

Ron Paul's FREEDOM REPORT

A publication of the Foundation for Rational Economics and Education.

VOLUME 8, NO. 6 JUNE 2004

Editor's note: Special emphasis is given to the first item below which should be required reading for every voter and every high school student. It should be reread until it sinks in...and the repeated readings should start on the floor of the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C.



THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 2004

Dr. Paul addresses the House

Oppose the Spendthrift 2005 Federal Budget Resolution

I once again find myself compelled to vote against the annual budget resolution (H.Con.Res. 393) for a very simple reason: **it makes government bigger.**

Like many of my Republican colleagues who curiously voted for today's enormous budget, I campaign on a simple promise that I will work to *make government smaller*. **This means I cannot vote for any budget that increases spending over previous years.**

In fact, I would have a hard time voting for any budget that did not slash federal spending by at least 25%, a feat that becomes less unthinkable when we **remember that the federal budget in 1990 was less than half what it is today.** Did anyone really think the federal government was uncomfortably small just 14 years ago? Hardly. It once took more than 100 years for the federal budget to double, now it takes *less than a decade*. **We need to end the phony rhetoric about priorities and recognize federal spending as the runaway freight train that it is. A federal government that spends 2.4 trillion dollars in one year and consumes roughly one-third of the nation's GDP is far too large.**

Neither political party wants to address the fundamental yet unspoken issue lurking beneath any budget debate: What is the proper role for government in our society? Are these ever-growing social services and defense expenditures really proper in a free country? **We need to understand that the more government spends, the more freedom is lost.** Instead of simply debating spending levels, we ought to be

debating whether the departments, agencies, and programs funded by the budget should exist at all.

My Republican colleagues especially ought to know this. Unfortunately, however, the GOP has decided to abandon principle and pander to the entitlements crowd. But this approach will backfire, because Democrats will always offer to spend even more than Republicans. When Republicans offer to spend \$500 billion on Medicare, Democrats will offer \$600 billion. Why not? It's all funny money anyway, and it helps them get reelected.

If Republicans offer a budget that grows federal spending by 3%, while Democrats seek 6% growth, Republicans trumpet that they are the party of smaller government!

I object strenuously to the term *baseline budget*. In Washington, this means that the previous year's spending levels represent only a baseline *starting point*. Both parties accept that each new budget will spend more than the last, the only issue being how much more. If Republicans offer a budget that grows federal spending by 3%, while Democrats seek 6% growth, Republicans trumpet that they are the party of smaller government! But expanding the government slower than some would like is not the same as reducing it. Furthermore, today's budget debate further entrenches the phony concept of discretionary versus non-discretionary spending.

An increasing percentage of the annual federal budget

is categorized as *non-discretionary* entitlement spending, meaning Congress ostensibly has no choice whether to fund certain programs. In fact, **roughly two-thirds of the fiscal year 2005 budget is consumed by non-discretionary spending.** When Congress has no say over how two-thirds of the federal budget is spent, the American people effectively have no say either. Why in the world should the American people be forced to spend 1.5 trillion dollars funding programs that cannot even be reviewed at budget time? The very concept of non-discretionary spending is a big-government statist's dream, because it assumes that we as a society simply have accepted that most of the federal leviathan must be funded as a matter of course.

No program or agency should be considered sacred, and no funding should be considered inevitable.

The assertion that this budget will reduce taxes is nonsense. Budget bills do not change the tax laws one bit. Congress can pass this budget today and raise taxes tomorrow — budget and tax bills are completely separate and originate from different committees. The budget may make revenue projections based on tax cuts, but the truth is that Congress has no idea what federal revenues will be in any future year.

Similarly, the deficit reduction supposedly contained in the budget is illusory. **The federal government always spends more in future years than originally projected,** and always runs single-year deficits when one factors in raids on funds supposedly earmarked for Social Security. The notion that today's budget will impose fiscal restraint on Congress in the future is laughable — Congress will vote for new budgets every year without the slightest regard for what we do today.

My colleagues have discussed the details of this budget ad nauseam. The increases in domestic, foreign, and military spending would not be needed if Congress stopped trying to build an empire abroad and a nanny state at home. Our interventionist foreign policy and growing entitlement society will bankrupt this nation if we do not change the way we think about the proper role of the federal government.

[Dr. Paul introduced the American Justice for Americans Citizens Act (H.R. 4118) on April 1, 2002, to insure that the courts interpret the Constitution in the manner the Framers intended. The following weekly column illuminates the problem this legislation addresses.]

Ron Paul's Texas Straight Talk
April 12, 2004

Whose Justice?

