which reflect their radical, intolerant, anti-religious agenda.

Additionally, the faith-hostile agenda of other groups supporting Mr. Edwards (such as Americans United for Separation of Church and State, and the Baptist Joint Committee, etc.) is clearly documented through the legal action they take in courts and in legislatures. And Mr. Edwards is pleased to have their support.

Another comment by Mr. Edwards which was of interest to me was his statement that—and I quote:

The best way to have religious freedom and respect in America is to build a firewall between government regulations and religion. And that separation, that wall of separation between church and State, has for 200 years worked extraordinarily well.

I wish that Mr. Edwards really believed his own statement! If he really thought there should be no government regulations imposed on the church, then he should aggressively pursue repealing the government tax regulations imposed on churches—government regulations which would have ended the government's ability to voice his convictions from the pulpit for fear of running afoul of the IRS or some other government body or regulation. And, surely, if Mr. Edwards wants to see churches free from government regulations, he should aggressively pursue exemptions for church bodies from government zoning regulations, from government fire regulations, from government health regulations, from government hiring regulations, from government social-service regulations, and from so many other government regulations which have resulted in literally hundreds of lawsuits brought by the government against churches.

Unfortunately, Mr. Edwards' record proves that he does not believe in protecting the faith community from government regulations—evidenced by his vote against the Religious Freedom Amendment. That Amendment was specifically designed (1) to free the community of faith from government intrusion into their religious expressions and (2) to protect voluntary citizen expressions of faith—including those of students. In opposing that Amendment—an Amendment which would have ended the government regulation of religious expression—Mr. Edwards amazingly declared—and I quote:

In my opinion, th[is] Amendment is the worst and most dangerous piece of legislation I have seen in my 15 years in public office.

Mr. Edwards actually feels that it is "dangerous" to end government regulation of public expressions of faith and to allow students to participate voluntarily in prayer.

Another problem with Mr. Edwards' "firewall" quote is that it attaches the phrase "separation of church and state" to the requirements of the First Amendment. He claims that the "separation of church and state" phrase accurately reflects the intent of those who framed the First Amendment. He claims that the "separation of church and state" phrase accurately reflects the intent of those who framed the First Amendment. Again, official records prove Mr. Edwards wrong.

The extent of Mr. Edwards' misunderstanding of the framing of the First Amendment are recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS from June 7 to September 25, 1789. Over those months, ninety Founding Fathers in the first Congress debated and produced the First Amendment. And those records make one fact exceptionally clear: in months of recorded discussions over the First Amendment, not one of the ninety Founding Fathers who framed the Constitution's religion clauses ever mentioned the phrase "separation of church and state"! It does seem that if this had been their intent, that at least one of them would of said something about it! None did.

For this reason, legal scholars committed to historical and constitutional accuracy rather than an activist judicial agenda have correctly drawn attention to the type of blunder committed by Mr. Edwards. In fact, one judge accurately commented: "[S]o much has been written in recent years... to a 'wall of separation between church and State'... . that one would almost think at that time that it is to be found somewhere in our Constitution." And Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart similarly observed: "[T]he metaphor [of the 'wall of separation'] is a phrase nowhere to be found in the Constitution." And Chief-Justice William Rehnquist also noted: "[T]he greatest injury of the 'wall' notion is its mischievous diversion from the actual words of the drafters of the Bill of Rights. The 'wall of separation between church and State' is a metaphor based on bad history. . . . It should be frankly and explicitly abandoned."

It is indeed striking that in the century-and-a-half following the adoption of the Constitution, the "separation of church and state" rhetoric so heavily embraced by Mr. Edwards was invoked in federal courts less than a dozen times—and on those occasions, the phrase was interpreted to mean that (1) America would establish no national denomination and (2) the federal government would not limit public religious expressions or activities. However, in the last 50 years, the federal courts have cited the "separation of church and state" state as a backdrop to "save our friends" or "save our children" in order to allow the federal government to regulate public religious bodies and expressions—in direct opposition to the original intent of the First Amendment!

In summary, Mr. Edwards claims that "separation of church and state" was the goal of the First Amendment. It was not. Mr. Edwards also claims that Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison would support his view. They would not. However, even if they had, they were only two among the 145 Founders who framed the Constitution and drafted the Bill of Rights. And unless Mr. Edwards can show that a majority of those framing the Constitution and First Amendment support his reading, then the views of two cannot be extrapolated to establish the intent of the entire body, especially when the great majority of those Founders—according to their own writings and legislative acts—opposed what Mr. Edwards proposes.

No Member of this Body should be part of obfuscating the clear, self-evident wording of the Constitution, or misleading the American public by claiming the First Amendment says something it doesn't. We should stick with what the First Amendment actually says rather than what constitutional and historical revisionists like Mr. Edwards wish that it said.
Dominican Republic, underwent heart surgery in Novosibirsk, but that it was highly experimental and there were no guarantees.

"In this country, we consider these kinds of medical procedures a procedure a year, explained that the wall that should have formed between the lower left and right chambers of Sergei's heart did not form, so Sergei was in the womb—resulting in an abnormal blood flow and increased pressure in the artery that goes through his lungs. Before the operation, the blood pressure in the artery to Sergei's lungs was the same as that in his aorta, when it should have been one-fourth of the pressure. It has, however, finally begun to drop, but not to the level it should be.

Under ideal circumstances, the surgery should have been performed before Sergei reached 6 months. "It is already late to start fixing the problem," Dr. Permut said.

Sergei's lungs have suffered, although the damage is probably reversible. Dr. Permut said. Without the surgery, or a heart-lung transplant later on, Sergei would have lived only into his teenage years or perhaps until he was 20.

In contrast, Sophia is undergoing a correction of a hole between the two upper chambers of her heart at precisely the correct time in her life, Dr. Permut said. Her medical problem is the opposite of Sergei's, although the mitral valve in her heart needs to be repaired as well. Without surgery, she might not have lived past her 20's, he said.

In the Siberian home where he lives with his mother, Mrs. Ovchinnikova, and Sergei's mother, Yulia Sergeevna Yurinskaya, said they had been overwhelmed by the kindness New Yorkers have shown to them and their children.

"They've treated us like family," Mrs. Yurinskaya, a housekeeper at a Siberian factory, said, speaking through Dr. Gregory Rozenbblit, a director of the department that performs angioplasties at the Medical Center. Sergei's bed is littered with toy trucks and other presents from well-wishers.

Mrs. Yurinskaya is able to phone every day to her husband Mikhail, who also works in a factory in Siberia, and to her parents and inlaws. "They were very worried about the baby, and at first they were crying because everything was so bad. But now they are crying because they're so happy," she said.

Sergei has an older brother, 10-year-old Ivan, and a younger brother, 7-year-old Vitaliy, who lives with their grandmother in a small town in Siberia. Ms. Ovchinnikova, a single mother who works as a housekeeper in a gym, said she talks to her husband several times a day.

Sophia is awaiting surgery, and since their arrival in the United States, Sophia and her mother have lived in a small apartment here provided by the hospital, so that Sophia can recuperate from a cold and ear infection.