

regardless of his or her race, content or creed. For we are all the people of the United States of America.

For together we stand proud as one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

We the people of the United States of America (every woman, man and child/all nationalities to be included), share a foundation bound by democracy, freedom, justice, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. This foundation has caused us to be united as one nation under God.

We the people of the United States of America have been blessed and recognized with freedom of speech and of the press.

We the people of the United States of America understand that freedom has a price, and we must maintain that which was set forth by the founding fathers of this great country and by those who have paid the ultimate price for freedom.

We the people of the United States of America must respect the laws of this great nation, and when we find ourselves outside of this realm, must act swiftly to make necessary corrections.

We the people of the United States are protected against unreasonable search and seizure.

We the people of the United States of America are all subject to due process of law and equal protection of the law.

We the people of the United States of America are protected against excessive bail and cruel and unusual punishment.

We the people of the United States retain all rights not specifically granted to the States or by the Constitution.

We the people of the United States of America recognize that slavery is wrong and hereby denounce and abolish it.

We the people of the United States of America (woman & man) have been granted the right to vote, regardless of race, color or previous condition of servitude.

We the people of the United States of America understand that this country may not be without faults, yet we will strive to do the best that we can to ensure the right to democracy, freedom, justice, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for all to enjoy.

We the people of the United States of America realize that this country is made up of different cultures, sexes beliefs and religions that may not necessarily be our own; however, we must respect and practice tolerance for one another. For it is diversity that serves as an important link which holds the foundation of this great country together.

We the people of the United States of America hold at the very core of our foundation that democracy is vital and necessary for the people and by the people. For democracy must never be threatened by forces from within or without these United States of America.

From the pages of the Magna Carta, to Puritan New England let liberty ring.

From the Virginia House of Burgesses, to the Washington Monument let liberty ring.

Let liberty ring from Williamsburg to Philadelphia.

From the waters of the Delaware to the Golden Gate Bridge, let liberty ring.

From the sparkling, sandy beaches of Miami to Stone Mountain Georgia, let liberty ring.

From the green pastures of New Hampshire, to the deserts of Arizona, let liberty ring.

From Alabama to Alaska, let liberty ring.

From the Oregon forests to the New Mexico desert, let liberty ring.

From the flat lands of Indiana, to the farm lands of Arkansas, let liberty ring.

From the Colorado Rocky Mountains to the clear Connecticut waters, let liberty ring.

From Seattle to Independence Hall, let liberty ring.

From the Florida Atlantic to the shores of Hawaii, let liberty ring.

From Stone Mountain Georgia to Mt. Rushmore, let liberty ring.

From the Iowa Woodlands to the mighty Missouri River, let liberty ring.

From the Bluegrass Heartlands of Kentucky, to the Flint Hills of Kansas, let liberty ring.

From the potato fields of Idaho, to the dairy lands of Iowa, let liberty ring.

From the golden country side of Kansas to Bourbon Street, let liberty ring.

Let Liberty ring from Freedom Trail Boston to Old town Alexandria.

From the cold waters of Maine to the green Montana mountains let liberty ring.

From the great lakes of Michigan to the mighty Mississippi River, let liberty ring.

From Historic New Jersey to the Statue of Liberty let liberty ring.

From the sandy mountains of New Mexico to the Alamo, let liberty ring.

Let Liberty ring from Industry, Ohio to the steel mills of Pittsburgh.

From the banks of Rhode Island to the historic Carolinas let liberty ring.

From Baltimore's inner harbors to Minnesota's Thousand lakes, let liberty ring.

From the subtly colored sandstones of Wisconsin to Mustang, Wyoming, let liberty ring.

Let liberty ring out from Apollo 13 to the Space Shuttle.

From the heart of Rock-n-roll to the soul of Jazz, let liberty ring.

My Country tis of thee, sweet land of liberty; of thee I sing. Land where my fathers died, land of every one's pride, from every mountain side let liberty ring.

For I am proud to be an American. I will do my best to give my fellow American my honor and my respect. When my fellow American is in need of a helping hand, it is I who must reach out. For it is I who must respect nature that God has placed for all to enjoy, for we must live with nature as one.

May the mercy of liberty, democracy, freedom and the pursuit of happiness echo throughout the world, making this land yours and mine for generations to come.

May God have mercy upon the United States of America and all that lie within.●

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MICHIGAN REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Michigan Rehabilitation Association, a remarkable organization from my home state of Michigan, which will celebrate its 50th Anniversary on November 1, 1999.

