

came from Dr. Damadian right from Long Island. Two years later, back in 1974, he received that patent from the U.S. Patent Office in Washington. By July 1977, Dr. Damadian and his assistants achieved the world's first whole body human MRI image. In March 1978, Dr. Damadian formed a company called FONAR and began to develop and market MRI scanners and, within 2 years, unveiled the world's first commercial MRI scanner.

The problem Dr. Damadian encountered was not really from the U.S. Patent Office, but in fact it was a failure by them to enforce his ownership of that patent. Eleven years after Dr. Damadian unveiled the world's first commercial MRI, his patent became infringed upon by several international corporations including Johnson & Johnson, General Electric, and Hitachi. For those who do not know, I mean by infringement that Dr. Damadian's patent technology for the MRI, the intellectual property that he owned, was basically copied by these large corporations.

Well, 25 years later, after literally millions of dollars in legal expenses, Dr. Damadian has finally won his day in court. He was judged by the courts to in fact be the rightful owner of the patent for the MRI. FONAR, a Long Island corporation, could today be clearly a corporation that would have retained and employed tens of thousands of Long Islanders were it not for the 25 years of legal maneuvers that kept Dr. Damadian tied up in court.

Mr. Speaker, again I think it is important to understand that the U.S. patent is really pure Americana. It is at the heart of American ingenuity and our ability, frankly, to remain No. 1 in the global marketplace. But afoot here in the Congress is something that has been evolving over the last several years, and that is to harmonize patents, to take American ingenuity and harmonize it to the lowest common denominator.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this chance to talk about the MRI and Dr. Damadian's important contributions.

□ 1300

AMERICA MUST REENERGIZE ITSELF IN FIGHTING THE WAR AGAINST ILLEGAL DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address a matter of the greatest public concern. Illegal drug abuse is soaring in our country, and it is the most serious social problem that faces our communities, our families, and our children. We hear this from every side. It is our children themselves who are telling us this. Thirty-five percent of teenagers ages 13 through 17 identified drugs as their most serious concern.

Our law enforcement agents are telling us this as well. Thirty-one percent of the Nation's police chiefs believe that the best way to reduce violent crime is to reduce drug abuse. Drug-related activities have been identified as being at the core of the violent crimes, the property crimes, and, yes, domestic abuse which afflict our communities.

During the 1980's our Nation declared a war against drugs. I was in that battle as a Federal prosecutor. It was during that time that our families, our communities, and our law enforcement officials mobilized in a united effort to fight this war. Because of this national crusade, teenage drug abuse declined from 1985 to 1992.

Then what happened? It was then that our national commitment against this war of drugs waned. It was then that teenage drug use again started to increase, and we saw that teenage experimentation with drugs was on the incline.

Today it is my belief that we need to renew our national commitment to saving our children, to restoring the vibrancy of our inner cities, and strengthening our families. How do we do this? By reenergizing ourselves in this war on drugs. We must not retreat. It is not the time. We must not be satisfied to hide in the foxhole. It is imperative that we fight on.

It is particularly timely today that we reenergize our country because last week the administration released its report on our Nation's drug control strategy. In that report, the administration criticized the war against drugs, and said the term war against drugs was misleading. The administration preferred to adopt the language of pessimism, and say that we should more appropriately use the term cancer. To me the implication of using the word cancer in relation to our drug problems is that it implies that it is going to be with us a long time, and we simply must learn to live with it.

I believe it is a war that we must fight, and not a problem that we must learn to accept and deal with. It is the wrong message when we change the terminology. It is the wrong message to our teens, who deal in symbols and listen to the nuances of language as to whether it is a serious national problem or it is something that is acceptable in our society. It is the wrong message to send with our families, who are struggling day in and day out, and as the parent of teenagers, I understand this. They face daily the corrosive effects of drug abuse. And it is the wrong message to our law enforcement officers who daily place their lives on the line in this struggle.

In signaling a retreat from the war on drugs, we also undermine the efforts of other nations, which are looking to the United States of America for leadership. The other nations are putting the lifeblood of their leaders, in many cases, and soldiers out on the front line in an effort to stop drug production and trafficking within their own borders.

While the administration says we should not call this a war, it refused to certify certain countries for not fighting hard enough, not fighting hard enough to stop the flow of illegal drugs into America. I applaud the administration for not certifying certain countries, but our country must lead in this battle. We must not change the terminology. We must call it a war, because it is a war for our families, it is a war for our children, it is a war for our streets and our inner cities, and it is a war that we must win.

In Mexico alone, 40 drug agents were killed fighting the importation of drugs into the United States of America to satisfy the demand we see in our country. We must provide leadership to Mexico. We must provide leadership to South America. We must call it a war, because it is a war in which people's lives are being lost, not just in America, but also in other countries.

