

and notwithstanding the requirement of clause 1(a)3 of rule XLVIII, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. SKELTON of Missouri and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

There was no objection.

RECLAIMING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my 5 minutes. I was unfortunately delayed earlier.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES SHOULD PRESERVE A STRONG PATENT SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, earlier in these 5-minute speech periods we heard from one of my colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES], about a fight that Mr. Ray Damadian has gone through over these last 25 years in order to secure his right of ownership to a piece of technology that he invented. We are talking about the inventor of the MRI.

This technology, which has saved thousands, perhaps even millions of lives over these last 25 years and permitted the medical profession to diagnose people without having to cut them open, as in the past, has been a tremendous boon to all of mankind. It, in fact, has been a major export item for the United States of America.

The MRI was one of those great inventions, along with the airplane, along with the light bulb, along with so many other inventions that Americans are so proud came from the United States of America. And Ray Damadian, perhaps more than anybody that I know personally, reflects this type of creative genius for which Americans are so proud and this type of creative genius that had meant everything to our standard of living and improved the well-being of people all over the world in the process.

As my colleague Mr. FORBES stated, Mr. Damadian has been in a 25-year fight to maintain his patent rights. Twenty-five years he has fought against this huge corporation, General Electric, for the rights of ownership of his own creative genius.

Why this is important is because Mr. Damadian was protected by a relatively strong patent law and a strong patent system. In fact, the United States has had the strongest patent protection of any Nation in the world. This is what has given us the edge on all our other competitors around the world. This is what has made America safe and secure. This is what has given

the average person in America an opportunity and a standard of living that is basically sought after by people from all over the planet. It has been our technology and our freedom. And the American patent system is what has created this impulse, this momentum for the creating of technology.

Our patent system is under attack now. The Ray Damadians in the future, if we permit H.R. 400, a bill that is going through Congress as we speak, if H.R. 400 passes, the Ray Damadians of the world will be chewed up and spit out by the huge corporations, just like his counterparts in Japan and other countries are beaten down by the economic shoguns of their society.

What is happening is there is an attempt, and hold on to your horses here, folks, you may not have heard this before, what is happening is there is a move to make American patent law, which has been the strongest in the world, to be exactly a mirror image of the law in Japan, and they are not bringing up the Japanese standards to the protection our people have been afforded. They are bringing down the protections that have been offered to Americans.

In 20 years this will mean the United States will no longer be the technological leader of the world. The standards of our people will be under attack, and they will never know what hit them because they changed the fundamental laws.

It is happening very quietly here, and the multinational organizations have hired the best lobbyists in town to come here and influence Congress and unless the American people let their feelings be known, H.R. 400, the Steal American Technologies Act, will pass, and the Ray Damadians of the world, the men who create the technology that changes our way of life, will find themselves vulnerable and pretty soon we will not be seeing the MRI's being invented, pretty soon we will not see the technology of the Wright brothers. In fact, the Wright brothers will end up vulnerable to the Mitsubishis of the world.

If that would have been the practice back at the turn of the century, the aerospace industry could have well been developed in Japan instead of the United States and the American people would never have known what hit them. We have to stand up for the United States of America and stand up for the fact that we need to be the technological leaders of the world.

H.R. 400, believe it or not, mandates that every person who applies for a patent in the United States, after 18 months, whether or not that patent has been granted, it is going to be published for the entire world to see. Every thief, every copycat, every economic adversary, every country that hates us and wants to destroy the American way of life will have the advantage of being in possession of all of our technological secrets even before the patent has been issued.

In Ray Damadian's case that means General Electric would actually have

had his information before the patent was issued to Ray and, for sure, he would not have been able to defend himself.

We will cease to be a great power. Our people will cease to have the standard of living if we cease to be the technological leader of the world. H.R. 400, the Steal American Technologies Act, will make us incredibly vulnerable to our economic adversaries. And, by the way, it also obliterates the Patent Office in the U.S. Government. It will take away the Patent Office, which was established by our Constitution, and replace it with a corporatized entity, and who knows what kind of influences will be on the patent examiners when they are now in a corporatized job rather than a Government job.

Our patent examiners have worked hard. They have been part of our system but they have been protected by civil service and other protections and the knowledge that they were Government employees. The fact is that will not be the same if we make it a corporatized entity.

H.R. 811 and 812 will fight against H.R. 400 and protect the American patent system. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 811 and 812 and to oppose the Steal American Technologies Act, H.R. 400.