Over the past five decades, the Michigan Rehabilitation Association (MRA) has proudly worked to meet the needs of Michigan's disabled community. While beginning as a professional association for rehabilitation practitioners, it has quickly grown into one of Michigan's leading advocates for the welfare and rights of handicapped people. While its scope and purpose have evolved, its members have remained steadfastly committed to excellence in the delivery of services to the disabled.

Since its inception in 1949 as the country's first state chapter of the National Rehabilitation Association, the MRA's far-reaching hand has helped thousands of Michigan's citizens

achieve a higher quality of life. As it celebrates this important milestone, I am sure its staff, friends and supporters will have the opportunity to recall its many successes. I am pleased to join with them in thanking the people of the Michigan Rehabilitation Association for their efforts while applauding all the hard work and determination that have resulted in the MRA's prestigious reputation.

The Michigan Rehabilitation Association can take pride in the many important achievements of its first fifty years. I know my colleagues will join me in saluting the accomplishments of MRA's first half century and in wishing it continued success for the future.●

RED MASS HOMILY

● Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, on Sunday, October 3, 1999, the Most Reverend Raymond J. Boland, Bishop of the Kansas City-St. Joseph area of Missouri, delivered the homily at the Red Mass held at St. Matthew's Cathedral in Washington, DC. The Red Mass traditionally marks the opening of the Supreme Court's new term. In his address, Bishop Boland discusses the idea of having cooperative dialog between the Church and State in their mutual search for justice and respect.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD the text of the homily given by Bishop Raymond J. Boland.

The text follows.

HOMILY: 1999 RED MASS

(St. Matthew's Cathedral, Washington, DC, Sunday, October 3, 1999, Most Reverend Raymond J. Boland, D.D., Bishop of Kansas City-St. Joseph, Missouri)

I am grateful to Cardinal Hickey for his gracious invitation to give the homily at this 47th annual Red Mass. Another legal year, the last of this century, is about to begin and conscious of our fallibilities we gather in prayer to beg God's Spirit to give us understanding, courage, forbearance and, above all else, wisdom. I am also grateful to the John Carroll Society for sponsoring this annual event once again. John Carroll, the first Roman Catholic Bishop of the Republic, played a significant part in defining the role of the church in an infant nation where religion would have freedom but not state sponsorship. John's brother, Daniel, signed the Constitution which gave political and legal shape to what is now the United States.

Because of a certain anniversary which occurs this year, I would like to think that a fuller acceptance of the dignity of the human person may lead to a more productive understanding of the relationship between church and state in this country and elsewhere. It augurs well for our individual freedoms but it is also a delicate balance which may be in jeopardy.

This year marks the 350th Anniversary of the Toleration Act of 1649, a significant development for its time which boldly reaffirmed the right of religious and political freedom in the Maryland colony. Many of you are familiar with the monument at St. Mary's City, the first capital of the future state, which symbolically depicts a man with uplifted countenance emerging from the confining stone from which he is sculpted. At his feet three words are carved, Freedom of Conscience.

The Edict of Toleration provided, "No person shall from henceforth be in any ways troubled . . . for or in respect of his or her religion nor in the free exercise thereof with-in this Province nor any way be compelled to the belief or exercise of any other against his will." (Their Rights and Liberties, Thomas O'Brien Hanley, S.J. p. 115)

When Jesus enunciated his oft-quoted judgment, "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's, but give to God what is God's." (Luke 20:25) Luke tells us that his response "completely disconcerted" his audience "and reduced them to silence." (Luke 20:26) Over the centuries we have not remained silent but we have continued to remain perplexed. Couched in terms of black and white the principle is one for the ages but its complexity intensifies as its application uncovers a multiplicity of details. All people of faith are citizens and most citizens are people of faith. Avowed atheists may not believe in God or any god, as Bishop Fulton Sheen used to quip, "they have no invisible means of support," but it can be argued that their secularized or humanistic self-sufficiency constitutes a belief system of some sort. The predicament is obvious. The church-goer pays taxes. A devout Christian can be passionately patriotic. Among our citizens are Jews, Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists and adherents of many other religions, all of whom wish to practice their faith in freedom and many of whom honor forebears who came to this country precisely for that reason. According to reputable opinion polls the vast majority of Americans believe in God, pray with some frequency and articulate their sincerely-held beliefs by following rituals and disciplines promoted by their respective churches. These same people are also participants in the political process. They vote, they seek political office, they express their opinions, they establish forums to give wider circulation to their political philosophies. There is absolutely no way they can prevent the influence of their religious beliefs from coloring their public attitudes and forming their political convictions. Indeed, churches as a whole, convinced that they have much which is positive to contribute to the public debate, expect their members to bring their cultural and religious values to the various arenas where ideas are being generated and laws being honed. The church, no less than the state, seeks to meet the challenges of a society where sociological and technological change seems to be constantly outpacing our human capacity to keep it within the bounds of comprehension not to mention control.

