

pass a homeland security bill and Americans are going to the polls; they are basically going to make a decision. They might decide that Senator DASCHLE is right, that the President doesn't care anything about national security, that he is out to bust the unions, and that we really don't need to change business as usual in Washington as it relates to homeland security. I think that is a possibility. People might reach that conclusion.

But I think there is an alternative possibility. I think people are going to reach a conclusion that when it came down to making a hard decision that meant changing business as usual in Washington, that required us to change a system for national security reasons and the protection of the life and health of our people, that meant going against the way things have been done here for 50 or 60 years, that the Democrats are unwilling to make that change and the President wanted to make the change.

I just remind my colleagues that when Senator DASCHLE was talking about the President's efforts at union busting, we have had three major commissions that have looked at our current Government system—the civil service system—in areas of national security and terrorism. The two major ones are the Volcker Commission and the Rudman Commission. Paul Volcker was a Democrat-appointed head of the Federal Reserve Bank and one of the most respected people in America. Warren Rudman is one of our former colleagues and was one of our most respected Republican members. Both of them headed up blue ribbon commissions to look at our ability to respond to threats to our national security, and both of those commissions concluded unanimously that we needed to change the current civil service system as it related to the ability to promote on merit and the ability to put the right person in the right place at the right time. That is what the President has asked for.

So like so many issues in the greatest democracy in history, this is one where you have to choose. The President cannot succeed because he is one vote short. I don't believe the Democrats could pass their bill because I think some of their own members would not vote for it on final passage, and none of our members are going to vote for a bill that the President said he will veto.

So we have an impasse, and it comes down to a choice. It is not a choice that Senator REID is going to make, or one that I am going to make. It is a choice the people back home are going to make. They have heard each side with its own focus, twist, spin, or whatever the conventional wisdom is. But, ultimately, it is the judgment of the American people that we are going to stand by, and I am willing to stand by it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Utah is recognized.

FAREWELL TO A FRIEND

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to honor the achievements of my good friend and colleague, Senator PHIL GRAMM.

After serving with him for 18 years, it is difficult to remember that our Texas colleague began his career as a Democrat.

After listening to him here today, I can see he is ending his career by going out with a bang. PHIL GRAMM is one of the most effective Senators who has ever sat in this body. In fact, even though he started out as a Democrat, he actually became one of the most effective conservatives in this body and a fixture on economic issues and a man who deserves much of the credit for changing the attitude of Congress about budget and fiscal responsibility.

I know I am not the only Member of this body who is deeply grateful for the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit-control legislation that Senator GRAMM poured his heart into creating and sustaining over so many years.

Another landmark bill that bears his name and is changing the course of the nation for good is the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Financial Services Modernization Act of 1999.

He brought his classroom skills to bear on more than one occasion, patiently explaining basic economics to his fellow Senators, again and again and again.

I, for one, am grateful for the opportunity to have been one of his students.

Senator GRAMM is also one of the Senate's most honest and forthright members, never hesitant to tell you exactly what he is thinking.

On more than one occasion, the senior Senator from Texas has approached me about bills on which we disagreed and said, in his distinct drawl, "ORRIN, you were one of the reasons I came to the Senate—to help you fight all those ridiculous liberal ideas. So I have to ask, what are you doing with this bill?"

And we all came to respect Senator GRAMM when he joined the GOP ranks.

The story is now legend, but compelling nonetheless.

He was serving in the other body when he decided he no longer felt comfortable as a Democrat.

Instead of simply announcing he was switching parties, he resigned his seat in 1983 and ran again in a special election as a Republican. He has served here ever since with, I think, the respect of both sides of the aisle.

He thus eliminated any question that his decision was motivated by anything other than a realization that his beliefs no longer fit within the Democratic Party.

Senator GRAMM'S dedication to the principles of a free society, his belief that free markets and limited govern-

ment allow people to realize their full potential, his reminders that good intentions are no substitute for good policy—these have shown through in ample body of Senate achievement he will leave behind.

Senator PHIL GRAMM'S career is proof that good ideas can have a real impact on our country, as long as those ideas are combined with a mountain of hard work.