DEFINING DEVIANCY, UP AND DOWN

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, let me say I think the gentleman from California has a wonderful idea and I am certainly pleased to be a cosponsor of his bill.

I wanted to talk today about something that occurred in this Chamber yesterday, something that was ridiculed by people that I consider to be radicals, dismissed by many in the media, called trivial by many observers, but in my mind we did something very significant yesterday.

We have seen over the past 30 years that the radical revolution of the left has torn this country apart at the seams. We live today in a country, as the Speaker says, that has 12-year-old children on drugs, 15-year-olds shooting each other, and 18-year-olds graduating from high school with diplomas that they cannot even read. America has lived in a valueless society that our radical policies of the past 30 years have created.

In 1994, there was a shift back to the center, and yesterday I believe that Congress passed a simple resolution that helped move us back to the right direction where our Founding Fathers wanted us to be.

So what was this dangerous piece of legislation? What was this supposedly unconstitutional resolution? What was this frightening document that the radicals said would spell an end to the separation between church and state and tear the Constitution apart at the seams? It was a very simple resolution that said a court in Alabama ought to be able to hang the Ten Commandments on the wall, the same way that the Supreme Court of the United States hangs the Ten Commandments on the wall in its building, just as we in this Congress every morning pledge allegiance and hear a prayer as we look up to the words "In God We Trust," just as Americans for the first 200 years of this civilization were not afraid to acknowledge that God and faith played a key role in the founding of this country.

Now, these radicals will tell you that this resolution we passed yesterday did violence to the Constitution and was something that the Founding Fathers would never agree with. They would also tell you that they were the ones that would have to step in to protect the Constitution, and yet I think it is very instructive at this point to look back at what the father of the Constitution said regarding the Ten Commandments. The father of the Constitution was also the fourth President of the United States, James Madison. And while drafting the Constitution, Madison said,

We have staked the entire future of America's civilization not upon the power of government, but upon the capacity of each of us to govern ourselves, control ourselves, and sustain ourselves according to the Ten Commandments of God.

So here we have the father of the Constitution telling us that the Constitution and American civilization was based upon the Ten Commandments of God. Here we have a situation where the Father of our country, George Washington, in his farewell address spoke to America and said, "It is impossible to govern rightly without God and the Ten Commandments."

We had Founding Father after Founding Father writing the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, who recognized that we were a country, one country under God, a country who knew its Judeo-Christian heritage and did not run away from it.

It is something they do not teach in schools, it is something the radicals do not want anyone to know about, but that is how it has been in this country until recently, until we had the radicals storm the streets in the 1960's and undermine our efforts across the globe, who in the 1970's stormed Washington and think tanks, and who in the 1980's took control of Hollywood and took control of the people making the TV shows that our children see, and who in the 1990's, unfortunately, took control of some of the highest seats of power in the United States of America.

□ 1345

It is very frightening to me, and it is very frightening, because what they

have sought to do and I think what they have accomplished is doing something called defining deviancy down and defining deviancy up. And those are a couple of catch phrases that Senator MOYNIHAN created and also a columnist named Charles Krauthammer created. To do that, what you try to do is you try to make the conventional seem radical and you try to make the radical seem conventional.

So we find ourselves 30 years later in a civilization where the words of Madonna, that life of Larry Flynt, and the acts of Dennis Rodman are glorified and take the place of the words of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and fill this valueless void that used to be filled and made complete by our Judeo-Christian heritage. It is a dangerous situation, it is a dangerous situation for my 6-year-old boy and my 9-year-old boy, and yet all they will tell us is that there is something called the separation between church and state.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not about religion. This debate is not about morality. This debate is not about Christianity. This debate is about America's proud heritage. I am more afraid, much, much more afraid of intolerance of ideas and of political correctness than I am of letting Americans know what their proud heritage has been and what it will be once again.

Mr. Speaker, we can build a bridge to the 21st century. I have got no problem with that. I just have a problem with radicals that would want to disconnect us from our proud heritage in the past that made America the greatest country in the history not only of Western civilization but in the history of this world.

My friend from California is here who has been talking about this for years. He has almost been like a voice crying in the wilderness while many people here did not want to talk about it while the radicals had control of power.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. When we talk about the Judeo-Christian heritage of our country, and let us remember, by the way, there are many people who agree with the Judeo-Christian tenets, for example, are in the Muslim community as well. This is not an attempt to try to force any type of religious prayer or religious concept on others. But what we do and what today we are faced with is that those people who stand for certain values and certain traditions find themselves under attack.