There is another dimension to this reality which is even more important because it comes closer to the cutting edge. Many citizens, whether they be religious or not, only participate in the public debate in a limited way. But we are concerned with the other end of the spectrum—the lawyers, the judges, the legislators who devote their lives to enacting and interpreting laws and who will naturally do so within the context of their own inherited and acquired religious convictions. When they enter statehouses and courtrooms they cannot leave their consciences along with their coats in the cloakroom. Not all matters are charged with ethical or moral overtones but those which are of most concern to our populace—rights and liberties, life and death, war and peace, affluence and poverty, personal freedom and the common good—are so interlaced with cultural, religious, scientific and legal implications that wisdom in all its personifications is called for.

Is it possible to hope that, as we enter a new millennium, church and state in our land, and even the international world, may all subscribe to a synthesis of basic principles which guarantee freedom for all while

equally protecting the rights of believers and unbelievers? Have we been moving in that direction? Surely such an outcome is desirable. Church and state have a lot in common in their mutual search for justice, in promoting respect for all just laws, in their concern for the common good and this, of necessity, includes such important areas as education, health care and social services.

It is difficult to assess what influence Maryland's Edict of Toleration had on the framers of the Constitution. The Establishment Clause and, later on, the Free Exercise Clause have achieved a hallowed place in our national psyche even though many modern scholars detect inconsistencies in their application and some straying from their authors' intention in their interpretation. History certainly indicates that Congress adopted the two religion clauses as protection for religion, not protection from religion. English teachers constantly warn their students that analogies and metaphors should not be pushed too far. Thomas Jefferson's famous "Wall of Separation" metaphor may have suffered this over extension, something certainly not supported by a complete examination of his legal philosophy nor of the Constitution itself. The phrase has become a mantra. How high the wall? How impenetrable? Nobody denies the need for separation but such does not exclude cooperation. This vital area of constitutional law has experienced many twists and turns in its two centuries of history and more cases are winding their way upwards from lower courts. Maybe we need the equivalent of what manufacturers call R and D, Research and Development, to discover where we've been and to propose new ways of legally facilitating those who work with Caesar and walk with God. Instead of tanks and guns and land mines, maybe we have a great opportunity to offer the world a legal system which guarantees elementary human rights and yes, religious rights, and as a result, the potential for peace, justice and economic growth. We may even get to the stage when the words of Deuteronomy will be applied to us, "this great nation is truly a wise and intelligent people." (Deut. 4:6).

In the last century the Church has made extraordinary strides in its own understanding of pluralism, religious freedom and political liberty. It was not easy because theocracies dominated the scene in the western world for so many centuries. The demise of the Holy Roman Empire and the disappearance of the Papal States gave the Church both an opportunity and a challenge to speak to the world with moral authority unfettered and unprotected by armies, navies or nuclear weapons.

The high point of this new attitude was enshrined in one of the shortest documents of the Second Vatican Council, that world-wide meeting of Catholic Bishops in Rome in the mid-sixties. The document, known as *Dignitatis Humanae*, the Declaration on Religious Liberty, was promulgated by Pope Paul VI in December, 1965 after five drafts and two years of vigorous debate. Called by the Pope "one of the major texts of the Council" it began with the felicitous observation, "contemporary man is becoming increasingly conscious of the dignity of the human person" (*Dignitatis Humanae*, 1). It is no secret that one of the most influential framers of this document was the American Jesuit, John Courtney Murray, who brought with him to the Vatican a deep understanding and a genuine admiration for the guarantees established by the United States Constitution and Bill of Rights. It may have been indirect but there is no doubt that the American experience, dating back to the Toleration Act of 1649, found a responsive echo in St. Peter's Basilica.

If there was any question about this new initiative it was resoundingly dispelled by our new Pope, John Paul II, in 1979 during the very first year of his pontificate. Here was a man whose only fellow seminarian was snatched in the night and executed by the Gestapo precisely because he was a Catholic seminarian. Here was a priest and bishop who later prevailed over the disabilities imposed upon him and his flock by an atheistic Communist regime.

