

UK disability benefits to residents of the United States. The Supplementary Agreement will also make a number of minor revisions in the Agreement to take account of other changes in U.S. and English law that have occurred in recent years.

The United States-United Kingdom Social Security Agreement, as amended, would continue to contain all provisions mandated by section 233 and other provisions that I deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of section 233, pursuant to section 233(c)(4) of the Act.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report prepared by the Social Security Administration explaining the key points of the Supplementary Agreement, along with a paragraph-by-paragraph explanation of the effect of the amendments on the principal agreement and the related administrative arrangement. Annexed to this report is the report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Act on the effect of the Agreement, as amended, on income and expenditures of the U.S. Social Security program and the number of individuals affected by the amended Agreement. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration have recommended the Supplementary Agreement and related documents to me.

I commend the United States-United Kingdom Social Security Agreement and related documents.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 25, 1997.

1997 NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on National Security, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the *1997 National Drug Control Strategy* to the Congress. This strategy renews our bipartisan commitment to reducing drug abuse and its destructive consequences. It reflects the combined and coordinated Federal effort that is directed by National Drug Control Policy Director Barry McCaffrey and includes every department and over 50 agencies. It enlists all State and local leaders from

across the country who must share in the responsibility to protect our children and all citizens from the scourge of illegal drugs.

In the *1996 National Drug Control Strategy*, we set forth the basis of a coherent, rational, long-term national effort to reduce illicit drug use and its consequences. Building upon that framework, the *1997 National Drug Control Strategy* adopts a 10-year national drug-control strategy that includes quantifiable measures of effectiveness. The use of a long-term strategy, with annual reports to the Congress and consistent outreach to the American people on our progress, will allow us to execute a dynamic, comprehensive plan for the Nation and will help us to achieve our goals.

We know from the past decade of Federal drug control efforts that progress in achieving our goals will not occur overnight. But our success in reducing casual drug use over the last decade demonstrates that drug abuse is not an incurable social ill. Thanks to the bipartisan efforts of the Congress and the past three administrations, combined with broad-based efforts of citizens and communities throughout the United States, we have made tremendous progress since the 1970's in reducing drug use.

Nonetheless, we are deeply concerned about the rising trend of drug use by young Americans. While overall use of drugs in the United States has fallen dramatically—by half in 15 years—adolescent drug abuse continues to rise. That is why the number one goal of our strategy is to motivate America's youth to reject illegal drugs and substance abuse.

Our strategy contains programs that will help youth to recognize the terrible risks associated with the use of illegal substances. The cornerstone of this effort will be our national media campaign that will target our youth with a consistent anti-drug message. But government cannot do this job alone. We challenge the national media and entertainment industry to join us—by renouncing the glamorization of drug abuse and realistically portraying its consequences.

All Americans must accept responsibility to teach young people that drugs are wrong, drugs are illegal, and drugs are deadly. We must renew our commitment to the drug prevention strategies that deter first-time drug use and halt the progression from alcohol and tobacco use to illicit drugs.

While we continue to teach our children the dangers of drugs, we must also increase the safety of our citizens by substantially reducing drug-related crime and violence. At the beginning of my Administration, we set out to change this country's approach to crime by putting more police officers on our streets, taking guns out of the hands of criminals and juveniles, and breaking the back of violent street gangs. We are making a difference. For the fifth year in a row serious crime in

this country has declined. This is the longest period of decline in over 25 years. But our work is far from done and we must continue to move in the right direction.

More than half of all individuals brought into the Nation's criminal justice systems have substance abuse problems. Unless we also break the cycle of drugs and violence, criminal addicts will end up back on the street, committing more crimes, and back in the criminal justice system, still hooked on drugs. The criminal justice system should reduce drug demand—not prolong or tolerate it. Our strategy implements testing and sanctions through coerced abstinence as a way to reduce the level of drug use in the population of offenders under criminal justice supervision, and thereby reduce the level of other criminal behavior.

Our strategy supports the expansion of drug-free workplaces, which have proven so successful and we will continue to seek more effective, efficient, and accessible drug treatment to ensure that we are responsive to emerging drug-abuse trends.

We must continue to shield America's air, land, and sea frontiers from the drug threat. By devoting more resources to protecting the Southwest border than ever before, we are increasing drug seizures, stopping drug smugglers, and disrupting major drug trafficking operations. We must continue our interdiction efforts, which have greatly disrupted the trafficking patterns of cocaine smugglers and have blocked the free flow of cocaine through the western Caribbean into Florida and the Southeast.

Our comprehensive effort to reduce the drug flow cannot be limited to seizing drugs as they enter the United States. We must persist in our efforts to break foreign and domestic sources of supply. We know that by working with source and transit nations, we can greatly reduce foreign supply. International criminal narcotics organizations are a threat to our national security. But if we target these networks, we can dismantle them—as we did the Cali Cartel.

We will continue to oppose all calls for the legalization of illicit drugs. Our vigilance is needed now more than ever. We will continue to ensure that all Americans have access to safe and effective medicine. However, the current drug legalization movement sends the wrong message to our children. It undermines the concerted efforts of parents, educators, businesses, elected leaders, community groups, and others to achieve a healthy, drug-free society.

I am confident that the national challenge of drug abuse can be met by extending our strategic vision into the future, educating citizens, treating addiction, and seizing the initiative in dealing with criminals who traffic not only in illegal drugs but in human misery and lost lives.

