

stands for Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. Instead of a renewed buildup of nuclear weapons, SMART security calls for aggressive diplomacy, a commitment to nuclear nonproliferation, strong regional security arrangements and inspection regimes. Being smart about national security requires the United States to set an example for young democracies so that they can follow.

The U.S. must renounce first use of nuclear weapons and the development of new nuclear weapons. The Bush doctrine of arrogant nuclear proliferation has been tried and it has failed. Instead of engaging in a nuclear arms race for the 21st century, the United States must engage in a SMART security strategy for the 21st century.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCOTTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Constitution is the most unique and best contract ever drawn up between a people and their government throughout history. Though flawed from the beginning, because all men are flawed, it nevertheless has served us well and set an example for the entire world.

Yet no matter how hard the authors tried, the inevitable corrupting influence of power was not thwarted by the Constitution. The notion of separate States and local governments championed by the followers of Jefferson was challenged by the Hamiltonians almost immediately following ratification of the Constitution.

Early on the supporters of strong centralized government promoted central banking, easy credit, protectionism, mercantilism and subsidies for corporate interests.

Although the 19th century generally was kind to the intent of the constitution, namely limiting government power, a major setback occurred with the Civil War and the severe undermining of the principle of sovereign States.

□ 2000

The Civil War will finally change the balance of power in our federalist system, paving the way for centralized big government.

Although the basic principle underlying the constitutional republic we were given was compromised in the post Civil War period, it was not until the 20th century that steady and significant erosion of the Constitution restraints placed on the central government occurred. This erosion adversely

affected not only economic and civil liberties but foreign affairs as well.

We now have persistent abuse of the Constitution by the executive, legislative and the judicial branches. Our legislative leaders in Washington demonstrate little concern for the rule of law, liberty and our republican form of government.

Today, the pragmatism of the politicians, as they spend more than \$2 trillion annually, create legislative chaos. The vultures consume the carcass of liberty without remorse. On the contrary, we hear politicians brag incessantly about their ability to deliver benefits to their district, thus qualifying themselves for automatic reelection.

The real purpose of the Constitution was the preservation of liberty, but our government ignores this while spending endlessly, taxing and regulating. The complacent electorate who are led to believe their interests and needs are best served by a huge bureaucratic welfare state convince themselves that enormous Federal deficits and destructive inflation can be dealt with on another day.

The answer to the dilemma of unconstitutional government and runaway spending is simple: restore a burning conviction in the hearts and minds of the people that freedom works and government largesse is a fraud. When the people once again regain their confidence in the benefits of liberty and demand it from their elected leaders, Congress will act appropriately.

The response of honorable men and women who represent us should be simply to take their oaths of office seriously, vote accordingly and return our Nation to its proper republican origins. The result would be economic prosperity, greater personal liberty, honest money, abolition of the Internal Revenue Service and a world made more peaceful when we abandon the futile policy of building and policing an American empire. No longer would we yield our sovereignty to international organizations that act outside of the restraints placed on the government by the Constitution.

The Constitution and those who have sworn to uphold it are not perfect, and it is understandable that abuse occurs, but it should not be acceptable. Without meticulous adherence to the principle of the rule of law, minor infractions become commonplace, and the Constitution loses all meaning. Unfortunately, that is where we are today.

The nonsense that the Constitution is a living, flexible document taught as gospel in most public schools must be challenged. The Founders were astute enough to recognize the Constitution was not perfect and wisely permitted amendments to the document, but they correctly made the process tedious and difficult. Without a renewed love for liberty and confidence in its results, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to restore once again the rule of law under the Constitution.

I have heard throughout my life how each upcoming election is the most important election ever and how the very future of our country is at stake. Those fears have always been grossly overstated. The real question is not who will achieve the next partisan victory; the real question is whether or not we will once again accept the clear restraints placed in the power of the national government by the Constitution. Obviously, the jury is still out on this issue. However, what we choose to do about this constitutional crisis is the most important "election" of our times, and the results will determine the kind of society our children will inherit. I believe it is worthwhile for all of us to tirelessly pursue the preservation of the elegant constitution with which we have been so blessed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCOTTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

PATENTS AND NANOTECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the current political debate on the economy is usually over the most recent economic statistics, but our economic future depends upon our remaining the most innovative economy in the world. The policies of this current administration and of this Congress are cheating Americans of our economic future, of the economic future that we deserve.

I rise tonight to speak specifically about the need for adequate funding for the United States Patent and Trademark Office and about the need to help get nanotechnology from the lab to the market.

Patents and trademarks are critical to the promotion and development of the American economy. In an increasingly competitive global market, it is essential that the administration and we in Congress do everything we can to maintain America's role as the leader in the creation of innovative technologies and of new products.

Innovation and competitiveness depend upon the effectiveness and efficiency of the United States Patent and

Trademark Office, the USPTO. Our biotechnology, electronic, pharmaceutical and nanotechnology industries rely on the United States patent system. But because of record innovation and growth beginning in the 1990s, the USPTO is overburdened to the breaking point.

