

Ron Paul's FREEDOM REPORT

A publication of the Foundation for Rational Economics and Education.

VOLUME 9, NO. 5 MAY 2005



WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 2005

Dr. Paul addresses the House

**Honoring Pope John Paul I –
A Consistent Pro-life Figure**

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the life and legacy of Pope John Paul II. Pope John Paul II was one of the great religious leaders of modern times, and an eloquent champion of human freedom and dignity. Unlike all-too-many misguided religious leaders, the Pope understood that liberty, both personal and economic, is a necessary condition for the flourishing of human virtue.

The Pope's commitment to human dignity, grounded in the teachings of Christ, led him to become one of the most eloquent spokesmen for the consistent ethic of life, exemplified by his struggles against abortion, war, euthanasia, and the death penalty.

Unfortunately, few in American politics today adhere to the consistent ethic of life, thus we see some who cheered the Pope's stand against the war and the death penalty while downplaying or even openly defying his teachings against abortion and euthanasia. Others who cheered the Pope's opposition to abortion and euthanasia were puzzled or hostile to his opposition to war. Many of these "pro-life supporters of war" tried to avoid facing the inherent contradictions in their position by distorting the Just War doctrine, which the Pope properly interpreted as denying sanction to the Iraq war. One prominent conservative commentator even suggested that the pope was the "enemy" of the United States.

In conclusion, I am pleased to pay tribute to Pope John Paul II. I would encourage those who wish to honor his memory to reflect on his teachings regarding war and the sanctity of life, and consider the inconsistencies in claiming to be pro-life but supporting the senseless killing of innocent people that inevitably accompanies militarism, or in claiming to be pro-peace and pro-compassion but supporting

the legal killing of the unborn.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 2005

Dr. Paul addresses the House

Hypocrisy and the Ordeal of Terri Schiavo

Clearly no one wins in the legal and political battles over the death of Terri Schiavo. Although it has been terribly politicized, a valuable debate has emerged. This debate is not about abortion or euthanasia in general, nor about death in the abstract. It's about an individual's right to life and the value of life itself. Without concern for the life of each individual, liberty is meaningless and indefensible.

This debate deals with the passive treatment of the critically and terminally ill. This type of decision is manageable most of the time without government interference, but circumstances in this case made it difficult to determine proper guardianship. The unprecedented level of government involvement, questions about which branch of government had the ultimate say, and what the explicit intent of the patient was, brought national attention to what was otherwise a family conflict.

Terri Schiavo is a unique case, and unfortunately her fate ended up in the hands of lawyers, judges, and the legislators. The media certainly did their part in disrupting her final days.

In a free society the doctor and the patient — or his or her designated spokesperson — make the decision, short of using violence, in dealing with death and dying issues. The government stays out of it.

This debate, though, shows that one life is indeed important. It is not an esoteric subject; it's a real life involved and a personal issue we can't ignore, especially in this age of Medicare, with government now responsible for most of the medical bills.

We're rapidly moving toward a time when these decisions will be based on the cost of care alone, since government pays all the bills under nationalized health care. As we defer to the state for our needs, and parental power is transferred to government, it is casually expected that government will be making more and more of these decisions. This has occurred in education, general medical care, and psychological testing. The government now can protect the so-called right of a teenager to have an abortion, sometimes paid for by the government, without notifying the parents.

Free-market medicine is not perfect, but it's the best system to sort out these difficult problems — and it did so for years. Eventually, government medicine surely will ignore the concern for a single patient as a person, and instead a computer program and cost analysis will make the determination. It will be said to be more efficient, though morally unjustified, to allow a patient to die by court order rather than permitting family and friends to assume responsibility for the cost of keeping patients alive.

There's plenty of hypocrisy to go around on both sides of this lingering and prolonged debate. In this instance we heard some very sound arguments from the left defending states' rights and family responsibility, while criticizing the federal government involvement. I'm anxious for the day when those who made these arguments join me in defending the Constitution and states' rights, especially the 9th and 10th Amendments, on many other economic and social issues. I won't hold my breath.

More importantly, where are those who rightfully condemn congressional meddling in the Schiavo case — because of federalism and separation of powers — on the issue of abortion? These same folks strongly defend *Roe vs. Wade* and the so-called constitutional right to abort healthy human fetuses at any stage. There's no hesitation to demand support of this phony right from both Congress and the federal courts. Not only do they demand federal legal protection for abortion, they insist that abortion foes be forced to fund this act that many of them equate with murder.

It's too bad that philosophic consistency and strict adherence to the Constitution are not a high priority for many Members. But perhaps this "flexibility" in administering the rule of law helps create problems such as we faced in the Schiavo ordeal.

Though the left produced some outstanding arguments for the federal government staying out of this controversy, they frequently used an analogy that could never persuade those of us who believe in a free society guided by the constraints of the Constitution. They argued that if conservatives who supported prolonging Terri's life would only spend

more money on welfare, they would demonstrate sincere concern for the right to life. This is false logic and does nothing to build the case for a local government solution to a feeding tube debate.

