are street stupid and miss the whole point. The Constitution and the Founders designed the Constitution to make sure there was not one State-sponsored religion. They did want to separate church and State, but they never intended to separate God and the American people.

What is next? How about our currency, "In God we trust"? Bring it all back and print it. How about the Chamber, "In God we trust"? Our fine Speaker pro tempore, above him, "In God we trust," that may be unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, I say let Ohio go, because with God, all things are possible. Would the court ban a motto that said "With the devil there is a lot more fun"? I do not mean to be light on this, but we have a Supreme Court established in this country. They seem to be acting like some sort of supreme being.

I am going to ask Congress today a question that I think the American people are asking: When will Congress grow some anatomy and stand up for God and the principles on which our Founders initiated our great Nation? I yield back all these harebrained, convoluted, nincompoop, stupid rulings of the courts that have literally removed God from America.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As usual, the gentleman from Ohio makes imminent sense. I compliment him for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from the Second District of Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Cincinnati for yielding time to me. I also want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) for bringing this resolution to the floor.

As some have probably already heard in this debate, our State motto, "With God all things are possible," was actually adopted in 1959 at the suggestion of a 10-year-old. This 10-year-old was from my hometown, STEVE's hometown, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

Jim Mastronardo found out that the State did not have a motto. There was no motto at all for Ohio. So this enterprising young man, and I have a 10-year-old son and I think that is interesting that a 10-year-old was that enterprising, came up with this motto.

Eventually the State adopted it. Then recently, during renovations to our historic State House in Columbus, our then Governor, now Senator, GEORGE VOINOVICH had this motto engraved in the granite plaza outside the building. I think that is probably what resulted in the controversy, and certainly what resulted in the specific complaint being filed.

I want to commend little Jimmy Mastronardo at 10 years old and Governor VOINOVICH for coming up with the idea, in one case, and then allowing more Ohioans to understand that this was our motto, and its significance.

I find the Sixth Circuit ruling to be headed in the wrong direction. I think it establishes a precedent that is troubling. In essence, I think what they are saying is that because "With God all things are possible" is attributed to the Gospel of Matthew, that therefore it is inappropriate.

As I look at it, and I know many other constitutional scholars other than those on the court share this view, it is on its face a generic, non-denominational, and definitely a ceremonial reference to God. I think it is exactly an example of the kind of ceremonial deism that the courts have accepted over the years. Beyond that, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) and others have pointed out, it is something that is positive for our State and our country.

I find the court ruling troubling, and I think it is appropriate that Congress establish today, I hope through a strong bipartisan majority of the House, that we also believe that this is a troubling precedent. It does not advocate a particular religious stance. It does not promote the establishment of a particular religion. I think it is very

similar to our national motto, In God we trust, which adorns this Chamber, which adorns our currency, which is an example of the faith with which our Founding Fathers created this great Nation over 200 years ago.

Instead of following the years of court precedent that upheld, again, the ceremonial use of the references, this court of the Sixth Circuit chose, I think, a very narrow First Amendment interpretation. As a result, not only is this motto in danger, but of course the mottos of other States. There are five other States and territories that have "God" in their motto. They are also endangered. In the end, the national motto "In God we trust" is endangered.

This was, incidentally, added to our Nation's paper currency in 1954 at the urging of a fellow named Matthew Rothert, another Ohio connection, because he was the father of our First Lady of Ohio, Hope Taft, and Hope has spoken out on this issue, as well. I think she has made a lot of sense in terms of her comments. Recently she summed it up with a statement, "You knock one down, and you are on to the next one."

I think both mottos, the national motto and the State motto, should stay just as they are. I agree with Hope Taft. Our Founding Fathers did envision a nation, Mr. Speaker, where there could be freedom of religion, not the absence of any form of religious expression.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle today to show their support for the State of Ohio's motto, and I think also in doing so show their support for our national motto, by voting in support of the measure today offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, because this resolution had not come through the Committee on the Judiciary process, I am at what I feel to be a disadvantage in commenting on the court opinion, since I have not read it. That may appear to me to be more of a disadvantage than some of my colleagues think it is.