One of the greatest parts of the Judeo-Christian heritage is a concept called individual responsibility, that you are responsible for your actions and that you will face that responsibility before God. And so really, individual freedom is part of that Judeo-Christian heritage that we talk about. That is where it ties into our Founding Fathers, who believed that freedom of religion was a right that they would

fight for. That has been so turned around and so disfigured today that what we have got are people who are trying to express their own religious beliefs are being told, in the name of separation of church and state, in the name of the Constitution to shut up.

How many times do we have to hear the ACLU and others say, you cannot put a manger scene in front of city hall, before we start saying to ourselves, something is wrong here. Whose freedom are we talking about? The freedom of someone who wants to just express a belief in God, whether it is a manger scene or a Star of David during a time of religious importance to one of the great faiths of our country. There is nothing wrong with having them be able to express themselves, and we Christians or Jews or Muslims express ourselves that way. But we have the left wing who is committed to use the force of law to prevent people in our society from expressing their religious beliefs using the separation of church and state as a hammer to prevent us from expressing ourselves.

In my part of the country out in Orange County, the Boy Scouts of America are spending tens of thousands of dollars in order to defend themselves against what? Defend themselves against some liberal left-wing parent who is trying to force the Scouts to take God out of the Scout oath because his children do not want to say "God." Because his children do not want to say "God," it should not be in the Scout oath. This is absolutely an attack on the freedom of those people in the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts of America. Yet where is the outcry in this? Where are the people who supposedly believe in freedom of speech?

The greatest threat today against people who believe in God, whether they be Christians, Jews, or Muslims, is the U.S. Government coming under the domination of atheists who want to suppress people's expression of their own religion.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. The gentleman has touched on something, we have seen it on local school boards, he has touched on something that we have seen up here for too long now. What that is, is people parading around in a politically correct cloak that will tell us in the name of tolerance that they have a right to be intolerant, that they have a right again to preach this valueless void, where Jews, Christians, Muslims cannot express their views.

Mr. Speaker, I do not fear my 9-year-old boy, who is in public schools, hearing somebody who is of the Muslim faith speak. I do not fear my 9-year-old boy hearing an orthodox Jew speak to him or to his class or a Catholic or a Pentecostal or a Baptist. I do not fear that. America, according to Jefferson, who the radicals are now calling radical, according to Jefferson, America is the free marketplace of ideas, where the strongest ideas survive. Yet what they want to do is this sort of moral leveling, where there is this valueless

void where nothing is right, nothing is wrong, nothing is black, nothing is white, nothing is legal, nothing is illegal.

We are seeing that manifest in the papers every day when officials in this administration continue to talk about moral revelancy, moral equivalency: Hey, nothing is right, nothing is wrong; I know what the law says, but it is not really important.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If the gentleman will yield further, we have more people being told they cannot put a traditional manger scene in front of city hall or at the school yard during Christmas time. At the same time, these same people, by the way, are insisting that we are engaged in censorship if we refuse to let the NEA, the National Endowment for the Arts, give grants to people who blatantly attack religion, blatantly attack other people's faith. It is okay to subsidize it, but it is wrong for us to put up a manger scene to respect the birth of Christ or to have a Star of David to reflect our worshiping on Passover or some of the other religious holidays that we have.

This has come to the point where the Boy Scouts of America, for example, as I said, not only, people are trying to force God out of the Scout oath. Here is one of the most decent organizations in the history of our country, who has done more to help young people through these hard times in their life, when they are coming into adulthood than Scouting, the young men and young women of our country teaching great values. Now they are having to spend tens of thousands of dollars, just, No. 1, to keep God in the Scout oath and, No. 2, to have standards so that they will have standards so that scoutmasters have a certain moral standard.

There have been a lot of attacks on the religious right, and I will say that I do not attack other people's beliefs, but one thing I demand is that my beliefs that I hold true should not be attacked as well and we should have a right to express it. The religious right more often than not is simply saying and representing a group of Americans that have a set of beliefs and just want to believe that for their own family. And they are saying the Federal Government should not force us to accept another standard which we believe to be immoral.

And the Boy Scouts of America, it has to do, and I will be flat out about it, the hiring of homosexuals as scoutmasters. That is their right as a private organization to do that. And I believe that, if they did not have that standard, a lot of parents would not permit their children into the Scouts and to go out under adult supervision of someone who is sexually attracted to someone of the same sex. But that is the right of that organization.