Mr. President, I am sad to see my good friend leaving this body.

I wish we could convince my friend to stay.

I personally am going to miss him. I can only wish him the very best as he begins his new life outside of Senate. I am sure of one thing: wherever PHIL GRAMM goes or whatever he does, he is going to be a success. PHIL GRAMM is one of the brightest people who ever served in both Houses of Congress, and he is certainly one of the best people, as far as I am concerned.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to change the subject because I think it is important before we leave this Congress that I say a few words. We have all seen the news reports suggesting our friends on the other side of the aisle want desperately to turn the focus of the national debate back to the economy. I am glad to do so, but let it be a full and fair debate. I hope we can talk about the recession we have been through, the recovery that is now under way, what we have already done to grow the economy and, most importantly, what we Members of the Senate from both political parties propose to do about the economy in the future.

Let us start by considering the shocks that have hit the economy since the last year of the Clinton Presidency.

In the summer and fall of 2000, the dot-com bubble burst and high-tech spending fell precipitously, triggering a slowdown that was worsened by the horrendous terrorist attacks that shook our entire economy last year on September 11 and afterwards.

Then about a year ago this week, we began discovering a few large companies have been massively deceiving their investors, deepening the malaise.

Finally, to top off all this bad news, oil prices have hovered around the danger level of \$30 a barrel because of war clouds in the Middle East.

This chart shows that how our slump began during the summer of 2000. While it would not be fair to blame all these problems entirely on the Clinton administration, in my view, it is clear that the beginnings of this slowdown—what some have called the "Clinton hangover"—occurred well before President Clinton took the oath of office.

This is not just a partisan position or partisan judgment.

As President Clinton's top economic adviser, Nobel Laureate Joe Stiglitz, recently said:

The economy was slipping into recession even before Bush took office, and the corporate scandals that are rocking America began much earlier.

That is what happened in the year 2000 right on up to our time today. One can see the red mark shows it began during the Clinton administration and continued for the first year of the Bush administration.

While these problems did not begin on President Bush's watch, we are committed to working with the President to solve our economy's current problems.

In of all the blows our economy suffered, consumer spending held up very well. New car and new home sales have stayed at record levels over the last year, and while times have been tough for some retailers, overall consumer spending has kept right on growing. Why? Because of last year's tax cuts.

Which part of the tax cuts helped the most? Was it the rate cuts or rebate checks that kept spending growing steadily? Let's think about that for a moment. Was it the rate cuts or was it the rebate checks? Some Democrats complained that last year's tax cut did not have enough rebates; it did not have enough immediate stimulus, they said.

Guess what? The numbers are in, and it turned out while rebate checks sure help families sleep better at night, they do not stimulate much spending. When the manna falls from Heaven, they do not just eat it, they store as much of it as they can. So when the rebates came, people did not spend most of the checks; only about a third of it. They saved most of the money, or they used it to pay down their debt.

Those are good things to do, but I do not think we should be under any illusions that most of these rebate checks are spent at the local Wal-Mart.

By contrast, the permanent rate cuts let people know the Government was going to let them keep more of their own money, not just this year, but for years to come. When people know their take-home pay is going up and that it is going to stay up, they feel more comfortable about spending today, tomorrow, and into the future.

The lesson is clear: Tax rebates help spending a little bit, for a month or two, but a permanent income tax cut gives people a green light to spend because it helps them over a long term. A permanent income tax cut may not be glamorous, but it does work, and if we want to speed up consumer spending, the most effective way to do it is by speeding up the tax cuts.

Even though consumer spending has held up, there are just not nearly enough good-paying jobs out there right now, and we all know it. I am seeing this in Utah where our State's economy has been hit harder than most by the current downturn.

In fact, just today, Delta Airlines, which has a hub in Salt Lake City, announced thousands of layoffs. My heart goes out to these families impacted by these layoffs.

Utah has a highly educated work force, and we have more high-tech and more tourism jobs than most States do. We saw Utah's unemployment rate rise from about 3 percent to almost 6 percent before coming back down toward 5 percent, a number that is still far too high. The way to bring back these lost jobs is to bring back investment spending.