As I said, not having read the opinion, I am somewhat reluctant to discuss it at great length, but I did want to say that I would disagree with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, in the suggestion that there is some danger that references to God will be removed from television. People would be understandably very unhappy about that. I want to allay their fears. The likelihood that there would be any governmental action removing references to God from television is zero. It would not be constitutional.

□ 1130

It would not be constitutional; it would not be appropriate. No official

body is talking about it, whether that is people conducting the services on television or programs.

So I do hope people will not unduly fear that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just in concluding, I remember hearing this decision when it came over my car radio and just shaking my head and thinking of all the other people in my State that are out there hearing this same court decision. It is one of the things that I think makes people wonder about their government and what is going on here. It is just such a ludicrous decision. It is almost incomprehensible.

It is incomprehensible to me that every morning we can pray in this Chamber before we start business here; that we can have a visiting rabbi, a priest, a minister, people of many different religions who come in here and start in the People's House the first session every morning with prayer; that we can have on the wall in front of us right now, "In God We Trust"; that we could have on our money, the currency that goes all around our country every day on behalf of our government and says "In God We Trust," yet it is somehow unconstitutional for the State of Ohio to have a very similar phrase, "In God All Things Are Possible"; that that is unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is just incomprehensible. It makes absolutely no sense. I certainly hope that the court's decision is overturned by the higher level in the court system. I feel very confident that it will be, but I think it is important that this House, the People's House, does express a sense of the House of Representatives that the Ohio State motto is constitutional. I think that is appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) for proposing this particular resolution.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today this body has the opportunity to speak out against a grave injustice that occurred in our country on April 25, 2000. For on April 25, 2000 the U.S. Court of Appeals of the Sixth Circuit ruled that the state motto of Ohio, "With God all Things Are Possible", is in violation of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, as we come to our Independence Day recess, I recall some 224 years ago we came together as a group to proclaim our independence from Britain. And in our Declaration of Independence we stated that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." From our nation's beginning we recognized the importance of God.

Mr. Speaker every day in this body before we begin our day we are led in a prayer, we ask God to bless and guide us in our proceedings. Before we begin our day we pledge

allegiance to our country, and proclaim that we are one nation under God. Mr. Speaker look around these chambers at our "law-givers" statues you will find two Popes and one Biblical figure, Moses. These are the men who laid the foundation of our American democracy.

Mr. Speaker for nearly 150 years our nation has lived under the motto "In God We Trust." The mint places copies of this motto on every nickel, dime, quarter, and paper money. The people of Ohio lived under their motto for forty years. Now, the judicial system after 224 years of foundation in our religious beliefs are trying to strike this down.

Mr. Speaker our nation has a strong heritage in our religious beliefs. For the past 224 years, we as a nation have asked God for leadership, guidance, and His blessing. I urge every member to stand today and support Mr. OXLEY'S resolution H. Res. 494 and support the motto of Ohio.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I respect the right of every member of this House to take a stand of conscience on the subject of religion, but the process of this resolution, in my opinion, does a disservice to the Constitution and to this House.

If this is intended to be a serious resolution, then it subjects matter of religious freedom in state mottoes deserves a full and open debate in Judiciary Committee hearings and on this floor.

Let us be honest with our constituents. The Constitution in Article III makes it absolutely clear that the Supreme Court—not the Congress—has the power to determine what is or is not constitutional.

Let us be honest, the passage of this resolution will have absolutely no impact upon whether the Supreme Court determines the constitutionality of the motto, "With God, all things are possible". No press releases today will change that fact.

If some members of this House envision this Congress as an advisory body to the Supreme Court, I would suggest that declaring an action constitutional, without any consideration of hearings on related court cases, would make our advice so grievously superficial as to make it ignored at best and counterproductive at worst.

