

Ron Paul's FREEDOM REPORT

A publication of the Foundation for Rational Economics and Education.

VOLUME 9, NO. 8 AUGUST 2005



MONDAY, JULY 11, 2005

*Before the
U.S. House of Representatives*

Henry Lamb - A Great Freedom Fighter Documents How Your Dietary Supplements are Under Attack

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read "Your dietary supplements: Under attack again" by Henry Lamb, which I am inserting into the record.

Mr. Lamb explains the threat to American consumers of dietary supplements and American sovereignty by the Codex Alimentarius Commission, commonly referred to simply as Codex. **The United Nations created Codex to establish international standards for foods and medicines.** Just last week, representatives of the United States government agreed to a final version of Codex's standards on dietary supplements which, if implemented in the United States, could drastically reduce Americans' ability to obtain the supplements of their choice.

Members of the American bureaucracy may be hoping to achieve via international fiat what they cannot achieve through the domestic law-making process — the power to restrict consumers' access to dietary supplements. American bureaucrats may gain this power if the World Trade Organization, which considers Codex "guidelines" the standard by which all other regulations are judged, decides that our failure to "harmonize" our regulations of dietary supplements to meet Codex's recommendations violates international trading standards! This could occur despite the fact that American consumers do not want to be subjected to the restrictive regulations common in other parts of the world, such as the European Union.

This article is typical of Henry Lamb's work. For almost twenty years, beginning at an age when most Americans are contemplating retirement, Mr. Lamb has worked to expose and stop threats to American liberty, sovereignty, and prosperity. Mr. Lamb became involved in the battle for liberty when, as the CEO of a Tennessee construction company, he founded a state association of contractors to work against excessive regulations.

True environmentalism is rooted in the truth that there is no better steward of the environment than a private property owner. In 1988, Henry Lamb founded the Environmental Conservation Organization to defend true environmentalism from those who used the environment as a cover for their radical statist agendas. Since 1992, Mr. Lamb and ECO have focused on the threat to economic liberty and self-government posed by the radical global environmental agenda.

Henry Lamb works to further the cause of liberty by giving speeches around the country, editing an on-line magazine, making numerous television and radio appearances, and writing a weekly column to inform his fellow Americans of the latest scheme to undermine their freedoms.

Mr. Lamb is the model of a citizen-activist, and all who wish to become involved in the battle for freedom can learn from his example. In conclusion, I once again urge my colleagues to read Mr. Lamb's article to learn about the need to protect American consumers from Codex, and I thank Mr. Lamb for his tireless devotion to the cause of freedom.

YOUR DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS:
UNDER ATTACK AGAIN
(from *WorldNetDaily*, June 11, 2005)

By Henry Lamb

The Codex Alimentarius Commission sounds like one of those shadowy, sinister organizations conjured up by one-world-government nuts to scare people.

Truth: It is!

The Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health Organization created this commission in the early 1960s to set standards for food safety and to “harmonize” the laws of member nations. The commission was endorsed by U.N. Resolution 39/248, which says:

When formulating national policies and plans with regard to food, governments should take into account the need of all consumers for food security and should support and, as far as possible, adopt standards from the...Codex Alimentarius. ...

The Codex Alimentarius Commission consists of delegates from 163 member nations representing 97 percent of the world's population. It meets every two years, either in Rome or Geneva. Between meetings, the commission is governed by an executive committee that directs the activities of its many committees.

Of immediate concern is the ongoing effort to bring dietary supplements in America under the control of standards set by this commission. Dietary supplements generate a \$17 billion industry in the United States, which affects more than 150 million consumers, according to Congressional findings (H.R. 2485). Proposed procedures and standards could virtually destroy this market and deprive millions of Americans of the supplements they want to use.

The European Union Directive on Dietary Supplements, which becomes law in August, severely restricts the types and quantities of supplements that may be legally sold. Most forms of vitamins C and E, for example, are not available, or are available only in extremely small doses. If current plans proceed on course, American consumers are in for a shock.

How can this little-known international commission control what consumers buy in the United States?

An even less-known agency, deep within the bowels of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is responsible for U.S. participation in the Codex Commission and designates delegates to each of the commission's committees. Barbara O. Schneeman is the delegate to the Codex Committee on Nutrition and Food for Special Dietary Uses.

The effort to regulate dietary supplements has been under way for more than a decade. In 1994, Congress adopted the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act, which kept supplements beyond the reach of the drug police. In the past, Codex recommendations have been non-binding. Now, however, the Codex Alimentarius

Commission is teaming up with the World Trade Organization to bring international enforcement to the dietary-supplement battle.

Ironically, it was primarily the U.S. that brought the WTO into existence in 1994, as the successor to GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The WTO agreement specifically requires that the member nations — including the U.S. — conform its laws to meet the requirements of WTO decisions. Failure to conform results in stiff financial penalties. The Codex Commission and the European Union want the WTO to enforce Codex standards, which fly directly in the face of the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act.