Businesses just have not been buying as much equipment as they used to, especially high-tech equipment. Investment spending started falling back in 2000, and while it has been recovering over the last few months, it is nowhere near the levels of 1999.

Early this year, Congress saw that business spending had nosedived, and we took action. We enacted a temporary bonus depreciation provision giving companies a tax incentive to buy equipment sooner rather than later. This powerful tax incentive is based on legislation that I championed.

Unfortunately, large corporate bureaucracies cannot turn on a dime, and many businesses had already worked out their spending plans before we managed to pass bonus depreciation, but it will help in the future.

Since many companies only plan their equipment budgets once a year, we can expect to see business purchases come back up early next year, and that will be, in part, because of this provision. With that revival, the weakest pillar of spending will be strengthened.

Some on the other side of the aisle have proposed speeding up and increasing the amount of bonus depreciation, and I think that is a great proposal. In fact, my original bonus depreciation proposal looks quite a lot like some of the Democratic depreciation proposals being discussed.

In another major economic accomplishment this year, Congress joined with the President to enact two more pieces of strong pro-growth legislation: trade promotion authority and corporate accountability legislation.

I worked together with Members of both Houses and both parties on the conference report because, as chairman of the Trade Subcommittee of the Finance Committee, I served on the conference for this bill. This report gave the President the much-needed authority to negotiate free trade agreements.

As the President finalizes free trade agreements, first with Chile and Singapore, and then expanding across the world, we are going to reap real benefits from trade promotion authority. I can remember all of the fighting on the floor over whether we were going to do that or not. We know we should have done it, and we finally did.

The American people will benefit from lower prices for Americans buying goods, services, and machinery; wider overseas markets for farm products, high-tech equipment and services; and higher wages for American workers, especially for workers in exporting industries.

The corporate accountability bill passed this year is also going to help

make sure stockholders are in charge of the corporation, not insiders with something to hide. It is going to make sure auditors serve the interests of the shareholders. But as I predicted on the Senate floor back in July, we now find ourselves locked in a fruitless debate, indeed a dangerous debate, over who can be the toughest on the public accounting profession.

Republicans have an agenda for economic recovery and economic security. We know what we want. We can pass this agenda this week if we can get the majority to agree.

I have already mentioned last year's tax rate cuts. Speeding up the date the remaining tax cuts take effect and making them permanent will have a powerful impact for good on the economy.

We also want terrorism insurance to create good-paying construction jobs.

Terrorism insurance has been delayed by the trial lawyer lobby, which insists on being able to sue businesses who are the victims of terrorism. I suspect that in the end they are probably going to win, even though that is a disastrous way of continuing to do business. As a result, we are going to find people who are totally innocent sued for punitive damages in the future.

We want an energy bill that will reduce our dependence on foreign oil, push gas prices down, and encourage conservation, all at the same time.

I joined with a number of my colleagues to sponsor a landmark provision, the CLEAR Act, in the energy bill that would change the transportation vehicle marketplace by giving tax incentives to cleaner-running alternative fuel and hybrid electric cars and trucks.

Unfortunately, the energy bill is stuck in conference, partly because some conferees apparently will not accept an extra 10 million acres of permanent Alaska wilderness in exchange for oil exploration that would leave a footprint no larger than Dulles International Airport. That 10 million acres would become wilderness. It is clear that they are not really serious about having a good energy bill or reducing our dependence on Middle Eastern oil. If these decisions were motivated by love for the environment rather than by ideology, we would already have an energy bill and Alaska would have 10 million more acres of permanent wilderness.

There are other good economic proposals that can and should be discussed in the coming months, proposals that could strengthen our economy now and restore to us another decade of exceptional growth.

I am convinced that ending the double taxation of dividends should be an important part of any such plan. Our Tax Code rewards corporations for loading up on debt, and it slows our Nation's rate of capital formation and innovation. I think this has to end.