I would hope that the Leadership of this House would honestly say to the American people that only the Supreme Court—not Congress—ultimately decides the constitutionality of an issue.

The first 16 words of the Bill of Rights have protected American's religious liberty for over two hundred years. It is a shame the House Republican leadership seems more interested in sound bite politics than in respecting our Constitution.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my home state of Ohio and its motto, "With God All Things Are Possible."

This motto was adopted by an act of the State Legislature in 1959 to express an optimistic and poignant view of what it means to be a resident of our great state. The motto embodies the belief that faith and Providence have played an important role in the development of the State of Ohio from pioneer times to the present day.

The 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals has ruled that the motto is an unconstitutional en-

dorsement of Christianity because the motto is derived from the Gospel of St. Matthew in the New Testament, yet followers of Islam have stated publicly that they have no objection to the motto since it simply references God.

The court's ruling is part of a disturbing trend to completely remove religious symbolism from public forums. This was never the intention of the Founding Fathers. The entire purpose behind the First Amendment was to prevent the establishment of an official state-endorsed religion like the Church of England and to protect the individual right to worship without fear of persecution by the government.

I'm sure that the authors of our Constitution would truly be perplexed at the way this straightforward constitutional matter has been interpreted to mean that the name of God or a supreme creator is never to be seen on a public document or inside a public building.

We have a state motto which states that the belief in God can inspire Ohioans to accomplish even greater achievements in the future. If the court's interpretation of the matter is allowed to stand we will soon be faced with the unpleasant task of striking the words "In God We Trust" from our currency, suspending prayer before the meetings of virtually every elected town council and state legislature in the nation, and eliminating the Prayer Room and the Office of the Chaplain from the U.S. Congress.

Is this the reality that we want to create? Must God only be praised in the voice of the individual and from private homes and established houses of worship? I truly hope not.

The First Amendment of the Constitution was created to protect religious freedoms, not to restrict the right of an individual state to determine its own motto. This ruling is a misguided attempt to negate the democratic process which allowed the motto to be established.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I will vote "present" today on this bill, not because I do not personally believe in the motto adopted by the State of Ohio, but because to do otherwise would be a disservice to my elected office, the judicial branch of our federal government, and the Constitution upon which our government is based.

This body has no authority to act in an advisory capacity to the courts of this land. The separation of powers embodied in the Constitution establishes separate and co-equal branches of government each possessing a unique role in the governance of the nation. Congress is authorized to enact laws, and the courts—under Article III as administered by the Supreme Court—are authorized to determine the constitutionality of those laws.

Congress should not purport to advise the courts regarding the constitutionality of a ruling of a particular court involving a particular matter. Such action is well beyond the scope of our constitutional role. The bill brought today is a knee-jerk reaction to a court decision that many Members disagree with. While I respect their opinions and their right to express themselves, I cannot support their attempt to influence this nation's courts in this manner and by this process.

I am disturbed that a bill that claims to express this body's well-reasoned and deliberative judgment over the constitutionality of a state motto was brought to the floor using the

suspension of the rules process. This bill was never fully researched and no committee hearing was held. Instead, it was rushed to the floor with no opportunity for amendment, scrutiny or serious discussion.

As a Member of this great body, I have sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States. Accordingly, I must abstain from voting on this measure which was blatantly brought to the floor for the sole purpose of trying to score cheap political points during an election year.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

"With God, all things are possible." If we could teach our children only one thing, it should be that with hard work, perseverance, and faith in themselves, all things are possible with God. I can think of no better message to send our future generations than to tell them that nothing is beyond their reach.

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, by ruling that the motto of the state of Ohio is unconstitutional, is keeping the people of Ohio from sharing this message. No branch of government should strip Ohioans of this, their expression of hope and optimism.