In San Diego, in California, they said the Boy Scouts could not even use school facilities. They could not use

the school facilities which their tax dollars are paying for unless they were willing to take the ban off hiring homosexuals as scoutmasters. In other words, they have to eliminate their moral standards. This is ridiculous. This is an attack on their rights.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. What radicals do is, and what they have done by defining deviancy down as up, is radicals attack conventional beliefs, they attack the foundation of this Republic, the views by our Founding Fathers, because that is the only way they can seem less radical. They attack the Ten Commandments as being radical and unconstitutional even though the father of our Constitution says that America's civilization is based on the Ten Commandments. They attack the Boy Scouts, saying it is a radical organization.

They attack the Christian right. I have never heard them attack the Christian left. I will be really honest. It is so politically correct to attack the Christian right that many people who agree with the Christian right do not come close to them because they have been the third rail of American politics for some time, touch them and you die.

If I stand up and support something that the Christian right is doing, then I am immediately a member of a suspect class, much as in the past those on the left were seen as members of the suspect class. It is a modern version of McCarthyism.

Let me read one thing and then I will yield further to the gentleman. I want to read something that Robert Bork wrote in a great book called "Slouching Towards Gomorrah." I think this explains why radicals have been able to get away with what radicals have gotten away with for the past 30 years and why they have made the conventional seem radical.

Bork writes on page 7 of "Slouching Towards Gomorrah":

Modern liberalism is powerful because it has enlisted our cultural elites; those who man the institutions that manufacture, manipulate and disseminate ideas, attitudes and symbols. Universities, churches, Hollywood, the national press, print and electronic, foundation staffs, the public interests, organizations, much of the congressional Democratic party, and some of the congressional Republicans as well and large sections of the judiciary, including all too often a majority of the Supreme Court.

People do not realize this. That is why one cannot turn on the news at night and get the straight news, because the same people, and they do not want you to say this. They want to revise history. They tried to revise the words of Jefferson and Madison and Lincoln. They want to revise what they did in the 1960's. The same people who marched in the streets in the 1960's and according to the North Vietnamese generals after the war, won the war for North Vietnam. That is their words, not mine. Those same people in the 1970's, in the 1980's and 1990's went straight to these areas, these cultural institutions where they could continue

to shape and manufacture ideas and continue to make the conventional seem radical.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Your basic point about those of us expressing another view becoming beaten down, I will have to say, I just expressed something a few moments ago about the hiring of homosexuals by the Boy Scouts. Let me say that I personally never criticize people's personal lives. I do not. I will answer to God for my personal life and I have my own set of beliefs. I just will not criticize people for their personal lives. But let me say, I demand the right for myself and for others to have the right to make those value judgments and to make those stands and to express them.

But I can tell you right now, I will be attacked by saying the Boy Scouts have a right to set their own standards, I will be attacked as if I am advocating an attack on somebody else. In reality, it is the opposite. It is the people with more traditional values who are under attack.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And you would be called a bigot because you do not sit back and say absolutely nothing. Again it is not an issue of intolerance, it is not an issue of whether I am going to judge somebody for the life they live. That is up to them. That is what America is about. But at the same time private organizations have a right to make private decisions.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. They have an obligation.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. They have an obligation. But again this is what has happened to us over the past 30 years, why we have been cowed, why we have been beaten down. Every time we try to speak up for values and beliefs that we hold dear and that our Founding Fathers hold dear, we are attacked by extremists in an extreme manner. We are called bigots, we are called racists.

I was just in an education hearing where I simply said that I believe that parents and teachers and school board members should have a bigger say in their education than bureaucrats in Washington, DC.

□ 1400

This person testifying, supporting the President, the President's proposals, basically said that if we left it to the States, then we would have handicapped children locked in closets, that we would have private schools taking control who did not care about handicapped children, who did not care about children with dirty clothes, who did not care about all these other things.

Now I have got to tell you we have not stood up and said enough is enough, and I can tell you as a Baptist who went to a Catholic parochial school I am insulted, and I am not afraid to say it any more, I am insulted by radicals attacking us, telling us that we do not care simply because we want to give power to parents instead of give power to bureaucrats, and it is

time that we stopped being cowed by these radicals that have destroyed this country over the past 30 years. It is time that we say enough is enough.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Yes, I find your conversation very interesting, and it reminds me of a incident that occurred not too many years ago.