I will now take a moment to address one of the most puzzling charges made

against our President's economic policies. Some of our Democratic colleagues have claimed that last year's tax cut brought back the deficit and destroyed the projected 10-year surplus. Since fiscal year 2002 is over, we now have a pretty clear explanation of why we ran a deficit. The Congressional Budget Office is clear on this issue. We had a slowdown that began during the Clinton administration, and continued during the first year of the Bush administration. That hurt income tax revenues, while a stock slump hurt capital gains revenues.

Let's look at this. How did CBO's fiscal year 2002 \$313 billion surplus forecast become a \$157 billion deficit? It was not the tax cuts. Look at this particular illustration. As we can see, the weakening economy caused 67 percent of the problem.

New discretionary spending is \$50 billion. That is 11 percent. The economic stimulus is \$51 billion. That is 11 percent. The tax relief is \$37 billion, or only 8 percent of this total pie that has literally eaten up the \$313 billion forecast which has now become a \$157 billion deficit.

A lot of it has come from our spending in the Congress. In some respects, we are spending like drunken sailors. The fact of the matter is that the smallest part of it, other than the "other," is the tax relief, which cost us \$37 billion of the \$313 billion.

Last year's recession was real, and our slow recovery is leaving behind pockets of real suffering both in my home State of Utah and across the Nation.

Without minimizing this suffering, let us put this in perspective by remembering just how bad recessions really have been in the past, as illustrated by this chart.

In January of 1980, when we had a recession, the average unemployment rate during and after the recession was 7.4 percent. In the next recession, starting in July of 1981, it averaged 9.4 percent. In July of 1990, we had the beginning of another recession and unemployment averaged 6.8 percent. Since our most recent recession, beginning in March of 2001, unemployment has averaged 5.3 percent. It is 5.6 percent today, which is considerably less than these other recessive periods of time.

These are 2-year averages of civilian unemployment rates beginning with the first month of recession. The source of this information is the National Bureau of Economic Research and the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. It has been a lower recession unemployment rate—and when I used to be chairman of the Labor Committee, we saw figures that said if the unemployment rate is around 5 percent, there is basically full employment in the country.

Now I am not saying 5.3 percent unemployment rate is full employment. It is not good enough for me, but the fact is it is less than the other recessive periods over the last 20 years, and that is a very important thing.

As my friends on the other side of the aisle like to remind us, the search for jobs is where people really feel the bite of a sluggish economy. How does the old saying go? "If your neighbor loses a job, it is a recession. But if you lose your job, it is a depression."

So I think we should compare the unemployment rates during and after the last three recessions with the unemployment rate since March of 2001, when the most recent recession began.

It comes as no secret that the job market often gets worse even after the economy starts growing again. Unfortunately, businesses want to be sure that their sector of the economy is going to keep growing before they take on more workers, and I cannot blame them for that.

A glance at this chart makes it clear that while our unemployment rate has been far too high, nowhere near the lows of 4 percent that we saw a few years ago, we have done better than we could have hoped.

I have not seen many of my colleagues making serious comparisons between this recession and previous recessions, and we can see why from this particular chart. There is just no comparison.

During the back-to-back recessions of the early 1990s, when the Federal Reserve finally broke the back of inflation, unemployment rates hovered near 10 percent. During our last recession 10 years ago, we suffered from jobless rates much higher than anything we have seen today.

Today's weak job market is real. It means Americans suffer through no cause of their own, and it is something we need to work together to fix. While we work to fix these problems, let us remember in our own lifetimes we have seen the face of deep recession.

While there are regions of the country that face steep hurdles and devastated job markets, the Nation as a whole is seeing a recovery. For that, our Nation can be grateful.

Our President's policies, the Federal Reserve's aggressive, preemptive rate cutting, combined with the flexibility of our free market system, keep unemployment rates much lower than in past recessions.

By enacting more job-creating, growth-enhancing initiatives, we can do even better. Accelerated tax cuts, terrorism insurance, and an energy bill should all be part of our recovery agenda. We can do these this year, even though this is our last real day of this session. We still can get this done, since we all know we are coming back for a partial lame duck session.

We do not need another economic forum. What we need is legislative action. It is pretty pitiful that the Senate has not enacted one non-defense appropriations bill—not one. For the first time in over 20 years, we do not have a budget.