Certainly, I believe strongly in the First Amendment, which protects individuals' freedom of religion but also prohibits government establishment of religion. I for one believe that we cannot be overzealous to the point of discouraging expression: historic, traditional, time-honored expression that has defined us as a state and nation for generations.

Let us be clear: The motto of the State of Ohio does not establish any particular religion nor does it express any religious belief. Rather, the Ohio motto simply represents an expression of American optimism—one that for over 200 years has served to help steer this great nation.

I urge you to support the people of my home state, and the people of our nation, by supporting the resolution.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 494.

"With God All Things Are Possible." This phrase, the Ohio State motto, represents optimism in the human spirit.

The motto suggests that Ohioans should be optimistic and hopeful about the future. Although the motto is a Biblical reference, its meaning extends beyond the scope of religion. In fact this phrase was expressed in many ancient Greek texts such as *The Odyssey*.

Since the founding fathers of this great nation created a "more perfect Union," the concepts of god and country have been deeply intertwined. Observe the Great Seal, which dates back to 1782, on the back of our dollar bill. The "All Seeing Eye" above the pyramid suggests the importance of divine guidance in favor of the American cause. A closer look on the back of the dollar reveals America's intimacy with spirituality: The Latin phrase *ANNUIT COEPTIS*, which is also inscribed in this very chamber, means "He (God) has favored our undertakings," and refers to the many instances of Divine Providence during our Government's formation. Even our own Pledge of Allegiance mentions that the United States is "One Nation Under God," which is a prime example of America's relationship with spirituality.

My fellow colleagues, it's clear to me that the Ohio State motto is analogous to the beloved phrase "In God We Trust"—our national motto, displayed prominently above the seat of our own Speaker of the House of Representatives. With God all things are possible, especially the United States of America.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 494.

The question was taken.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2000

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1515) to amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1515

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Radiation Exposure Compensation Act Amendments of 2000".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (42 U.S.C. 2210 note) recognized the responsibility of the Federal Government to compensate individuals who were harmed by the mining of radioactive materials or fallout from nuclear arms testing;

(2) a congressional oversight hearing conducted by the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate demonstrated that since enactment of the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (42 U.S.C. 2210 note), regulatory burdens have made it too difficult for some deserving individuals to be fairly and efficiently compensated;

(3) reports of the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health testify to the need to extend eligibility to States in which the Federal Government sponsored uranium mining and milling from 1941 through 1971;

(4) scientific data resulting from the enactment of the Radiation Exposed Veterans Compensation Act of 1988 (38 U.S.C. 101 note), and obtained from the Committee on the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiations, and the President's Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments provide medical validation for the extension of compensable radiogenic pathologies;

(5) above-ground uranium miners, millers and individuals who transported ore should be fairly compensated, in a manner similar to that provided for underground uranium miners, in cases in which those individuals suffered disease or resultant death, associ-

ated with radiation exposure, due to the failure of the Federal Government to warn and otherwise help protect citizens from the health hazards addressed by the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 2210 note); and

(6) it should be the responsibility of the Federal Government in partnership with State and local governments and appropriate healthcare organizations, to initiate and support programs designed for the early detection, prevention and education on radiogenic diseases in approved States to aid the thousands of individuals adversely affected by the mining of uranium and the testing of nuclear weapons for the Nation's weapons arsenal.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION ACT.

(a) CLAIMS RELATING TO ATMOSPHERIC CLEAR TESTING.—Section 4(a)(1) of the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (42 U.S.C. 2210 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) CLAIMS RELATING TO LEUKEMIA.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An individual described in this subparagraph shall receive an amount specified in subparagraph (B) if the conditions described in subparagraph (C) are met. An individual referred to in the preceding sentence is an individual who—

“(i)(I) was physically present in an affected area for a period of at least 1 year during the period beginning on January 21, 1951, and ending on October 31, 1958;

“(II) was physically present in the affected area for the period beginning on June 30, 1962, and ending on July 31, 1962; or

“(III) participated onsite in a test involving the atmospheric detonation of a nuclear device; and

“(ii) submits written documentation that such individual developed leukemia—

“(I) after the applicable period of physical presence described in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) or onsite participation described in clause (i)(III) (as the case may be); and

“(II) more that 2 years after first exposure to fallout.

