The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MICA addressed the House. His remarks will appear in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WE MUST CONTINUE TO PUSH FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BOB SCHAFFER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I also rise to speak on the topic of excessive taxation.

Tuesday of this week the first attempt of the 105th Congress to pass a balanced budget amendment fell short by only one pathetic vote. The failure to pass this amendment was of great disappointment not only to me and my family but to most Members of Congress and to approximately 80 percent of the American people who have repeatedly and consistently asked Congress to protect the futures of their children by the passage of a balanced budget amendment.

Now yesterday's setback is temporary, I assure you of that. We must and we will continue to push for a balanced budget amendment for the American taxpayer. But for now it is essential that we remember just whose hard-earned dollars provide for the budget, the same budget that we hope will one day be balanced. It is the retired school teacher in Cincinnati OH, small businessmen in Atlanta, GA or, closer to my home, the farmer in Lamar, CO. They are the ones who sacrifice a greater and growing portion of their strenuous effort, hard work and time away from their families in order to pay more and more cash only to be squandered here in Washington, DC, year after year after year.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we focused on strategies to allow these honest, hard-working producers to keep more of what they earn for themselves and for their families. They deserve a break from excessive and punitive taxation such as the capital gains tax and the inheritance tax. Mr. Speaker, these taxes do nothing more than betray the very characteristics that Americans stand for: accomplishment, success, honesty, opportunity, and optimism, but most especially responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, these are the core American values upon which our budget and Tax Code should be built, not the waste, duplicity, despair and stupidity that our Government heaps upon taxpayers every day.

Now, since the President and his party seem to have the upper hand in their zeal to kill a balanced budget, let us agree at least that the dead hand of capital gains taxes and the tax on inheritance be lifted from the worn backs of American families. Let us free the productive instincts of a Nation, unleash its creativity and competitiveness, restore the value of thrift, and preserve families and their businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I am just a new Member of Congress, but the people of Colorado did not send me here to make friends with the alligators. They expect me to help drain the swamp, and providing relief from capital gains taxes and death taxes are two important ways to help Americans rise above the muck and mire of oppressive taxation. On this topic I intend to be most persistent and to speak here often.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ROHRABACHER addressed the House. His remarks will appear in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TAX-FREE INTERNET ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is only fitting that I should rise now, the Representative from the home State of the alligator, to address a particular area of our economy that I would like to set aside as not eligible for taxation, and that is the Internet.

Specifically, I have filed a bill today entitled the Tax-Free Internet Act of 1997. This legislation amends the Internal Revenue Code to declare that fees for Internet access and other online services are not and shall not be subject to Federal taxation. Furthermore, the bill would prevent any Federal department from using its funds to study the revenue potential of Internet taxation. I believe that this legislation is a strong statement in support of the free and unfettered development of this industry. My bill has already been endorsed by several online services and Internet service providers.

America Online, one of the Nation's most widely used Internet-related service providers, said, and I quote, ''We commend your leadership in authoring and sponsoring the Tax-Free Internet Act of 1997. AOL strongly supports your policy efforts. Any new tax could threaten the continued growth of this global medium.''

The President of Erol's online service adds, ''This legislation is a very positive development, and I give it my full support.''

Mr. Speaker, we must not allow this budding industry to be smothered by Federal taxation. A few of the States, including my own State of Florida, have already initiated legislation to exempt the Internet and online service access fees from State and local taxes. We on the Federal level should do likewise.

As the United States Internet Providers Association says of my bill: ''We support the efforts of all informed policymakers to protect technology innovation and the growth of the industry through sound legislation. This is a step in the right direction.''

Mr. Speaker, let us here resolve not to interfere with the technological phenomenon which has done so much to inform and educate so many millions of Americans. Let us restrain the reach of government so as not to smother the vitality and creativity that characterize this new frontier in communications.

PATENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about something that really is pure Americana. It is important enough that it is noted in the U.S. Constitution. I refer to the U.S. patent which is the backbone of the United States economy, the basis for our dominant place in the world economy, and clearly the key to a more prosperous economic future. Invention is certainly pure Americana.

As I have said, by offering the strongest patent protections in the world the United States has stimulated more creativity, more new industries and tens of millions of more new jobs than anywhere else in the world throughout all of our history. Yet the small independent inventors, the future Graham Bells, the Edisons, the Henry Ford, are now having to fight tooth and nail to maintain their constitutional right to their intellectual property. It is slowly, slowly being stolen out from them by the mega corporations and foreign interests. Truly, intellectual property in the United States is under dire threat. The system we have in place may not be perfect, but at least the small independent inventor has a fighting chance against the larger multinational corporations.

A perfect illustration, Mr. Speaker, of the importance of saving our patent system is the very true story of Dr. Raymond Damadian of Long Island and the inventor of the MRI. It has taken Dr. Damadian, who is a physician at the Down State Medical Center in Brooklyn, some 25 years to uphold the patent he received back in 1970, and that is with the protections of the U.S. Constitution. In June 1970, Dr. Damadian discovered the different types of tissues taken from rats emit different signals when placed in a nuclear magnetic resonance spectrometer. Not only that, but cancerous tissues taken from the rats emit significantly different NMR signals. It immediately occurred to Dr. Damadian that if it were possible to create a large enough and powerful enough scanner to contain a human, it would be possible to detect cancer very early on.

Less than 2 years later, Dr. Damadian filed the pioneer patent application that really was the world's first MRI, a patent application that

came from Dr. Damadian right from Long Island. Two years later, back in 1974, he received that patent from the U.S. Patent Office in Washington. By July 1977, Dr. Damadian and his assistants achieved the world's first whole body human MRI image. In March 1978, Dr. Damadian formed a company called FONAR and began to develop and market MRI scanners and, within 2 years, unveiled the world's first commercial MRI scanner.