I will tell my colleagues the reason we do not have a budget. In the past, I can remember when we on this side

were in the majority and had to come up with a budget, and it was really tough to do because we knew we would be subject to all kinds of cheap criticisms from others who wanted to score political points. But we always came up with that budget, and we endured the cheap political criticisms.

I have to say I think part of the reason we do not have a budget today is that the other side is afraid we might use the same type of cheap criticisms on them that were used on us for all of these years. I hope we will not do that. I hope what we will do is work together in the best interest of our country.

I am sure there are good ideas on both sides, and I hope we can work together to bring in all the good ideas we can find. The strength of our democracy, as the strength of our businesses and our families, comes from our willingness to listen to each other. After we listen and negotiate a compromise, we need to take action—action to restore the economy to its potential, action to restore a healthy job market, action to ensure that our workers are the most productive and best paid in the world. It is time for us to live up to our duties. The American people are waiting for action. I think we still have enough time, even though it may have to be during a lame duck session, to be able to get this done.

One last thing. I, for one, am very disappointed that we were unable to get a prescription drug benefit bill passed. Everybody knew the bipartisan bill would have swooshed through the Senate Finance Committee. We were foreclosed from allowing that bill to come through the normal legislative process because it was known that it would have swooshed through and it would become the bill of merit on the floor and it would have passed the Senate.

That bill had \$70 billion more in it, in the final analysis, than what those on the other side asked for last year.

Instead, we had a bill which was brought up pursuant to rule 14, which is a procedural mechanism on the floor which allows you to call up a bill once and, if it is objected to, then it goes on the calendar and on the agenda of the U.S. Senate.

We had a bill called up that would have been probably twice as expensive as this \$370 billion bill we had. It would have passed—our bill would have passed. The competing proposal was twice as expensive and never once had the final CBO scoring necessary for a bill of that magnitude on the floor of the Senate. It was pulled down because it clearly did not have the votes, where we did.

We could have had the prescription drug benefit package for our seniors in this society, had it not been for politics. I, for one, lament that. We could have had it. We had Democrats, Republicans, and an Independent in support of that bill.

Would everybody have been pleased with that bill? No, but it would have

S. 2690

passed and would have passed overwhelmingly. Now we do not have a prescription drug bill for senior citizens, all because of the way this floor has been managed over the last year or so.

I have to tell you I think it is going to be virtually impossible to pass it next year, especially if we are in a conflict with Iraq. That will have to take precedence and the spending for that will have to take precedence. Everybody knows that. Everybody knew those were the facts. This was the year to get that job done, and we had it done. I believe we could have gotten it through the House.

As somebody who has been on the passing end of a lot of legislation over the last 26 years, I think I can speak with authority. We could have gotten it through the House as well, and it would be law today.

So I, for one, think we have lost a tremendous opportunity, mainly because of politics and the hoped-for advantage that one side might have had over the other. Our side would have supported the tripartisan bill, and I think a considerable number of Democrats would have, too. But we don't control the floor and we were not able to get that bill up. I am disappointed because I think we should have done that.

There are a lot of other things I wish we could have done during this year. Had we had a budget, we might have been able to. Had we had appropriations bills, we might have been able to. I just wish all our colleagues well. At the end of this session I have good will towards every person in this Chamber. I care for every Member of this body, and I will tell the public at large that most everybody in the Congress I know happens to be a good person who is trying to do the job to the best of their ability.

But occasionally politics gets in the way and we do not get things done that should be done. This year has been a prime example of that, in my humble opinion.

But I wish everybody well. With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REAFFIRMING THE REFERENCE TO ONE NATION UNDER GOD IN THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 2690, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) On November 11, 1620, prior to embarking for the shores of America, the Pilgrims signed the Mayflower Compact that declared: "Having undertaken, for the Glory of God and the advancement of the Christian Faith and honor of our King and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia,".

(2) On July 4, 1776, America's Founding Fathers, after appealing to the "Laws of Nature, and of Nature's God" to justify their separation from Great Britain, then declared: "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".