So it is my hope that this administration will reengage itself in the war against drugs, that this Congress will reenergize itself, that we will provide leadership to our American families, to our teenagers, and to set the appropriate example. I pledge that support as a Member of this body.

WE SHOULD VALUE AND CHERISH OUR NATION'S IMMIGRANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to an all too familiar debate in our country, immigration and immigrants. This is an age-old topic that has taken many different faces since the founding of this Nation. Today the immigration debate seems to be focused on mostly Latino and Asian-American immigrants, or individuals from the Caribbean or African nations, people of color.

However, I am concerned that the immigration issue is too often raised in a negative manner. Why is it that we cannot talk about immigrants without mentioning the undocumented, those who may not have complied with all of the rules and regulations? The politicizing of the immigration issues and programs like Citizenship U.S.A. made by certain groups have attempted to demonize immigrants.

I submit that certain groups have been using immigrants as a scapegoat for years. Oftentimes they have been marginalized in the great divide between black and white. As illustrated in the words of W.E.B. DuBois, he pointed out that mass immigration hurt both black and white laborers, as he foreshadowed future events by noting the Republican Party platform of 1864, which advocated increased immigration in the interests of big business:

A new flood of eager-to-work immigrant labor was brought into the country to work

on the railroads and in the new industries. Northern mill owners, who had feared free farms because they might decrease the number of laborers and raise their wages, were appeased by the promotion of alien immigration. It was interesting to hear the Union Party, as the Republicans called themselves in 1864, say in their platform: "Foreign immigration, which in the past had added so much to the wealth and development of resources and the increase of power to this Nation—the aspirations of the oppressed of all nations should be fostered and encouraged by a liberal and just policy." That year the Bureau of Immigration was created. . . . In 1860 immigrants were coming in at a rate of 130,000 a year but the new homestead laws began to attract them, so after the war immigration quickly rose . . . and in 1873 had reached 460,000 annually.

I feel it is important to address the issue of stereotyping our Nation's immigrants because it is unjust, it is unfair, and it is wrong. I would like people to think of the many contributions that immigrants have made. We should value and cherish immigrants. Everyone in this country, except for native Americans, are immigrants. Some came voluntarily and others, like myself, came involuntarily.

It is my hope that the next time immigration is brought up as a topic, that it conjures up a positive image in our mind, one that values the mosaic background and cultures that make up the Nation as well as the district where I live, represent, and work.

I enjoy experiencing the sights, sounds, and smells of Caribbean restaurants on Georgia Avenue, and Ethiopian cuisine in Adams Morgan. Closer to home, I also enjoy Little Italy, on Taylor street, Chinatown, at Wentworth and Surmack, Little Village in Franklin Park.

The top 10 immigrant groups that boast the great land of Lincoln as their home are a diverse group. They are from Mexico, Poland, Philippines, Germany, India, Italy, Korea, the United Kingdom, Yugoslavia, Greece, Africa, all over the world. By no means do I view them as a threat. I think they are, indeed, a great asset.

That is why it disturbs me that the INS Citizenship U.S.A. Program is in the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. I feel it is offensive to all Americans to question the integrity and loyalty and contributions of immigrants.

This is not the first time. During World War II, Japanese-Americans and their children were rounded up and placed into internment camps. They were placed in these camps because the American Government viewed these Americans of Japanese descent as a threat to national security.

Imagine how they must have felt to be viewed as a threat to their own country. Many of those Japanese-Americans interned were actually born here. In spite of this insult, Japanese-Americans formed a special regimental combat team, which was one of the most decorated units of its size in World War II.

It should also be noted that a United States Government commission later concluded, and I quote: "Not a single documented act of espionage, sabotage, or fifth column activity was committed by an American citizen of Japanese ancestry, or by a resident Japanese alien."

This is just one fine example of the many various contributions that immigrants have made. I question the accusation that immigrants do not share the same commitment to the United States.

According to a recent study released by the Cato Institute called "In Defense of a Nation" on the military contributions of immigrants,

The military contributions of immigrants is a story that has gone largely untold. Today, 62,560 immigrants serve on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces. More than 20 percent of the recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor in United States have been immigrants. Immigrant scientists and engineers are major developers of advanced U.S. Government laboratories and major defense firms. In fact, the submarine, the helicopter, a more advanced ironclad ship, and the atomic and hydrogen bombs were developed by immigrants.

In short, the study concludes that "Throughout history and even now, immigrants have demonstrated their loyalty to this country, and have voluntarily sacrificed to protect the freedom of civil rights and the pride of this Nation itself."