Judicial activism, the practice of judges ignoring the

law and deciding cases based on their *personal political views*, has been a problem in America since well before the Supreme Court invented a right to abortion in *Roe v. Wade*. Many federal judges have become *de facto legislators* in recent decades, substituting their self-presumed wisdom for the will of Congress. **In the process, the American people have lost more and more power to influence the laws under which they must live.**

Activist federal judges often view the Constitution as an *anachronism* that stands in the way of their visions for *social justice*. They usually view European socialism very positively, and unconditionally believe in the United Nations and international law. Accordingly, activist judges increasingly are looking outside the US for guidance when deciding cases.

This latest brand of judicial activism has a name: *transjudicialism*. *Transjudicialism* means that American federal judges consider foreign and international legal sources when deciding cases, even though such sources often conflict directly with our own Constitution. **As Robert Bork explains, six of the nine Supreme Court justices have either written or joined opinions that favorably cited foreign authorities.** These justices have considered the European Court of Human Rights, various United Nations conventions, international human rights treaties, and even judicial decisions from India, Jamaica, and Zimbabwe when writing their opinions!

Simply put, these justices are making the incredible argument that American federal courts should consider sources other than U.S. law when deciding cases. In the words of one justice, the Court *cannot afford to ignore the rest of the world.*

It's not hard to see the grave danger posed by this new trend. Anti-gun judges could cite restrictions on gun ownership in other countries approvingly when disregarding our Second amendment. Hate speech laws in other nations could be used as authority to weaken the First amendment. Our wholly domestic tax, labor, environmental, and family laws could be influenced by United Nations edicts, foreign court judgments, and international treaties which have not been ratified by the United States.

The U.S. Constitution is the supreme law of the land in America. Congress needs to exercise its constitutional power over federal courts and send judges a strong message that Americans will be governed by American law only. I recently introduced legislation that forbids the Supreme Court and lower federal courts from citing any foreign or international laws, rules, policies, or court decisions as authority for their opinions.

Federal judges take an oath of office promising to decide cases in accordance with the Constitution and U.S. federal law. Those judges who insist on considering foreign law and foreign opinions should be removed from their positions for violating that oath, pure and simple. Justice Scalia warns that *Day by day, case by case, the Court is busy de-*

signing a Constitution for a country I do not recognize. Congress needs to act quickly before Mr. Scalia's fears are fully realized.

[American Justice for American Citizens Act (H.R. 4118), was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary.]

Ron Paul's Texas Straight Talk

April 5, 2004

LOST at Sea

Back in the 1970s, the United Nations launched its plan for a global program of taxation without representation called the *New International Economic Order*. The goal of this new economic order was not so new at all, however. **It sought the involuntary transfer of wealth and technology from the developed world to the third world under the direction of the United Nations.** A cornerstone of this dangerous attempt to loot the prosperous nations was the *Law of the Sea Treaty* (LOST).

Under the Law of the Sea Treaty, an *International Seabed Authority* would control the minerals and other resources of the oceans' seabed. After taking its own cut, this U.N. body would transfer whatever is left to select third-world governments and non-governmental organizations.

The Law of the Sea Treaty also would give the U.N. power to tax American citizens and businesses, which has been a long-time dream of the anti-sovereignty globalists. LOST also would establish an international court system to enforce its provisions and rulings. Imagine not being able to do business internationally without the approval of the United Nations!

It all sounds like something out of a science-fiction novel, but it is real.

Fortunately, when the treaty came before President Ronald Reagan in the 1980s, he ignored those warning of impending international chaos and refused to sign the treaty. It was the right thing to do. It appeared that the push toward global governance was — at least temporarily — halted.

But that was not the end of LOST. Determined proponents of the treaty worked to *fix* its most objectionable parts in hopes the United States would become a party. The U.N. and its supporters know that without the participation of the United States, their schemes are doomed to failure.

Satisfied with their efforts to alter the treaty in the 1990s, LOST supporters sent it to President Bill Clinton, who wasted no time signing the treaty and sending it to the Senate for ratification. Fortunately the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, then headed by Senator Jesse Helms, concluded that despite cosmetic changes the treaty remained hopelessly flawed. Senator Helms sent it back to the president in 2000

with no action.

It seemed as though this treaty would finally die. But it did not. Undeterred, LOST supporters in the State Department sent the treaty back to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 2003. This time the Committee voted unanimously — just this February — to send it to the full Senate for ratification! LOST currently sits before the Senate, available at any time for a full Senate vote on ratification. Despite President Reagan's rejection and Senator Jesse Helms' rejection, LOST therefore is still very much alive.