(3) In 1781, Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence and later the Nation's third President, in his work titled "Notes on the State of Virginia" wrote: "God who gave us life gave us liberty. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the Gift of God. That they are not to be violated but with His wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever."

(4) On May 14, 1787, George Washington, as President of the Constitutional Convention, rose to admonish and exhort the delegates and declared: "If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God!".

(5) On July 21, 1789, on the same day that it approved the Establishment Clause concerning religion, the First Congress of the United States also passed the Northwest Ordinance, providing for a territorial government for lands northwest of the Ohio River, which declared: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

(6) On September 25, 1789, the First Congress unanimously approved a resolution calling on President George Washington to proclaim a National Day of Thanksgiving for the people of the United States by declaring, "a day of public thanksgiving and prayer, to be observed by acknowledging, with grateful hearts, the many signal favors of Almighty God, especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a constitution of government for their safety and happiness."

(7) On November 19, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln delivered his Gettysburg Address on the site of the battle and declared: "It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

(8) On April 28, 1952, in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Zorach v. Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306 (1952), in which school children were allowed to be excused from public schools for religious observances and education, Justice William O. Douglas, in writing for the Court stated: "The First Amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of Church and State. Rather, it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways, in which there shall be no concern or union or dependency one on the other. That is the common sense of the matter. Other-

wise the State and religion would be aliens to each other—hostile, suspicious, and even unfriendly. Churches could not be required to pay even property taxes. Municipalities would not be permitted to render police or fire protection to religious groups. Policemen who helped parishioners into their places of worship would violate the Constitution. Prayers in our legislative halls; the appeals to the Almighty in the messages of the Chief Executive; the proclamations making Thanksgiving Day a holiday; 'so help me God' in our courtroom oaths—these and all other references to the Almighty that run through our laws, our public rituals, our ceremonies would be flouting the First Amendment. A fastidious atheist or agnostic could even object to the supplication with which the Court opens each session: 'God save the United States and this Honorable Court.'"

(9) On June 15, 1954, Congress passed and President Eisenhower signed into law a statute that was clearly consistent with the text and intent of the Constitution of the United States, that amended the Pledge of Allegiance to read: "I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.";

(10) On July 20, 1956, Congress proclaimed that the national motto of the United States is "In God We Trust", and that motto is inscribed above the main door of the Senate, behind the Chair of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and on the currency of the United States.

(11) On June 17, 1963, in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Abington School District v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963), in which compulsory school prayer was held unconstitutional, Justices Goldberg and Harlan, concurring in the decision, stated: "But untutored devotion to the concept of neutrality can lead to invocation or approval of results which partake not simply of that noninterference and noninvolvement with the religious which the Constitution commands, but of a brooding and pervasive devotion to the secular and a passive, or even active, hostility to the religious. Such results are not only not compelled by the Constitution, but, it seems to me, are prohibited by it. Neither government nor this Court can or should ignore the significance of the fact that a vast portion of our people believe in and worship God and that many of our legal, political, and personal values derive historically from religious teachings. Government must inevitably take cognizance of the existence of religion and, indeed, under certain circumstances the First Amendment may require that it do so."

(12) On March 5, 1984, in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Lynch v. Donnelly*, 465 U.S. 668 (1984), in which a city government's display of a nativity scene was held to be constitutional, Chief Justice Burger, writing for the Court, stated: "There is an unbroken history of official acknowledgment by all three branches of government of the role of religion in American life from at least 1789 . . . [E]xamples of reference to our religious heritage are found in the statutorily prescribed national motto 'In God We Trust' (36 U.S.C. 186), which Congress and the President mandated for our currency, see (31 U.S.C. 5112(d)(1) (1982 ed.)), and in the language 'One Nation under God', as part of the Pledge of Allegiance to the American flag. That pledge is recited by many thousands of public school children—and adults—every year . . . Art galleries supported by public revenues display religious paintings of the 15th and 16th centuries, predominantly inspired by one religious faith. The National Gallery in Washington, maintained with Government support, for example, has long exhibited masterpieces with religious messages, notably the *Last Supper*, and paintings depicting the Birth of Christ, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection, among many others with explicit Christian themes and