In his papal letter *Redemptor Hominis*, John Paul II would recall and reaffirm that Vatican Council document and again declare that the right to religious freedom together with the right to freedom of conscience is not only a theological concept but is one also "reached from the point of view of natural law, that is to say, from the purely human position, on the basis of the premises given by man's own experience, his reason and his sense of human dignity." (*Redemptor Hominis*, 17)

For over 20 years, on every continent, again and again the Holy Father has stressed that the human dignity of each individual is the basis for all law.

Within the last year, in his New Year's message, addressing people of good will everywhere the Pope reiterated his conviction that "when the promotion of the dignity of the human person is the guiding principle and when the search for the common good is the overriding commitment" (World Day of Peace Message, 1999, 1) the right to life, to religious freedom, of citizens to participate in the life of their community, the right of ethnic groups and national minorities to exist along with those rights to self-fulfillment covering educational, economic and peace issues become possible.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, intimately associated with the United Nations Charter, affirms the innate dignity of all members of the human family along with the equality and inalienability of their rights. Even though these ideals are being blatantly ignored in many places across the globe, here in this land we must not ignore the unique opportunity we have to solidify the principle enunciated and developed by our leaders of both church and state that "human rights stem from the inherent dignity and worth of the human person." (Cf. In particular the Vienna Declaration, 1993 Preamble 2).

Crafting principles is easy in comparison to applying them to the extraordinary complexities of modern life. Mistakes have been made in the past. On the part of the Church there have been excesses of evangelistic zeal: in the halls of justice nobody seems proud of the Dred Scott decision. We live in an imperfect world and we are not all pious God-fearing and timid law-abiding clones.

There will always be tension between church and state. This tension, in many ways, creates a safety valve. It is, after all, when this tension disappears that we should worry.

In the enactment and administration of civil laws, people of faith do not expect privileges but they do expect fairness. George Orwell in his classic, *Animal Farm*, coined the phrase that "all animals are created equal but some are more equal than others." Is there a danger that the devotees of secularism are "more equal" than those who are proud of the faith they profess? Do secular symbols enjoy more protection than religious symbols? In every age there are some who would like to have religion disappear. As religion has proven itself remarkably durable, the next line of attack is the attempt to trivialize it into insignificance. It seems incredible but now and again there are those who maintain that believers have no right to engage in the public debate.

"To accept the separation of the church from the state did not mean accepting a passive or marginal status for the Church in society". (Responsibilities and Temptations of Power: A Catholic View. J. Bryan Hehir, Georgetown University.)

The church by definition has a theological foundation but it is also a voluntary association within our society with much to say about social policies. It should be accorded the same rights in the public debate as associations which profess no theological leanings.

Even Pope John Paul II expressed his apprehension on this matter when he accepted the credentials of one of the esteemed John Carroll Society members, Lindy Boggs, as the United States Ambassador to the Holy See, a year ago. On that occasion he declared, "It would truly be a sad thing if the religious and moral convictions upon which the American experiment was founded could now somehow be considered a danger to free society, such that those who would bring these convictions to bear upon your nation's public life would be denied a voice in debating and resolving issues of public policy. The original separation of church and state in the United States was certainly not an effort to ban all religious conviction from the public sphere, a kind of banishment of God from civil society. Indeed, the vast majority of Americans, regardless of their religious persuasion, are convinced that religious conviction and religiously informed moral argument have a vital role in public life."

Religion will endure. Christianity, for one, has its own inner guarantees revolving around the presence of God's Spirit and the promises of Christ. They are doomed to disappointment who constantly predict that the unfolding discoveries of the many scientific disciplines will make religion obsolete or, at best, the hollow consolation of the feeble-minded. On the contrary, the more we reveal the mysteries of the universe in which we live, and decipher the minutiae of human existence, the more we come face to face with the creativity of God. We can partially answer the "hows" and the "whens" and the "whats" but at the end of the day, there is still the "why"?

My accent always betrays my origins and on July 12, 1965 I became an American citizen in the court house of Upper Marlboro, Maryland, which, coincidentally, is the town where John Carroll was born. I willingly promised to uphold the laws of the United States and I acquired the freedom and, indeed, the expectation to be part of the process which monitors, implements and sometimes modifies those laws. During these past thirty something years of my citizenship I have observed the Constitution endure some severe pressures and, by and large, I agree with the national consensus that "the system works". There is no substitute for the rule of law.

Across the impressive facade of the Supreme Court Building are the words "Equal Justice Under Law." If I were the architect I would have been tempted to add two further words, "For All." Criminals should fear the law: good people whose means are meager should not be intimidated by either the law itself or the wealth of those who can retain a bevy of high-profile lawyers. Claims are sometimes made that those on the lowest rungs of the economic ladder rarely have access to adequate legal representation. It is for this reason that I wish to commend those legal firms and individual lawyers who, through various pro bono networks, seek to alleviate this shortcoming. They bring a nobility to their profession which is beyond value and it is often the only antidote to the popular cynicism which is foisted upon lawyers in general.