The problem Dr. Damadian encountered was not really from the U.S. Patent Office, but in fact it was a failure by them to enforce his ownership of that patent. Eleven years after Dr. Damadian unveiled the world's first commercial MRI, his patent became infringed upon by several international corporations including Johnson & Johnson, General Electric, and Hitachi. For those who do not know, I mean by infringement that Dr. Damadian's patent technology for the MRI, the intellectual property that he owned, was basically copied by these large corporations.

Well, 25 years later, after literally millions of dollars in legal expenses, Dr. Damadian has finally won his day in court. He was judged by the courts to in fact be the rightful owner of the patent for the MRI. FONAR, a Long Island corporation, could today be clearly a corporation that would have retained and employed tens of thousands of Long Islanders were it not for the 25 years of legal maneuvers that kept Dr. Damadian tied up in court.

Mr. Speaker, again I think it is important to understand that the U.S. patent is really pure Americana. It is at the heart of American ingenuity and our ability, frankly, to remain No. 1 in the global marketplace. But afoot here in the Congress is something that has been evolving over the last several years, and that is to harmonize patents, to take American ingenuity and harmonize it to the lowest common denominator.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this chance to talk about the MRI and Dr. Damadian's important contributions.

□ 1300

AMERICA MUST REENERGIZE ITSELF IN FIGHTING THE WAR AGAINST ILLEGAL DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address a matter of the greatest public concern. Illegal drug abuse is soaring in our country, and it is the most serious social problem that faces our communities, our families, and our children. We hear this from every side. It is our children themselves who are telling us this. Thirty-five percent of teenagers ages 13 through 17 identified drugs as their most serious concern.

Our law enforcement agents are telling us this as well. Thirty-one percent of the Nation's police chiefs believe that the best way to reduce violent crime is to reduce drug abuse. Drug-related activities have been identified as being at the core of the violent crimes, the property crimes, and, yes, domestic abuse which afflict our communities.

During the 1980's our Nation declared a war against drugs. I was in that battle as a Federal prosecutor. It was during that time that our families, our communities, and our law enforcement officials mobilized in a united effort to fight this war. Because of this national crusade, teenage drug abuse declined from 1985 to 1992.

Then what happened? It was then that our national commitment against this war of drugs waned. It was then that teenage drug use again started to increase, and we saw that teenage experimentation with drugs was on the incline.

Today it is my belief that we need to renew our national commitment to saving our children, to restoring the vibrancy of our inner cities, and strengthening our families. How do we do this? By reenergizing ourselves in this war on drugs. We must not retreat. It is not the time. We must not be satisfied to hide in the foxhole. It is imperative that we fight on.

It is particularly timely today that we reenergize our country because last week the administration released its report on our Nation's drug control strategy. In that report, the administration criticized the war against drugs, and said the term war against drugs was misleading. The administration preferred to adopt the language of pessimism, and say that we should more appropriately use the term cancer. To me the implication of using the word cancer in relation to our drug problems is that it implies that it is going to be with us a long time, and we simply must learn to live with it.

I believe it is a war that we must fight, and not a problem that we must learn to accept and deal with. It is the wrong message when we change the terminology. It is the wrong message to our teens, who deal in symbols and listen to the nuances of language as to whether it is a serious national problem or it is something that is acceptable in our society. It is the wrong message to send with our families, who are struggling day in and day out, and as the parent of teenagers, I understand this. They face daily the corrosive effects of drug abuse. And it is the wrong message to our law enforcement officers who daily place their lives on the line in this struggle.

In signaling a retreat from the war on drugs, we also undermine the efforts of other nations, which are looking to the United States of America for leadership. The other nations are putting the lifeblood of their leaders, in many cases, and soldiers out on the front line in an effort to stop drug production and trafficking within their own borders.

While the administration says we should not call this a war, it refused to certify certain countries for not fighting hard enough, not fighting hard enough to stop the flow of illegal drugs into America. I applaud the administration for not certifying certain countries, but our country must lead in this battle. We must not change the terminology. We must call it a war, because it is a war for our families, it is a war for our children, it is a war for our streets and our inner cities, and it is a war that we must win.

In Mexico alone, 40 drug agents were killed fighting the importation of drugs into the United States of America to satisfy the demand we see in our country. We must provide leadership to Mexico. We must provide leadership to South America. We must call it a war, because it is a war in which people's lives are being lost, not just in America, but also in other countries.

So it is my hope that this administration will reengage itself in the war against drugs, that this Congress will reenergize itself, that we will provide leadership to our American families, to our teenagers, and to set the appropriate example. I pledge that support as a Member of this body.

WE SHOULD VALUE AND CHERISH OUR NATION'S IMMIGRANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to an all too familiar debate in our country, immigration and immigrants. This is an age-old topic that has taken many different faces since the founding of this Nation. Today the immigration debate seems to be focused on mostly Latino and Asian-American immigrants, or individuals from the Caribbean or African nations, people of color.

However, I am concerned that the immigration issue is too often raised in a negative manner. Why is it that we cannot talk about immigrants without mentioning the undocumented, those who may not have complied with all of the rules and regulations? The politicizing of the immigration issues and programs like Citizenship U.S.A. made by certain groups have attempted to demonize immigrants.

I submit that certain groups have been using immigrants as a scapegoat for years. Oftentimes they have been marginalized in the great divide between black and white. As illustrated in the words of W.E.B. DuBois, he pointed out that mass immigration hurt both black and white laborers, as he foreshadowed future events by noting the Republican Party platform of 1864, which advocated increased immigration in the interests of big business:

A new flood of eager-to-work immigrant labor was brought into the country to work