“(B) AMOUNTS.—If the conditions described in subparagraph (C) are met, an individual—

“(i) who is described in subclause (I) or (II) of subparagraph (A)(i) shall receive \$50,000; or

“(ii) who is described in subclause (III) of subparagraph (A)(i) shall receive \$75,000.

“(C) CONDITIONS.—The conditions described in this subparagraph are as follows:

“(i) Initial exposure occurred prior to age 21.

“(ii) The claim for a payment under subparagraph (B) is filed with the Attorney General by or on behalf of the individual.

“(iii) The Attorney General determines, in accordance with section 6, that the claim meets the requirements of this Act.”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 4(b) of the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (42 U.S.C. 2210 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by inserting “Wayne, San Juan,” after “Millard,”; and

(B) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

“(C) in the State of Arizona, the counties of Coconino, Yavapai, Navajo, Apache, and Gila; and”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “the onset of the disease was between 2 and 30 years of first exposure,” and inserting “the onset of the disease was at least 2 years after first exposure, lung cancer (other than in situ lung cancer that is discovered during or after a post-mortem exam),”; and

(B) by striking “(provided initial exposure occurred by the age of 20)” after “thyroid”;

(C) by inserting “male or” before “female breast”;

(D) by striking “(provided initial exposure occurred prior to age 40)” after “female breast”;

(E) by striking “(provided low alcohol consumption and not a heavy smoker)” after “esophagus”;

(F) by striking “(provided initial exposure occurred before age 30)” after “stomach”;

(G) by striking “(provided not a heavy smoker)” after “pharynx”;

(H) by striking “(provided not a heavy smoker and low coffee consumption)” after “pancreas”; and

(I) by inserting “salivary gland, urinary bladder, brain, colon, ovary,” after “gall bladder,”.

(c) CLAIMS RELATING TO URANIUM MINING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(a) of the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (42 U.S.C. 2210 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) ELIGIBILITY OF INDIVIDUALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual shall receive \$100,000 for a claim made under this Act if—

“(A) that individual—

“(i) was employed in a uranium mine or uranium mill (including any individual who was employed in the transport of uranium ore or vanadium-uranium ore from such mine or mill) located in Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Wyoming, South Dakota, Washington, Utah, Idaho, North Dakota, Oregon, and Texas at any time during the period beginning on January 1, 1942, and ending on December 31, 1971; and

“(ii)(I) was a miner exposed to 40 or more working level months of radiation and submits written medical documentation that the individual, after that exposure, developed lung cancer or a nonmalignant respiratory disease; or

“(II) was a miller or ore transporter who worked for at least 1 year during the period described under clause (i) and submits written medical documentation that the individual, after that exposure, developed lung cancer or a nonmalignant respiratory disease or renal cancers and other chronic renal disease including nephritis and kidney tubal tissue injury;

“(B) the claim for that payment is filed with the Attorney General by or on behalf of that individual; and

“(C) the Attorney General determines, in accordance with section 6, that the claim meets the requirements of this Act.

“(2) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL STATES.—Paragraph (1)(A)(i) shall apply to a State, in addition to the States named under such clause, if—

“(A) an Atomic Energy Commission uranium mine was operated in such State at any time during the period beginning on January 1, 1942, and ending on December 31, 1971;

“(B) the State submits an application to the Department of Justice to include such State; and

“(C) the Attorney General makes a determination to include such State.

“(3) PAYMENT REQUIREMENT.—Each payment under this section may be made only in accordance with section 6.”.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Section 5(b) of the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (42 U.S.C. 2210 note) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “and” before “corpulmonale”; and