I am a physician. I graduated from medical school in 1961, and at that particular time they decided that saying the Hippocratic oath was no longer necessary, and I did not recite the Hippocratic oath at my graduation.

But when my son graduated there in 1988, they allowed us to come back to say the Hippocratic oath. We were given that chance to come back because they were saying it once again, and I was very interested in this, so I went to his graduation, and at the ceremony they were reciting the Hippocratic oath. And lo and behold, when I looked carefully at it, it was not the same oath. They had changed the clause on abortion. It did not say that you should not use an instrument to do an abortion. They merely said you should follow the law, whatever the law is.

So I thought that was a interesting little story to support your case that truth seems to be easily revised in this day and age.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman. And revisionism occurs all the time, and we are told that our Founding Fathers were racists and bigots and that they were radicals and that is—you know, that did not happen before 1994. It is very interesting that Jefferson was the hero of liberals until 1994, and then a group of us got elected quoting Jefferson, saying the government that governs least governs best, and suddenly he was not a useful hero. In fact, we had people actually writing op-eds this past year saying that the Jefferson Memorial needed to be taken down brick by brick by brick because he was a racist and because he was a radical.

Mr. Speaker, that just shows how desperate revisionists are. They would say the same thing of Abraham Lincoln if we quoted Lincoln too much, and I want to quote Lincoln because I am sure that if a President, sitting President today, said these words, he or she would be called a radical. Abraham Lincoln said this in 1863 in a proclamation.

He said we have grown in numbers, wealth and power as no other Nation has ever grown, but we have forgotten God. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace and too proud to pray to the God that made us.

My gosh. If we said that, we would be called radicals, we would be called extremists, and now what they will tell us is that this is about religion, that you are trying to make everybody a Christian or a Jew or a Muslim. It is

not the case. This fight is not about establishing a religion because that is unconstitutional, and I am against it 100 percent. What this is about is reconnecting our children and our grandchildren with their heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, you know I agree in what you are saying and being able to speak what you think, and I appreciate your quoting Lincoln because he is also one of my heroes. And it kind of ties in with a couple of things that I wanted to mention this afternoon, you know, and this is really kind of in view of our bipartisan retreat that is coming up. I kind of wanted to remind people, making an appeal that, you know the words of the great American philosopher, Pogo: We have met the enemy, and he is us.

I think there are few of us who have been entrusted with the honor of serving in this great institution that are unaware of the low esteem in which we are corporately regarded today. And you know sometimes in the interest of reelection, flawed egos or some purposes of political or personal gain, we abuse our privilege and we dishonor our predecessors and slight our fellow Americans and weaken our Nation, and you know it has been true that there have been scoundrels in the past that have thrown shadows over this great noble body. But you know we have gotten to the point where there is a great deal of distrust and cynicism out there in what we do and what goes on here, in the way we treat one another.

And so I guess I am just saying that, you know, we claim to trust God, and in His name I would like to ask us to really reason together for the good of all and, you know, let us respect one another and tolerate one another's differences and not get upset when somebody says something that they deeply believe, but try and work together and stop destroying one another and lift one another up and endeavor to achieve the height of leadership the American people not only deserve but that they expect of us. And let us seek to be a credit to our Nation and proper example to our world and a joy to our God, and I believe that Lincoln who have agreed with that. Do you not?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I certainly do, and I certainly appreciate your words because I guess this is what has disappointed me over the past 2 years more than anything else.

There are Members here who I disagree with on practically every issue, Members like RON DELLUMS of California. He is on National Defense. I do not think I could find anybody on the issue of national defense that I disagree with more. I do not think I could find anybody on several other issues that I disagree with more. Quite frankly, I think his views are not the best views for America's future. The same with BARNEY FRANK from Massachusetts. But I have got to tell you I can talk to BARNEY FRANK of Massachusetts, and it

helps me as a conservative, talking to a liberal who I disagree with to see whether my views are correct or to see whether I am taking an easier path than I should be taking.

The same thing with RON DELLUMS. I had a great talk with RON DELLUMS when we first got here. He came over, he walked over from that side of the aisle, over here where a lot of us were sitting, young Republicans who had just gotten elected, and we talked for a while. And he said to me, he goes: "You know,"—he said, "I don't understand why all you young guys are Republicans, why you're all conservatives. It doesn't make sense to me. Explain it to me."