Every year drug abuse kills 14,000 Americans and costs taxpayers nearly

\$70 billion. Drug abuse fuels spouse and child abuse, property and violent crime, the incarceration of young men and women, the spread of AIDS, workplace and motor vehicle accidents, and absenteeism in the work force.

For our children's sake and the sake of this Nation, this menace must be confronted through a rational, coherent, cooperative, and long-range strategy. I ask the Congress to join me in a partnership to carry out this national strategy to reduce illegal drug use and its devastating impact on America.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 25, 1997.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO RESTORE PATENT RIGHTS TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I have submitted to Congress legislation which will restore to the American people the patent rights that have been protected by law in our country since the ratification of our Constitution.

Now, I say restore to the American people because unbeknownst to our population, and I might say unbeknownst to many Members of Congress, over these last few years our patent rights have been under attack and that attack has already greatly diminished the patent protection, the rights that our people have had in the area of intellectual property rights for their inventions, to control their products and their genius, the protection they have had since the founding of our country. This has been, already, as I say, let me repeat, greatly diminished.

To be specific, we as a people have already lost our right to a guaranteed patent term. Now, that may sound a bit innocuous, because most Americans do not know what I am talking about. A guaranteed patent term? Yes, Americans, from the founding of our country until just 2 years ago, had a right to a guaranteed term where they would control and own their inventions. Every generation of Americans has been confident that no matter how long after filing for a patent, no matter how long it took the patent to be issued, the owner of the patent, once it was issued, would have a guaranteed term of 17 years of ownership from which to benefit from his or her invention.

Now, this may seem a bit obscure, it may seem a bit innocuous in terms of why would someone be so concerned about this little part of the law? Well, American investors and American inventors have had, since our country's founding, the strongest protection of any people of the world. That counts for something. And it does not just count for the well-being of inventors and investors.

Now, some people believe the American miracle is a result of the vast resources of the United States of America. They look at our oil and our gold and our minerals and our lakes and our streams, and they look at the trees, and they look at all of the vast expanses of territory and say that must be the basis of America's well-being, of its economic strength. Well, that is not the basis of our strength. What has given us a higher standard of living and produced a country where opportunity has been unlimited compared to other countries of the world is that we produced more wealth than other societies. Thus, the wealth that we produced pushed up the standard of living of the average person and opened doors of opportunity never seen or even dreamed of before in other countries.

We produced more wealth not because we worked harder. It is almost a cliché to say that Americans work very hard. Well, I know many people around the world who work very hard, and I know many nations around the world who worked very hard throughout history and that got nowhere. Their people did not benefit or profit. It was not an uplifting of the human experience for them to work hard.

Our people worked hard but it was coupled with two things: It was coupled with freedom, which was vitally important, but it was also coupled with the fact that the United States was always on the cutting edge of technology. The work of our people was magnified over and over again by the fact that our people were using the best and the latest equipment and technology to get their job done, which made our people more productive and more competitive than the vast numbers of people and the huge multitude of populations throughout the world who worked just as hard and had just as much muscle and got up in the morning perhaps even earlier than Americans. But that their labor was not magnified by the technology that produced much more wealth per hour worked.

Our Founding Fathers believed in this. They understood it. In fact, they made sure that it was written into our Constitution. And the laws that we passed concerning the ownership of technology was based on the idea that if we encourage people to own the things that they developed, that more things would be invented here and that the lifestyle of our people would be improved by the genius of our people because people would seek to create new inventions that would build the wealth and raise the standard of living. We know that. We are very proud of that as Americans.

In fact, one of the things Americans are most proud of is the fact that we were the people who invented some of the most important inventions in the history of mankind. Samuel Morris, who invented the telegraph; Robert Fulton. These were not rich people who just managed to buy their way into some invention. They were common or-

dinary people that invented things that changed the world forever.

Thomas Edison. Here I sit under electric lights and I wonder what this body must have done before there was electricity; how we were able to function without electricity. Certainly how can we have a democracy when we do not have the radio technology or the television technology or the printing technology that permits the huge number of citizens to participate in their open government?

Alexander Graham Bell; another person who came from great adversity in order to invent something that changed the face of the planet and has magnified the amount of wealth available to the common man beyond anything that was ever believed before.

The Wright brothers. The Wrights' first flight down in North Carolina, which I recently visited. These two young men who worked in a bicycle shop, whose education was limited but whose imagination and tenacity and intelligence was superior. They pushed and they pushed, and they knew that if they had their invention, if they could conquer the secrets that would lead mankind to flight, they would own that technology for 17 years. They knew it would be their property. That is the same with all the inventors I just mentioned.

Our technology laws brought us through cold wars and hot wars, it brought us through times of great peril and it brought us through times of great development in our Nation. We were the most undeveloped nation of the world and we became an industrial power, and also a power in which economic activity was so diversified and spread throughout the population that all people of all backgrounds were able to have opportunities that were never dreamed of, as I say, in other countries.

This was a result of our laws. It did not just happen. It did not just happen. It happened because we had the strongest patent protection of any country of the world and, thus, we benefited more than any country of the world from the development of new technology and new inventions.

Well, 3 years ago, I sadly say, a plan was put into motion to change that fundamental protection that Americans enjoyed for so long. The American inventor and the American investor, who before were certain that they would have a guaranteed patent term no matter how long it took them once they had applied for the patent, no matter how long it took them to get that through the patent process after they had filed, and Alexander Graham Bell and Thomas Edison fought for decades at times to try to get their patents through, they knew at the end of that time there would be 17 years in which they would own their technology and be able to benefit from it. Thus, the investors were able to come through with the money that was necessary to do the work and the research