Pascal Lamy of France was just selected as director general of the WTO. Lamy served as a member of the French Socialist Party's steering committee and was chief of staff and representative of the European Commission for President Jacques Delors. Since 1995, he has served as a member of the Central Office of the Mouvement Européen (France) and as a member of the European Commission, responsible for trade.

The Codex Commission will be meeting in Rome July 4-9 to adopt the final rules on dietary supplement use. Dr. Carolyn Dean, president of Friends of Freedom International, will attend this meeting and return to the U.S. just in time to present her report to the Sixth Annual Freedom 21 Conference in Reno, July 14-16.

The Codex Alimentarius Commission's reach is much broader than dietary supplements. Its committees are also working on standards for pesticide residue, labeling of all kinds of foods, food additives and nutrients, veterinary medicine and drugs, as well as standards and methods for analysis. The function of this organization is to establish standards for all food worldwide and to enforce those standards through the power of the World Trade Organization.

Few people know that there is such a thing as the Codex Alimentarius Commission. It was created to promote food safety in international trade. It is on the brink of becoming an Orwellian bureaucracy — far worse than the worst fantasies of the one-world conspiracy theories.

The Codex Alimentarius Commission is neither fantasy nor theory; it is real.

Dr. Paul addresses the U.S. House

Statement on the Flag Burning Amendment

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution [H. Res 330]. The process may well be legal, but it is unwise.

The problem is minimal. This is more like a solution in search of a problem. We just do not need to amend the Constitution for such a tiny problem.

It was stated earlier that [amending the Constitution] is the only recourse we have since the Supreme Court ruled the Texas law unconstitutional. That is not true. There are other alternatives.

One merely would be to use State law. There are a lot of State laws, such as laws against arson, disturbing the peace, theft, inciting riots, trespassing. We could deal with all of the flag desecration with these laws. But there is another solution that our side has used and pretends to want to use on numerous occasions, and that is to eliminate the jurisdiction of the federal courts. We did it on the marriage issue; we can do it right here.

So, to say [a constitutional amendment] is the only solution is incorrect. And besides, the [alternative solutions] would go quickly, pass the House by a majority vote, pass the Senate by a majority vote, and be sent to the President. The Schiavo legislation was expedited and passed quickly. Why not do it with the flag? It is a solution, and we should pay attention to it.

Desecration is reserved for religious symbols. To me, this is scary because the flag is a symbol today of the State. Why is it, our side never seems to answer this question when we bring it up: *Why is it that we have the Red Chinese, Cuba, North Korea, and Saddam Hussein who support the position that you severely punish those who burn a flag?* No, our side just glosses over this. Is it not rather ironic today that we have troops dying in Iraq, “spreading freedom,” and yet, we are here trying to pass laws similar to what Saddam Hussein had with regard to the flag? I just do not see where that makes a lot of sense.

A question I would like to ask the proponents of this legislation is this: What if some military officials arrived at a home to report to the family that their son had just been

killed in Iraq, and the mother is totally overwhelmed by grief which quickly turns to anger. She grabs a flag and she burns it? What is the proper punishment for this woman who is grieved, who acts out in this manner? We say, well, these are special circumstances, we will excuse her for that; or no, she has to be punished, she burned a flag because she was making a political statement. That is the question that has to be answered. What is the proper punishment for a woman like that? I would say it is very difficult to mete out any punishment whatsoever.

We do not need a new amendment to the Constitution to take care of a problem that does not exist.

Another point: The real problem that exists routinely on the House floor is the daily trashing of the Constitution by totally ignoring Act I Sec. 8. We should spend a lot more time following the rule of law, as defined by our oath of office, and a lot less on unnecessary constitutional amendments that expand the role of the federal government while undermining the States.

Let me summarize my views on this proposed amendment. I have myself served five years in the military, and I have great respect for the symbol of our freedom. I salute the flag, and I pledge to the flag. I also support overriding the Supreme Court case that overturned state laws prohibiting flag burning. Under the constitutional principle of federalism, questions such as whether or not Texas should prohibit flag burning are strictly up to the people of Texas, not the United States Supreme Court. Thus, if this amendment simply restored the states’ authority to ban flag burning, I would enthusiastically support it.

However, I cannot support an amendment to give Congress new power to prohibit flag burning. I served my country to protect our freedoms and to protect our Constitution. I believe very sincerely that today we are undermining to some degree that freedom that we have had all these many years.

We have some misfits who on occasion burn the flag. We all despise this behavior, but the offensive conduct of a few does not justify making an exception to the First Amendment protections of political speech the majority

finds offensive. According to the pro-flag amendment Citizens Flag Alliance, there were only three incidents of flag desecration in 2004 and there have only been two acts of desecration thus far in 2005, and the majority of those cases involved vandalism or some other activity that is already punishable by local law enforcement!