And I said to him, I said, "Well, you know, Congressman, when you look on this side of the aisle, your views were shaped in the 1950's and 1960's. You saw a Republican majority that supported public discrimination, that supported a lot of the things that happened in the Southeast, where I am from, that were morally repugnant, and the party of Vietnam and Watergate. When I look on your side of the aisle, I think of where I was in 1979, 1978, 1979, 1980, when I first started becoming politically involved, or in my mind watching TV, and as I was about to start college, and I see the party of the Iran hostage crisis. I see the party of Jimmy Carter. I see the party of 21-percent interest rates. I see the party of a failed liberal policy that has bankrupted this country."

So we come from two different worlds, but we can still respect each other, and RON DELLUMS, always a gentleman, said to me, said something like, "That is really deep, man," or whatever RON said, and we respect each other. I think most everybody in this Chamber respects RON DELLUMS.

When RON was over on the Committee on National Security as chairman, hardly any Republicans and most Democrats agreed with him, but when I first got here and I started saying, well, how is this Member and how is that Member, when we talked about RON DELLUMS, they said, "Hey, don't say anything bad about RON. He may be out there in left field ideologically, but at the same time the guy is fair."

And so we can disagree without being disagreeable. We can get on the floor, and we can debate in the strongest terms possible, and we need to do that without becoming personal in our attacks.

Mrs. MYRICK. I think that is true, and that is one thing that has been missing, and it is a good point that you make because this place is such a busy place that you do not take time to build those friendships and you do not take time to walk across that aisle and get to know somebody else, and I think that has been a big mistake and I hope that all of us can start to do more of that sharing and really try and reach out, and have our disagreements because you are going to have to disagree philosophically. We will have a lot of

differences; that is the way it is. But it does not mean that you cannot establish those friendships, and I commend you for doing that.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, and I agree with her. We do need to establish these friendships, and at the same time we do not need to create this false, bland bipartisanship where nobody is afraid to speak their mind because the American people might be upset that two independent minds in the free marketplace of ideas disagree with each other. Do not be afraid when you turn on C-SPAN and somebody is pointing across the aisle to somebody else and talking about how they disagree. That is how we move forward as a country, two competing ideas. Unfortunately many of us on the conservative side have been quiet for too long.

Early on in the Bork book he quotes a poet, William Butler Yates, in a great poem called "The Second Coming," and the last line talks about the beast slouching toward Bethlehem. The book is obviously called "Slouching Toward Gomorrah," but this is what Bork highlights, the part where it says the best lack all conviction while the worst are full of passionate intensity. For too long the best have lacked all conviction, the best have remained silent as this country has gone down a radical left path that our Founding Fathers would have been absolutely horrified in, a path that dooms our children.

It is not just cultural. It is economic, too. You know, we have got a \$5.6 trillion debt, and we still do not have enough people in this town with the willpower to spend only as much money as we take in.

So what does that mean? It means that our children are going to be burdened with an incredible debt as they grow older.

My 6- and 9-year-old boys 20 years from now are going to be paying 89 percent of every dollar they make to the Federal Government, and that was not a Republican that came up with that. That came from Senator BOB KERREY's independent commission on entitlement reform, you see, because these baby boomers who are slouching toward retirement will overwhelm the system too soon.

You know, back in the 1950's there were 15 people working for every 1 person on Social Security. Today there are 3 people working for every 1 person on Social Security. And 20 years from now when baby boomers are retiring, there is going to be 1 person working for every 1 person on Social Security. So that means our children will not have 14 others in a pool to help pay the beneficiary their benefits that were promised to them. We will only have 1 person working for every 1 person on Social Security, and I have got to tell you the prospects are bleak if we do not have the moral conviction and the moral courage to step forward and save our children's future, and ensure them the same American dream that our

parents and grandparents tried to pass on to us.

One member of our historic freshman class of the 104th Congress is the gentleman from South Carolina, who has been looking into how we can make Social Security solvent for our senior citizens without bankrupting our children, and there are going to be a lot of different ideas. We may not agree on what is the best approach, but I can tell you that in the free marketplace of ideas the only way that we can move forward with an agenda that can save our children and save our grandparents from economic calamity is to debate in the free marketplace of ideas and hopefully do so without people demagoging and trying to scare our eldest citizens.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] for a few minutes, and if he could, to discuss one of his proposals.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

In our limited time I will not really go into a proposal we are working on, but what I would like to do for just a few minutes is talk about the problem that is before us, because as the gentleman suggested, we have a very considerable problem if we do nothing. There is the old saying of hear no evil, speak no evil, see no evil, the three monkeys. That seems to be the way Congress is at this point approaching Social Security. It is the most important program we have in this country and it is absolutely vital that we save it.