Let us stop talking about the myths and misconceptions of immigrants. Let us look at the facts. It is a fact that most immigrants enter the United States legally; about 70 percent, according to the American immigration law forum. It is a fact that most immigrants come to the United States to unite with close family members. People come to this country for the American dream of freedom, peace, economic prosperity, opportunity, and democracy. They do not come here to take advantage of the welfare system.

Contrary to popular belief, not all immigrants are Mexican or Chinese. Many are from places, African countries like Somalia, Ethiopia, Nigeria, and Ghana, escaping violent upheavals; from Haiti, fleeing war, political oppression, drought, and famine. There are many children in Romania, China, and Brazil fleeing poverty and hunger.

Many wait in places like the Philippines, where the average waiting period is as long as 12 to 15 years. There is a need for fair and more efficient immigration policy and a more efficient system.

According to a 1996 report released by the Illinois Immigrant Policy Project, immigrants make up 7.1 percent of the total State population, and 49.2 percent of the city of Chicago. Illinois immigrants pay \$7.2 billion, or 10.6 percent of the \$68 billion of taxes paid by all Illinois residents.

The seven taxes included in this estimate are Federal and State income, State and local tax, property, Social Security, and unemployment insurance.

□ 1315

Additionally, immigrants only use 7 percent of major welfare and education services. The programs included in this estimate include most of the large cash and in-kind welfare programs and the basic education, SSI, AFDC, aid to the aged, blind and disabled, transitional assistance, Medicaid, and K through 12 public education. Thus when the seven major taxes are compared to the five major types of governmental services, immigrants in Illinois actually pay more taxes than services used. They are paying \$6.11 for every \$1 of services received.

Mr. Speaker, these findings reveal that immigrants are substantial economic contributors. And some 70 percent of immigrants' taxes flow to the Federal Government, primarily through Federal income and Social Security taxes.

It is a fact that immigrants start new businesses; 18 percent of all new small businesses are started by immigrants. These small businesses account for up to 80 percent of the new jobs available in the United States each year.

Now, having stated the facts, I would urge my fellow Members of Congress to take the partisan politics out of the immigration debate. While this issue is being politicized, there are many constituents in my district who are unable to naturalize and stand to soon lose much-needed benefits underneath the new welfare reform law.

It is my understanding that the last time an oath ceremony was performed was September 30, 1996. Why should immigrants experience longer delays due to the decisions of government bureaucracy? Citizenship USA was enacted with bipartisan support and was a good idea in order to reduce the backlog of some 1 million eligible immigrants who filed in fiscal 1995 to become U.S. citizens. This number is more than triple the number of citizens who filed in recent years. This can be largely contributed to the 1986 amnesty program, the passage of issues like proposition 187 in California, and the threat of losing benefits due to welfare reform.

I would like to note that out of the 1.3 million new citizens naturalized under Citizenship USA, only about 71,500 were found to have FBI records, which includes the following categories: INS administrative record, 34,000; misdemeanor but not a felony, 25,000; felony 10,000. Sixty-nine percent have still demonstrated good moral character, 29 percent good moral character may not have been met, further review is required. Two percent good moral character was not met, represents 168 individuals, 168 individuals out of the 1.3 million that naturalized under Citizenship USA is only about two-tenths of 1 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is hardly reason to exploit naturalized citizens as criminals. Prior to the program Citizenship USA, applicants waited 2 to 4 years to become citizens.

Given that so many elderly and disabled people were at risk to lose much-needed benefits due to welfare reform, it is my opinion that Citizenship USA actually served as a partial solution to some of the negative effects of welfare reform and in response to the criticisms aimed at a high number of these newly naturalized citizens registered to vote, I must ask, is it not a double standard? In an election year where apathy seemed to be a common tune ringing throughout the land, why criticize any group for exercising their right to vote? Do we not teach all citizens that voting is not only the epitome of living in a democracy but a responsibility as well?

I submit that the very fabric of our social, economic, cultural, and political institutions has changed into a great, great mosaic due to our Nation's newcomers. Immigrants are an integral part of our work force, tax base, and cultural diversity. May we as a Nation of immigrants not turn on ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I will now shift to another idea, one that we have been discussing, debating, and talking about and will continue to do so as we talk about the reauthorization of ISTEA. I appreciate having this opportunity to speak in behalf of projects which have been proposed for the Seventh Congressional District in the State of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of this country are in favor of policies and programs that meet discernible needs, create jobs, promote economic development, protect and improve the environment, and improve the overall quality of life. I shall describe four projects which are consistent with these goals and trust that they will be seriously considered by the Congress for funding, as they will greatly benefit the residents of Chicago, its western suburbs, and Cook County.