Together with 13 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I sent a letter last week to Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist urging him to reject this dangerous and foolish treaty. **Should the United Nations succeed in its dream of taxing American citizens when they do business abroad, how much longer will it be until they begin taxing us at home?** Just last month, in fact, U.N. bureaucrats gathered in New York to look for ways to revive their dream of imposing U.N. control and a global tax on the internet. Imagine a global policy on internet content dictated by nations such as Saudi Arabia and China - and paid for by Americans!

Let us hope that the Senate does the sensible thing and rejects LOST and any further U.N. encroachments on our sovereignty.

Ron Paul's Texas Straight Talk

May 10, 2004

Passing the Buck in Iraq

The allegations of prisoner torture by our troops in Iraq are disturbing, and clearly drastic action must be taken to ensure such conduct stops immediately. But why are we condemning a small group of low-level reservists when we do not yet know the full story?

As revolting as the pictures are, we cannot know with certainty what took place in Iraq's prisons based on a few photographs. We do not and cannot know the full story at this point, yet we jump to condemn those who have not even had the benefit of a trial. We appear to be operating on the principle of guilty until proven innocent. It seems convenient and perhaps politically expedient to blame a small group of *bad apples* for what may well turn out to be something completely different as the continuously widening investigation suggests.

Some of the soldiers in the photographs claim their superior officers and civilian contractors in charge of the interrogations forced them to pose for photos. We have heard that some soldiers put in charge of prisons in Iraq were woefully unprepared for the task at hand. We have heard they were thrown into a terribly confusing, stressful, and dangerous situation with little training and little understanding of the

rules and responsibilities. What additional stresses and psychological pressures were applied by those in charge of interrogations? We don't know. Does this excuse reprehensible behavior? Not in the slightest, but it does suggest we need to get all the facts before drawing conclusions.

It is disturbing that little mention is made of the scores of civilian contractors operating in these prisons who may have been the instigators of abuse.

Our current presence in Iraq is nothing more than a nation-building exercise, despite the justifications given before the war. Nation building is an inherently dirty and difficult task, one that our military forces are not trained to perform. Endless occupation of a dangerous and resentful nation is not part of a soldier's job description. We should condemn unequivocally any soldiers who are found guilty of torturing prisoners, but surely we must also condemn those who put those soldiers into such a rotten situation in the first place.

Members of Congress decry the fact that the administration did not inform us of these abuses and purposely kept Congress out of the information loop. Yet Congress made it clear to the administration from the very beginning that it wanted no responsibility for the war in Iraq. If Congress wanted to be kept in the loop, it should have vigorously exercised its responsibilities. This means, first and foremost, that Congress should have voted on a declaration of war as required by the Constitution. Congress, after abandoning this responsibility in October 2002, now complains it is in the dark. Who is to say the legal ambiguity created by the congressional refusal to declare war may not have contributed to the mentality that prisoners need not be treated in accordance with the Geneva Convention? Until Congress takes up its constitutional responsibilities, complaints that the administration is not sufficiently forthcoming with information ring hollow.

Congress has the power *and the obligation* to keep itself better informed. Congress should hold hearings on the torture allegations, exercising its subpoena power if necessary. Demanding that the administration investigate the matter is simply another example of Congress passing the buck. That's what got us into trouble in the first place.

MONDAY, MARCH 22, 2004

Dr. Paul introduces the Health Information Independence Act

Don't Let the FDA Block Access to Needed Health Care Information

I rise to introduce the *Health Information Independence Act*. **This Act restores the right of consumers to purchase**

the dietary supplements of their choice and receive accurate information about the health benefits of foods and dietary supplements. The Act *restricts* the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) power to impede consumers' access to truthful claims regarding the benefits of foods and dietary supplements to those cases where the FDA has evidence that a product poses a threat to safety and well-being, or that a product does not have a disclaimer informing consumers that the claims are not FDA-approved.

The procedures established by the *Health Information Independence Act* are a fair and balanced way to ensure consumers have access to truthful information about dietary supplements. Over the past decade, the American people have made it clear they do not want the federal government to interfere with their access to dietary supplements, yet the FDA continues to engage in heavy-handed attempts to restrict such access.

The FDA's *grocery-store censorship* not only violates consumers' First Amendment rights by preventing consumers from learning about the benefits of foods and dietary supplements, but the FDA's policies prevent consumers from taking easy steps to improve their own health!

If Congress is serious about respecting First Amendment rights and the people's right to improve their own health, we must remove the FDA's authority to censor non-misleading health claims, and claims that can be rendered non-misleading by the simple device of adopting a disclaimer.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to help establish an objective process that respects consumers' First Amendment rights to non-misleading information regarding the health benefits of foods and dietary supplements by cosponsoring the *Health Information Independence Act*.

[The Health Information Independence Act (H.R. 4004) was sent to the House Energy and Commerce Committee.]

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.