To save it, we have to begin, as the gentleman suggested, by talking about it. What is interesting about this problem is not what Republicans have said, not what Democrats have said, not what Ross Perot has said, but what the trustees for the trust fund itself have said; that if we do nothing, Social Security will go bankrupt in 2029, and it will begin to run deficits around 2012 when those baby boomers begin to retire, such that either we have to look at raising payroll taxes by about 16 percent, or cutting benefits by about 14 percent, or growing the deficit by roughly the same number.

What I hear from folks back home in the district is, MARK, I am struggling. The idea of raising my payroll taxes by another 16 percent makes no sense to me. When I talk to seniors, they say, MARK, I am struggling. The idea of cutting my benefits by 14 percent is not an option.

What is really interesting are the demographics behind what is driving this change. They are, one, that people are living longer. When Social Security was created in 1935, the average life expectancy was 62 years of age. Today it is 76. Every year that I grow older I hope it keeps moving in that direction, but it creates real strains on a pay-as-you-go system, which is what our system is right now.

The other demographic problem that is headed our way, and again it is, I

guess, a mixed blessing, is that we have gone from having big families on the farm to having relatively few families today. As my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, suggested, again, when Social Security was created there were 42 workers for every retiree. By 1960 there were, or 1950 rather, there were around 16 workers for every retiree. Today there are 3.2 workers for every retiree. We are well on our way to having two and then one worker for every retiree.

Again, that is a demographic phenomenon we are not going to change. For me to suggest to my wife—we have three little boys—Jennie, what do you think, another six or seven children and I think we can maybe help to solve this Social Security problem, is not going to fly. So we are looking at demographic trends we cannot change.

That leaves us with a number of, I think, crazy options. We can wait and do nothing and let Social Security go bankrupt, which I do not think is an option. We can wait and do nothing and raise payroll taxes by 16 percent. I do not think that is an option. We can wait and do nothing and cut benefits by 14 percent. I do not think that is an option. We can grow the deficit by roughly 14 to 16 percent. I do not think that is an option. We can lower life expectancy or change fertility rates. Those are not options.

That leaves us with one option. That one option is letting people invest their own money in their own savings accounts and letting that grow and compound over time.

Einstein was once asked, what is the most powerful force in the universe? His reply was, compound interest. It is amazing what you can end up with at the end of a working lifetime if you put a little bit away into your own account that politicians cannot get their hands on, again, over a working lifetime.

I just wanted to touch for a few minutes on the problem. I will be back on many other visits to talk about many of the benefits that would come with change, or our specific ideas on the subject. But I did not want to interrupt my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for more than just a couple of minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Let me ask the gentleman quickly, I know the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] has been talking about taking Social Security off budget. What we mean by that is right now I think Social Security is running about a \$62 billion, \$63 billion surplus.

When we get together and talk about balancing the budget, one of the ways we do it is say, we have \$63 billion over in that trust fund. Why do we not do a little accounting trick and shift it over, and that will make our job \$63 billion easier when they know they cannot get their hands on that anyway.

Unfortunately, there is a conspiracy of silence on both sides of the aisle with Congress and the President, because it is in the President's best interest to try to balance the budget. He

says he is going to balance the budget, and he has a balanced budget plan. It is \$62 billion out of whack. If we add the \$62 billion surplus in Social Security that he is counting on to cook the books, it is \$120 billion in red. The same thing with the Republicans.

If we have the courage, and I pray that we still do, if we have the courage to come forward with a plan to balance the budget, and yet if we shift \$62 billion over from a Social Security trust fund in an accounting trick that we cannot use, then we are \$62 billion short.

So I support the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN]. Does the gentleman from South Carolina support the gentleman from Wisconsin's proposal?

Mr. SANFORD. I do. As we both know, it will not save Social Security in the long run, because we have this giant demographic shift coming our way as the baby boomers begin to retire in 2012, and there are 730 million. They are about double the size of the generation before and double the size of the generation after.

In other words, it will not save us from that avalanche of graying in America, if you want to call it that, that is headed our way, but it would certainly be a step in the right direction. And most importantly, as the gentleman suggests, if Washington is to be trusted, we have to have, in essence, honest accounting.