As we usher in a new millennium, and as the world shrinks around us, we have much to learn from each other. The Church and the state must protect the freedom and the integrity of one another within their respective spheres of competence, and where there is overlapping, the dialogue must be marked by, as one scholar suggested, (J. Bryan Hehir) technical competency, civil intelligibility and political courtesy. In this way the 350 year old vision of the Toleration Act of 1649 will endure.●

IN TRIBUTE TO RONALD DOBIES' INDUCTION TO THE NEW JERSEY ELECTED OFFICIALS HALL OF FAME

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Mayor Ronald Dobies of Middlesex Borough on his induction into the New Jersey Elected Officials Hall of Fame. After nearly 30 years in public service Mayor Dobies was inducted last January. He was first elected Mayor in 1979, and he has been re-elected four times since. Prior to this service, Mayor Dobies was a member of the school board for six years, as well as a four-year member of the Borough Council.

Through these years, Mayor Dobies' administrations have grappled with some basic suburban dilemmas, such as preserving open space while attracting development and keeping municipal services up and taxes down. Among his accomplishments, Mayor Dobies has secured flood-control measures and ongoing road projects, increased park and recreation areas, and overseen the construction of the borough's Senior Citizen Housing complex.

Mayor Dobies is originally from Scranton, Pennsylvania, and attended the University of Scranton. He graduated with a degree in chemistry and philosophy, and ultimately joined basic training at Fort Gordon in Augusta, Georgia. After serving in the military police corps overseas, Ronald and his wife Blanche returned to the United States.

Mayor Dobies has added to his impressive record of community service by demonstrating his abilities in the business world as well. He is currently the Director of Analytical Research for Wyeth-Ayerst Research in Pearl River, New York. While this job is a full-time one, he still finds the time to devote between 30 and 40 hours each week to his responsibilities as Mayor. Each Friday night, Mayor Dobies hosts meetings with his constituents, a tradition he began during his first term. Mayor Dobies has won the respect of both Republicans and Democrats in his borough, and his non-contentious style has promoted a successful bipartisan spirit at all levels of government in Middlesex Borough. This December, Mayor Dobies will conclude his fifth term, and he hopes to return for a sixth next year. I look forward to his continued service in this office, and I extend my congratulations to him on his honor by the New Jersey Elected Officials Hall of Fame.●

WORKER SAFETY AWARD FOR FORT JAMES MILL OF OLD TOWN

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that this past June 2, 1999, the Fort James Corporation Paper Mills 2 was recognized for its impressive safety record of performance for the entire year of 1998. The award was presented by the Pulp & Paper Association, which honored the St. James Mill at its Awards Banquet at the Association's annual Professional Development Conference in St. Petersburg, Florida.

The award is the highest honor given for safety performance throughout the paper industry, and reflects the most improved safety record in the class of 56 mills working between one and to two million hours per year. Mr. President, the mill logged over 1.3 million work hours with an extremely low incidence of Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) recordable work injuries—only 21, yielding an exemplary incident rate of 3.2. This incident rate reflects that very few employees required any type of medical attention while carrying out their demanding jobs.

Further, in light of their accomplishments on behalf of the safety of the community and its people, the City of Old Town issued a resolution to the Fort James Corporation honoring its employees for their outstanding commitment. And at a follow-up picnic, mill employees were given a true Maine "thank you" as mill management, along with corporate environmental and safety leaders as well as local officials, helped out in cooking and serving a Celebration Picnic to all of the mill's employees. Each employee was also presented with a gift in recognition of the worker safety accomplishments.

To the entire workforce and management at the Fort James Mill, I would like to add my congratulations and a sincere Maine thank you as well for their efforts in worker safety that have culminated in this well deserved award, and I thank the Chair.●

10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VERMONT DEVELOPMENT CREDIT UNION

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, 10 years ago, Caryl Stewart, Executive Director of the Vermont Development Credit Union, had a dream for a grass roots community development "bank" to serve low and moderate income people in Burlington, Vermont. Who would have guessed them that her dream would become a growing credit union with over \$10 million in assets and 5,000 members in 175 Vermont towns?

Through it all, the credit union, with Caryl at its helm, has stayed true to its vision of serving lower income families and small business entrepreneurs in Vermont. Not just with loans, but also with the personal attention and counseling needed to ensure that loan