FUNDING FOR FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in support of faith-based entities who have long worked to address social ills. In fact, we just recently, earlier this week, paid a tribute to the efforts of these entities and encouraged private corporations to contribute to their worthwhile efforts.

This bill will also likely consider proposals aimed at providing government funding to faith-based entities. Charitable Choice. However, I have grave concerns with those proposals and believe that before adopting them, they merit serious examination to ensure they do not work to dilute our Nation’s constitutional principles and civil rights laws.

First, are we prepared to modify our constitutional principle of separation of church and state to one promoting a church state?

The First Amendment says Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. This clause was intended to erect a wall of separation between church and state. In essence, our Nation has been successful in preventing the church from controlling the state and the state from controlling the religion.

The current faith-based proposals threaten this very important principle. Who will qualify for the government funding? Will the more dominant or better financed faiths be awarded the grants? The government will be forced to choose one religion or denomination over the other.

Once the government funding, they then must be held accountable for the use of these funds. As such, faith-based entities will open themselves up to government regulation. So we must ask ourselves, will groups forego the full expression of their religious beliefs, their independence and autonomy in exchange for money? Are we comfortable with our houses of worship becoming houses of investigation?

Further, while the proposals state that government funds should not be used for worship or proselytization, meaningful safeguards to prevent such action are not included in the provisions. The consequence is the possibility of using funds to promote certain religious beliefs or a beneficiary of social programs being subject to religious influence that is not welcome.

In addition to ensuring that faith-based initiatives do not threaten our Nation’s constitutional principles, we must also guarantee that our citizens will remain protected under our civil rights laws. Religious institutions are currently exempted from the ban on religious discrimination and employment provided under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As such, if faith-based proposals do not include a repeal of this exemption, these institutions will be able to engage in government-funded employment discrimination.

Allowing the exemption to be applied to hiring and staffing decisions by religious entities as they deliver critical services flies in the face of our Nation’s long-standing principle that Federal funds may not be used in a discriminatory fashion.

As I reflect on those who fought hard to secure civil rights for us all, and as one who has been a strong advocate myself, I cannot sit idly by and watch them be eroded. As such, I believe that any faith-based proposals must include a repeal of the Title VII exemption.

As we review faith-based proposals, it is important to note that under current law religious entities can seek government funding by establishing a 501(c)(3) affiliate organization. Such religious-affiliated organizations have successfully partnered with government and received government funding for years.

I urge my colleagues to carefully examine these issues. As we continue to support faith-based entities and their good works, we must remember our duty to also protect the very foundation of this Nation, our Constitution and our civil rights laws. Let us stand against discrimination and stand up for religious tolerance and freedom.

PAYING HOMAGE TO A SPECIAL GROUP OF VETERANS, SURVIVORS OF BATAAN AND CORREGIDOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 50 minutes as a designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay homage to a very special group of American veterans. As Americans, these World War II survivors have sacrificed and have suffered for their country. But this special group is different.

This group that I would like to call attention to tonight are men who continue to fight for justice even though these many years have passed since the close of World War II. These are men who fought and paid an enormous price for our freedom and for the peace and safety of the world, yet today, I repeat, continue to struggle for justice to their own cause.

Instead of fighting the emperors of Japan which they fought during the second World War, these brave veterans are now forced to fight lawyers, the lawyers of Japanese and international business giants, companies like Mitsubishi, Matsui and Nippon Steel. Instead of battling in the jungles, instead of battling on the islands in the South Pacific, these veterans are battling in the courtroom.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest irony about what is happening today about the veterans of whom I speak, while they battled for our freedom in the second World War, and today, as they say, they are battling lawyers of some of the biggest Japanese companies, the greatest irony is that these American heroes have the United States Government not on their side, but on the side of their adversary. They find themselves arguing against representatives of their own government.

Let me make this clear. Some heroic veterans from World War II were trying