First, all wealth transfers depend on an authoritarian state willing to use lethal force to satisfy the politicians' notion of an unachievable fair society. Robbing Peter to pay Paul, no matter how well intentioned, can never be justified. It's theft, plain and simple, and morally wrong. Actually, welfare is anti-prosperity; so it can't be pro-life. Too often good intentions are motivated only by the good that someone believes will result from the transfer program. They never ask who must pay, who must be threatened, who must be arrested and imprisoned. They never ask whether the welfare funds taken by forcible taxation could have helped someone in a private or voluntary way.

Practically speaking, welfare rarely works. The hundreds of billions of dollars spent on the war on poverty over the last 50 years have done little to eradicate poverty. Matter-of-fact, worthwhile studies show that poverty is actually made worse by government efforts to eradicate poverty. Certainly the whole system does nothing to build self-esteem and more often than not does exactly the opposite.

My suggestion to my colleagues who did argue convincingly that Congress should not be involved in the Schiavo case, is please consider using these same arguments consistently and avoid the false accusation that if one opposes increases in welfare one is not pro-life. Being pro-liberty and pro-Constitution is in-

deed being pro-life, as well as pro-prosperity.

Conservatives on the other hand are equally inconsistent in their arguments for life. There's little hesitation by the conservative right to come to Congress to promote their moral agenda even when it's not within the jurisdiction of the federal government to do so. Take for instance the funding of faith-based charities. The process is of little concern to conservatives if their agenda is met by passing more federal laws and increasing spending. Instead of concentrating on the repeal of *Roe vs. Wade* and eliminating federal judicial authority over issues best dealt with at the state level, more federal laws are passed, which strictly speaking should not be the prerogative of the federal government.

The biggest shortcoming of the Christian Right position is its adamancy for protecting life in the very early, late, and weakened stages, while enthusiastically supporting aggressive war that results in hundreds of thousands of unnecessary deaths. While the killing of the innocent unborn represents a morally decadent society, and all life deserves an advocate, including Terri Schiavo, promoting a policy of deadly sanc-

Being pro-liberty and pro-Constitution is indeed being pro-life, as well as pro-prosperity.

tions and all-out war against a nation that committed no act of aggression against us cannot come close to being morally consistent or defensible under our Constitution.

The one issue generally ignored in the Schiavo debate is the subtle influence the cost of care for the dying had on the debate. Government-paid care clouds the issue, and it must be noted that the courts ruled out any privately paid care for Terri. It could be embarrassing in a government-run nursing home to see some patients receiving extra care from families while others are denied the same. However, as time goes on, the economics of care will play even a greater role since under socialized medicine the state makes all the decisions based on affordability. Then there will be no debate as we just witnessed in the case of Terri Schiavo.

Having practiced medicine in simpler times, agonizing problems like we just witnessed in this case did not arise. Yes, similar medical decisions were made and have been made for many, many years. But lawyers weren't involved, nor the courts nor the legislators nor any part of the government — only the patient, the patient's family, and the doctor. No one would have dreamed of making a federal case of the dying process.

A society and a government that lose respect for life help create dilemmas of this sort. Today there is little respect for life — witness the number of abortions performed each year. There is little respect for liberty — witness the rules and laws that regulate our every move. There is little respect for peace — witness our eagerness to initiate war to impose our will on others. Tragically, government financing of the elderly, out of economic necessity, will usher in an age of euthanasia.

The accountants already have calculated that if the baby-boomer generation is treated to allow maximum longevity without quality of life concerns, we're talking about \$7 trillion in additional medical costs. Economists will determine the outcome, and personal decisions will vanish. National health care, of necessity, will always conflict with personal choices.

Compounding the cost problems that will lead to government ordered euthanasia is the fact that costs always skyrocket in government-run programs. This is true whether it's a \$300 hammer for the Pentagon or an emergency room visit for a broken toe. And in addition, deficit financing, already epidemic because of our flawed philosophy of guns and butter, always leads to inflation when a country operates on a paper-money system.

Without a renewal in the moral fiber of the country and respect for the constitutional rule of law, we can expect a lot more and worse problems than we witnessed in the case of Terri Schiavo. When dying and medical care become solely commercial events, we will long for the days of debating what was best for Terri.

Hopefully, this messy debate will lead more Members to be convinced that all life is precious, that family and patient

wishes should be respected, and that government jurisprudence and financing falls far short of providing a just solution in these difficult matters.

Ron Paul's Texas Straight Talk

March 21, 2005

Where is Your Money Going?

Last week Congress spent another \$82 billion in an “emergency” supplemental appropriations bill. **There is no emergency, however: Congress simply exceeded its fiscal year budget once again and needs more money.** The 13 standard appropriations bills, which provide about \$2.4 trillion to run the federal government in 2005, are not enough to satisfy the ravenous spending appetites of Congress and the administration. Hence the so-called emergency supplemental bill, which cravenly combines troop funding with use-less foreign aid and domestic pork.