For us to say a trust fund, but it is not really a trust fund, is not honest accounting. For us to use Social Security moneys to in essence mask the size of the real operating budget here in Washington again is not an honest accounting. What I hear from folks back home in my district say is that they would like to see honest accounting, and they would like trust fund money to stay in its trust fund.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. When you talk about honest accounting, and talking about trust, I have to tell the gentleman, his job is going to be made more difficult, the job of the gentleman from Wisconsin is going to be made more difficult, and this institution's job is going to be made more difficult in this area and the entitlement area in general, because of the shameless display we saw over the past 2 years of those who would attack us because we were trying to keep Medicare solvent.

The gentleman talked about the trustees. They told us that Medicare was going bankrupt. So we had a group of people step forward with a bold proposal, and the Speaker of the House, who has been fodder for every political campaign over the past 2 years, the Speaker actually had the courage to step forward and say, I know Medicare is the third rail of American politics, I know we are not supposed to touch entitlements; but it is dying and we had better fix it now. If we do not fix it now, we are going to have to pay for it later, and it is going to be seniors and

middle-class taxpayers who take the biggest hit if we do not fix it now.

So we stepped forward and we had the courage to do something 2 years ago. Unfortunately, we paid for it in political terms, because there were others that used that against us.

I have to say that if I could do anything this session, it would be to once again instill in the hearts and minds of all these people the courage to step forward and do what has to be done to make Medicare solvent, to make Social Security solvent; because all these other issues about cutting a program 2 percentage points or 4 percentage points, or increasing school lunch programs 4 percentage points instead of 6 percentage points, they are irrelevant.

In the long run, they are irrelevant economically, because it is Medicare, it is Social Security, it is Medicaid that is expanding at such a rapid clip that it is going to overwhelm all of us, it is going to overwhelm this Congress, and it is going to create an economic meltdown if we do not do something about it.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. I appreciate him letting me borrow a little of his time.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman, because it does really play into what we were talking about before, and that is talking about creating a civilization that is more connected, more closely connected to the views of our Founding Fathers, to the views of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln, than to the cultural views of what happened in the 1960s or what is happening now: The life of Larry Flynt or the words of Madonna or the actions of Dennis Rodman.

We have to step forward and not be afraid of our past but embrace our past, embrace the ideals of our Founding Fathers who said, "We have staked the entire future of the American civilization not on the power of government, but on the capacity of Americans to live and govern and control themselves according to the Ten Commandments of God"; or the ideals of Jefferson, who said that the government that governs least governs best.

Those are not radical ideas. Those are ideas for the 21st century. Those are ideas that are going to overwhelm the liberals anyway, that are going to overwhelm the radicals anyway. We are moving from an industrial age to an information society, where information disseminates, and just as the agrarian age had a decentralizing impact and the industrial age had a centralizing impact, the Information Age once again is going to empower the individual.

We in Washington should get out of the way and let individuals live as they choose to live, let individuals study as they choose to study, let them worship as they choose to worship, let them spend their hard-earned tax dollars as they choose to spend the money that they make, and we need to get out of their way and let them prosper.

If we do that, we will once again be the great civilization that we once were. We will once again be what Abraham Lincoln spoke about when he said America was the last great hope for a dying world. We still are. We have just gotten off track in the past 30 years.

And hopefully what we did yesterday, what we tried to do over the past 2 years, will begin to bear some fruit. We will create America, we will build a bridge to the 21st century also that will not be based on what happened over the past 30 years, but instead based on those great and lofty ideas that we find in the writings and words of our Founding Fathers.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 6, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This letter is to inform you that in order for me to accept an appointment by Democratic Leader Richard Gephardt to a seat on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, it will be necessary for me to interrupt my service on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and as Ranking Member of its subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Rule 19 F. of the Preamble and Rules of the Democratic Caucus provides that no Democratic Member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence may serve on more than one standing committee during that Member's term of service on the select committee. However, the rule also provides that Members shall be entitled to take leaves of absence from service on any committee (or subcommittee thereof) during the period they serve on the select committee and seniority rights on such committee (and on each subcommittee) to which they were assigned at the time shall be fully protected as if they had continued to serve during the period of leave of absence.

While I will remain committed to protecting and enhancing the needs and benefits of our nation's veterans, this letter constitutes notice of my intent to take the necessary leave of absence from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in order to accept an appointment to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

With kindest regards, I remain
Sincerely yours,

SANFORD D. BISHOP, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

CIVIL LIBERTIES, WHERE AMERICA IS HEADED, ITS PROBLEMS AND THEIR SOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this special order today to continue