One, Marion Street mall-to-mall transit center and commuter parking facility in Oak Park, IL, is one of these projects. This project will increase rider access to several different forms of public transportation, including bus, elevated trains, and passenger rails. It will provide reciprocal access to suburban and city of Chicago residents who need public transportation to get to and from work. It will promote commercial revitalization for the villages of Oak Park and River Forest and reduce the number of cars on the roadways, thereby enhancing air quality and improvement of the overall environment.

Mr. Speaker, the second project is the funding of a preliminary engineering project to determine the feasibility and cost of widening the Union Pacific bridge over Illinois State Route 43 at Harlem Avenue.

Presently this stretch of road, which is considered a strategic arterial route, has shortcomings which cannot be easily and readily remedied. Principally the bridge embodies a dangerous center pier which severely impedes traffic

flow. Simply by widening the two-spanned structure, we can decrease the potential number of accidents as well as facilitate the flow of traffic. The reduction in congestion on the bridge will diminish the amount of air pollution and gridlock on the road.

The third project calls for the establishment of an Intelligent Transportation Systems Research Institute. This institute would marshal the research capabilities of the University of Illinois at Chicago and Champaign-Urbana, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, Purdue University in Indiana, and the Argonne National Laboratory.

In an effort to employ communications technology as a solution to some of the region's inter- and intrastate traffic problems, the target area is the region spanning from Gary, IN, through Chicago, IL, and on to Milwaukee, WI. This stretch is essential for efficient commercial travel throughout the region.

An example of the technology that the Intelligent Transportation Institute will explore includes computerized traffic lights. These lights will be capable of detecting the approach of a massive public transportation bus or a commercial truck and will stay green longer to permit their passage.

Mr. Speaker, this is an idea whose time has truly come. This innovation will facilitate a way of ingress and egress from Chicago's commercial districts to the expressways linking Gary and Milwaukee. It will also expedite travel time for all workers. Through such technologies, we will be able to create a more effective transportation system.

In addition, this system will provide through the use of communications technology real-time schedules for public transportation. One will be able to access the scheduling information from work and from home. At a time when both parents work most of the day and single parents are forced to work two and three jobs, any way we can make travel time more predictable, reliable, and efficient allows American citizens to spend more time with their families. Our transportation policies can and should work to strengthen families.

Evaluation results to date show that the intelligent transportation system will yield major benefits in congestion mitigation, safety and environmental impact. To date, public and private organizations have succeeded in raising half of the financing required for the project, which has a total cost of \$6 million. Therefore, the Federal share of this worthwhile endeavor will be only one half the actual cost.

The fourth project proposes a north-south computer rail line by Metra with the station in the Village of Bellwood. Bellwood is ideally located as a crossroads of the Chicago metropolitan area at the juncture of Interstates 290, 88, and 94, between O'Hare and Midway Airports. Both Metra and the Village of Bellwood view this project as a real opportunity for partnership in dealing

with transportation needs and economic development for the region.

Mr. Speaker, I feel, and the people of the Seventh Congressional District in the State of Illinois feel that each one of these projects is viable, valuable, greatly needed and will seriously enhance the quality of life for the residents, of people who live in that particular area.

Now to conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I shall address briefly the issue that I think is so vitally important in this country, and that is the issue of children's health. I firmly believe that the greatness of a society can be determined by how well it treats its old, its young, and those who have difficulty caring for themselves. If this is the case, then by all standards we are not moving toward greatness because we are not doing well by our children.

In my own hometown, Chicago, the city of the big shoulders, the Annie E. Casey Foundation reports that 10.9 percent of all children born are considered low birth weight. According to the Voices for Illinois Children, more than 13,200 of all new mothers in the State, 4,000 in Chicago alone, receive virtually no prenatal care. We all know that there are more than 10 million children in this country who have no health insurance. We know that a disproportionate number of our children are being born to teen parents and are destined to live in the squalor of poverty and deprivation.

□ 1330

We know that it is tough to be hungry and not have food; demoralizing to be broke and not have a job; agonizing to be cold and not have heat; and frustrating to be illiterate and not have hope. But to be sick and not be able to get health care adds another dimension to all the other problems.

The blues singer Marvin Gaye asked the question, "Who will save the baby? Who is willing to try? Who will save a world that is destined to die?" Another songwriter said that "Our children are indeed the future. Teach them well and let them lead the way."

Everybody is searching for a hero. People need somebody to look up to. And so I ask the question this day: Can the children of this Nation look to its Congress to be the hero? Can the children of this Nation look to this Congress to preserve, promote and protect the health of the Nation, the future of our country, and the destiny of our being?

So I ask the question: Will this Congress save the children? We sure can, if we are willing to try.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of clause 1 of rule XLVIII and clause 6(f) of rule X,