Supplemental spending bills are particularly galling because “emergency” funds are not subject to the same congressional budget rules. **This allows Congress to spend billions of dollars completely outside the stated budget, with little or no public attention.** It also underscores how meaningless government budgets really are — unlike families and businesses, the political class never has to worry about busting the budget.

Remember the optimistic claims about how the Iraq war would pay for itself? The liberated Iraqis would exploit the country's oil resources and gratefully write a check to Uncle Sam, so the story went. Yet we don't hear much about repayment from the Iraqis these days. **American taxpayers already have spent over \$200 billion in Iraq, and now Congress is digging us deeper into debt with the supplemental bill.**

Worse yet, much of the supplemental spending is exceedingly wasteful foreign aid. Consider some of these expenditures of your tax dollars:

- \$656 million for tsunami relief. As I've written before, Americans have sent hundreds of millions of dollars in private donations to tsunami victims. Why should we be taxed further? Why is flooding in Sri Lanka or Thailand more important than flooding in Wharton, Victoria, or Galveston, Texas?
- \$94 million for Sudan, another candidate for charity rather than government aid;
- \$582 million to build a new American embassy in Iraq, an outrageous sum considering that entire luxury resorts are built for less than \$500 million;
- \$76 million to build a new airport in Kuwait, one of the wealthiest countries on earth;

- Over \$500 million to address the drug trade in Afghanistan, despite clear evidence that the production of opium has grown exponentially since America began pouring billions of tax dollars into that country in 2001;
- \$200 million in economic aid for the Palestinians;
- \$150 million for Pakistan, which is run by an unelected dictator;
- \$34 million for Ukraine, where the U.S. already intervened in last year's elections using your tax dollars. Ukraine recently repaid our generosity by dumping the U.S. dollar and adopting an exchange rate that includes the Euro.

Finally, **the emergency supplemental bill enables the District of Columbia to use taxpayer funds to build a new baseball stadium.** This is perhaps the greatest insult of all in a bill that amounts to extortion cloaked in patriotic "support the troops" rhetoric.

Ron Paul's Texas Straight Talk

March 7, 2005

Tax Reform is a Shell Game

Tax reform is back in the news, brought to the political forefront by a recent meeting of the president's advisory panel on tax reform. Once again, politicians and former politicians are lamenting the complexity of our tax laws, as though their own spending measures have nothing to do with it.

But we've heard this song before. In fact, we've been promised a simpler, fairer, and better income tax system many times, most recently in 1997 and 1986 when Congress made relatively significant changes to the tax code. Yet the federal tax system remains an embarrassment, both in terms of the tax burden itself and the outrageous compliance costs engendered by its complexity.

One tax reform idea tacitly endorsed by Federal Reserve chairman Alan Greenspan calls for a national retail consumption tax to replace the existing income tax. Absent the outright repeal of the 16th Amendment, however, we cannot be sure that an income tax would not reappear at some point. **One can easily imagine popular support for retaining the income tax on the "very rich," which of course is how the 16th amendment originally was sold to a gullible public in the 1910s.**

The president has thrown cold water on the consumption tax proposal, however, by announcing he opposes any reform that eliminates mortgage and charitable deductions. This leaves us with variations on the flat tax concept, which was savaged by the political left when advocated by the likes of House Majority Leader Dick Armey and Steve Forbes in

the 1990s.

Lew Rockwell of the Ludwig von Mises Institute offers a very simple test for any tax reform proposal: *Does it reduce or eliminate an existing tax?* If not, then it amounts to nothing more than a political shell game that pits taxpayers against each other in a lobbying scramble to make sure the other guy pays. True tax reform is as simple as cutting or eliminating taxes. No studies, panels, committees, or hearings are needed. When reform proposals seem complicated, they almost certainly don't cut taxes.

The reform debate is strictly about politics and not serious economics. Both sides use demagoguery but don't propose truly significant tax reductions. Both sides use the outrageous expression "cost to government" when talking about the impact of tax legislation on revenues. This implies that government owns everything, and that any tax rate less than 100% costs government some of its rightful bounty.

Government spending is the problem! When the federal government takes \$2.5 trillion dollars out of the legitimate private economy in a single year, whether through taxes or borrowing, spending clearly is out of control. **Deficit spending creates a de facto tax hike, because deficits can be repaid only by future tax increases.** By this measure Congress and the president have raised taxes dramatically over the past few years, despite the tax-cutting rhetoric. The real issue is total spending by government, not tax reform.

Who wants a 40% flat tax? Who wants a national sales tax if it adds 35% to the retail price of everything we buy? In other words, why change the tax structure if spending stays the same? Once we accept that Congress needs \$2.5 trillion from us — and *more* each year — the only question left is from whom it will be collected. Until the federal government is held to its proper constitutionally limited functions, tax reform will remain a mirage.

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.