Let me emphasize how the First Amendment is written,

Let me summarize my views on this proposed amendment. I have myself served 5 years in the military, and I have great respect for the symbol of our freedom. I salute the flag, and I pledge to the flag. I also support overriding the Supreme Court case that overturned state laws prohibiting flag burning. Under the constitutional principle of federalism, questions such as whether or not Texas should prohibit flag burning are strictly up to the people of Texas, not the United States Supreme Court. Thus, if this amendment simply restored the states’ authority to ban flag burning, I would enthusiastically support it.

“Congress shall make no law.” That was the spirit of our nation at that time: “Congress shall make no laws.”

Unfortunately, Congress has long since disregarded the original intent of the Founders and has written a lot of laws regulating private property and private conduct. But I would ask my colleagues to remember that every time we write a law to control private behavior, we imply that somebody has to arrive with a gun, because if you desecrate the flag, you have to punish that person. So how do you do that? You send an agent of the government, perhaps an employee of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Flags, to arrest him. This is in many ways patriotism with a gun — if your actions do not fit the official definition of a *patriot*, we will send somebody to arrest you.

Congress has models of flag desecration laws. For example, Saddam Hussein made desecration of the Iraq flag a criminal offense punishable by up to 10 years in prison.

It is assumed that many in the military support this amendment, but in fact there are veterans who have been great heroes in war on both sides of this issue. I would like to quote a past national commander of the American Legion, Keith Kreul. He said:

Our Nation was not founded on devotion to symbolic idols, but on principles, beliefs and ideals expressed in the Constitution and its Bill of Rights. American veterans who have protected our banner in battle have not done so to protect a golden calf. Instead, they carried the banner forward with reverence for what it represents, our beliefs and freedom for all. Therein lies the beauty of our flag. A patriot cannot be created by legislation.

Former Secretary of State, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and two-time winner of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, Colin Powell, also has expressed opposition to amending the Constitution in this manner: *I would not amend that great shield of democracy to hammer out a few miscreants. The flag will be flying proudly long after they have slunk away.*

This amendment will not even reach the majority of cases of flag burning. When we see flag burning on television, it is usually not American citizens, but foreigners who have strong objections to what we do overseas. This is what I see on television and it is the conduct that most angers me.

One of the very first laws that Red China passed upon assuming control of Hong Kong was to make flag burning illegal. Since that time, they have prosecuted some individuals for flag burning. Our State Department keeps records of how often the Red Chinese prosecute people for burning the Chinese flag, as it considers those prosecutions an example of how the Red Chinese violate human rights. Those violations are used against Red China in the argument that they should not have most-favored-nation status. There is just a bit of hypocrisy among those Members who claim this amendment

does not interfere with fundamental liberties, yet are critical of Red China for punishing those who burn the Chinese flag.

This is ultimately an attack on private property. Freedom of speech and freedom of expression depend on property. We do not have freedom of expression of our religion in other people’s churches; it is honored and respected because we respect the ownership of the property. The property conveys the right of free expression, as a newspaper would or a radio station. Once Congress limits property rights, for any cause, no matter how noble, it limits freedom.

Some claim that this is not an issue of private property rights because the flag belongs to the country. The flag belongs to everybody. But if you say that, you are a *collectivist*. That means you believe everybody owns everything. So why do American citizens have to spend money to obtain, and maintain, a flag if the flag is communally owned? If your neighbor, or the federal government, owns a flag, even without this amendment you do not have the right to go and burn that flag. If you are causing civil disturbances, you are liable for your conduct under state and local laws. But this whole idea that there could be a collective ownership of the flag is erroneous.

Finally, I wish to point out that by using the word *desecration*, which is traditionally reserved for religious symbols, the authors of this amendment are placing the symbol of the state on the same plane as symbols of the church. The practical effect of this is to either lower religious symbols to the level of the secular state, or raise the state symbol to the status of a holy icon. Perhaps this amendment harkens back to the time when the state was seen as interchangeable with the church. In any case, those who believe we have *no king but Christ* should be troubled by this amendment.

We must be interested in the spirit of our Constitution. We must be interested in the principles of liberty. I therefore urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Instead, my colleagues should work to restore the rights of the individual states to ban flag burning, free from unconstitutional interference by the Supreme Court.

Nothing in this publication is intended to aid or hinder the passage of legislation before Congress.

About the F.R.E.E. Foundation

The Foundation for Rational Economics and Education, Inc. is a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt public foundation dedicated to individual liberty and free-market economics. It was founded by Congressman Ron Paul of Texas and publishes his Freedom Report. For more information, or to make a tax-deductible donation write: F.R.E.E., Inc., P.O. Box 1776, Lake Jackson, Texas 77566, or call 979-265-3034.