The Under Secretary of Commerce For Intellectual Property, Jon Dudas, testified that the USPTO may be facing the greatest workload and operational crisis in more than 200 years; in other words, in the USPTO's history. The backlog is now 475,000 patent applications. By comparison, the backlog in 1981 was 190,000 applications. By 2008, the backlog is expected to grow to more than 1 million applications. That is 1 million ideas, 1 million innovations, 1 million potential money makers and job creators that will sit on the shelf until patent examiners clear the backlog of cases in front of it and consider that application. Once an application reaches its way to the front of the line, the time a patent application takes to be approved is also increasing dramatically, from 22 months in 1981 to more than 3 years for many of our critical technologies. By 2008, the average pendency is expected to grow to 6 to 8 years.

The House has already passed a bill that would alleviate the backlog. H.R. 1561 would raise patent fees and allow the USPTO to use the revenues to reduce the backlog and patent pendency delays.

I urge my colleagues in this House, as well as the members of the Senate and the administration, to meet the needs of an innovative economy by allowing the USPTO to collect the increased patent fees, to improve their work.

Mr. Speaker, our most innovative technologies, our research intensive technologies, the very folks who will be paying the increased fees, are desperate to pay those fees and to improve the effectiveness of the USPTO in processing patent applications. The status quo is just unacceptable. We must have an efficient, cost effective patent and trademark system to remain the leader in today's global economy.

Mr. Speaker, as to the next nanotechnology industry, the administration's preference for partisan dogma over investment guarantees that most of the nanotechnology industry will develop in other countries, regardless of how much we spend here in the United States on research. The administration did support H.R. 766 which authorized funding for more nanotechnology research and development, but every amendment to that bill that would have increased the competence by our industry in nanotechnology-related manufacturing jobs was defeated in the Committee on Science along party lines. My colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), offered an amendment that would have authorized money specifically to enhance the advanced technology program efforts

in nanotechnology. Again, that amendment was defeated on a party line vote.

The ATP, the Advanced Technology Program, is the only source of patient capital for many high-tech, small companies in areas like nanotechnology, and there is usually nowhere else to turn in the United States for a company that is 3 to 5 years from the market and 2 to 4 years from interesting venture capitalists in their ideas. To the administration, though, the ATP is just a corporate welfare program that should be abolished.

Mr. Speaker, highly-skilled, well-paid jobs are going to exist in the nanotechnology industry whether or not we support those companies, that is true, but they are not going to exist here.

Mr. Speaker, the triumph of dogma over practicality and over our economic future is unacceptable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

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

There was no objection.

ACCEPTING THE TRUTH OF INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, the basis of international alliances rests not upon ephemeral, nebulous sentimentality, but upon concrete national interests. To willfully ignore this truth and instead wallow in the wistful mists of melancholy and nostalgia is injurious for a nation at peace and lethal to a nation at war. To prove the point, I cite the Democratic presidential nominee's recent New York speech in which he said, "In the dark days of the Cuban Missile Crisis, President Kennedy sent former Secretary of State Dean Acheson to Europe to build support. Acheson explained the situation to the French President de Gaulle, and then he offered to show him highly classified satellite photos as proof. De Gaulle waved the photos away saying, the word of the President of the United States is good enough for me."

It is a fine story, but what proves the point about changes in world circumstance I think is a story from 1966 about the Johnson administration's experience.

In 1966, upon being told that President Charles de Gaulle had taken France out of NATO and that all U.S. troops must be evacuated off of French soil, President Johnson mentioned to Secretary of State Dean Rusk that he should ask de Gaulle a rather pointed question. Dean implied in his answer that de Gaulle really should not be asked that in a meeting, but LBJ, a Texan, insisted.

During his meeting with de Gaulle, the Secretary of State did ask if his order to remove all U.S. troops from French soil also included the 60,000-plus soldiers buried in France from World War I to World War II. President de Gaulle did not respond.

Mr. Speaker, September 11 was a defining moment in the life of our country and, indeed, all the world. In such perilous times we must accept the hard truth of international alliances. While we regret the state of our erstwhile alliances, we must always strive to honor and expand the valorous new alliances that we have forged that are fighting for freedom throughout the world.

NATION HEADED IN WRONG DIRECTION FOR JOBS AND ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is headed in the wrong direction on jobs and our economy. And one-party control in the White House, in the Congress, in the House and in the other body, the Senate, has made for a plundering of our national wealth. We have not seen the type of actions that have been going on in this Capital since the time of the 1920s in the last century: extravagant borrowing, historic debt levels, a rising gap between the rich and the poor and a sluggish job market, real softness, even with the new term being invented, "jobless recovery."

Now, the President says that the reason this is happening is because we are at war. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the first administration since the time of Roosevelt that has not been able to create jobs during war. In fact, if you look, after World War II, we have had job creation by every U.S. President, Democrat or Republican, until now. War always leads to job creation, but not under this President, because the fundamental economic policies are all out of whack.

This week, in the business pages of the New York Times, the chief of the International Monetary Fund talked about the hazards to the international economy as well as to the U.S. economy because of our budget and fiscal policies. He says that the United States is going to have to tackle its growing indebtedness to avoid a threat to the entire world economy. He says that our deficit remaining well over 4 percent of gross domestic product for years to come is a risk not just for the