

unlike the Law, it is what anyone says it is on any given day. We need only to move back a few years, or travel a few thousand miles, and one is certain to find an entirely different definition of social justice. At the end of the day, it is nothing more than an empty slogan, to be filled by power-hungry political activists so as to enlist the participation of well-intentioned people.

The Rule of Law and a world according to "Social Justice" are mutually exclusive. One cannot have it both ways.

What have the Rule of Law and the pursuit of "social justice" respectively spawned over time? The Rule of Law gave birth to a series of individual rights. In other words, rights vested solely in individuals. Only individuals are capable of having rights, just as only individuals can be free. We say a society is free if the individuals who make up that society are free. For individuals to be free, they must have certain unalienable rights, and others upon which they had agreed with one another.

Social justice has spawned an aberration called group rights. Group rights are the negation of individual rights. Group rights say in effect, "you cannot and do not have rights as an individual—only as the member of a certain group." The Rule of Law knows nothing about groups, therefore it could not provide for, or legitimize rights of groups. Groups have no standing in the eyes of the Law. And, since their so-called rights are invariably created and conferred by persons of temporary authority, they are "subject to change without notice," as the saying goes, just like the definition of social justice itself.

Individual rights recognize and promote similarity. Group rights promote differences and stereotypes. Individual rights and group rights are mutually exclusive. One cannot have it both ways.

Among our individual rights, the right to acquire and hold property has a special place. If ever a concept came to be developed to protect the weak against the strong, to balance inborn gifts with the fruits of sheer diligence and industry, property inviolate is its name. But who am I to speak, after John Locke, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison have pronounced on this topic. They held that civilized society is predicated upon the sanctity of private property, and that to guarantee it is government's primary function. Without absolute property there is no incentive. Without absolute property there is no security. Without absolute property there is no liberty. The freedom to enter into contract, the freedom to keep what is mine, the freedom to dispose of what is mine underlies all our liberties.

Neither the search for "social justice" nor so-called group rights recognize, or respect, private property. They look upon flesh-and-blood individuals as faceless members of a multitude who, together, create a certain amount of goods. These goods belong to what they call "The Community." Then certain people decide who needs what and, being privy to some higher wisdom, distribute—actually redistribute—the goods. Redistribution is pursuant to group rights expressed in something called entitlement. Entitlements are based neither on law nor on accomplishment. Entitlements are based on membership in a certain group, and we have seen that groups are designated by persons of temporary authority, rather than the law.

The right to property and entitlements through redistribution are mutually exclusive. One cannot have it both ways.

We have been ordered by the prophets of social justice to replace our national identity with something they call "multi-culturalism." I will confess that some time in the past, I might have shared the allergic

reaction some of you experience in the face of "national" and "identity." But then I noticed the enormous importance the social-justice crowd attaches to the destruction of the American identity. Just think: bi-lingual education and multi-lingual ballots. Removal of the founding documents from our schools. Anti-American history standards. Exiling the Ten Commandments. Replacing American competence with generic "self-esteem." Replacing voluntarism with coercion. Encouraging vast numbers of new immigrants to ignore the very reasons which brought them here in the first place. The list goes on, and sooner or later will affect national defense, if it hasn't already.

And for those who would point to Yugoslavia as proof of the tragedy nationalism can cause, let me say that a healthy national identity is utterly distinct from nationalism. Like the United States, Yugoslavia was created. But unlike in the case of the United States, ingredients for a national identity were not provided, and Yugoslavia imploded at the first opportunity precisely for that reason. Had it not done so, it would have succumbed to the first external attack, for no Croat would lay down his life for the good of Serbs or Bosnians. Will Americans lay down their lives if America is nothing but a patchwork of countless group identities?

Will the Armed Forces of the United States fight to uphold, defend, and advance the cause of Multi-Culturalism?

This is not a frivolous question.

The questions before us are serious, and legion. We are virtually drowning in what we call "issues," and they are becoming increasingly difficult to sort out. How do we find our position? And, once we find our position, how do we argue its merit? Above all, how do we avoid the plague of serious matters turning into bogus soap operas?

We asked you to hear me today, because the Center for the American Founding has a proposal to submit. We call it "Four Points of the Compass" because these points provide direction, because—in a manner of speaking—they constitute a re-calibration of our compass which the events of the past thirty years have distorted. They are the Rule of Law, Individual Rights, the Sanctity of Property, and the sense of National Identity. As you have seen, they are interconnected, they literally flow from one another, just as the false compass-points which have come to displace them—social justice, group rights, redistribution and multi-culturalism—are interconnected and flow from one another. What is multi-culturalism if not a redistribution of cultural "goods"? What is redistribution if not a group right? What is a group right if not the implementation of some political activist's version of "social justice"?

For thirty years, we have acquiesced in a steady erosion of America's founding principles. The time has come to reverse the movement. Rather than contending with countless individual issues, all we need to do is take the debate down a few notches, closer to the core. Let me repeat: we need to take the debate down a few notches, close to the core. We submit that all future policy and legislative initiatives be tested against the four points of the compass. Does the proposed bill negate the Rule of Law? Does it violate individual rights? Does it interfere with the sanctity of Property? Does it constitute an assault on National Identity? Only if the answer is "No" in each case, would the proposal proceed. In other words:

Only if the answers are NO is the bill a GO.

A few items need tidying up. How do we know what the Rule of Law can accommodate, and how far do we take individual rights? The answer, in both cases, comes from Article VI of the Constitution. "This

Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby * * *" It is as uncomplicated as that.

In the coming months, we intend to approach the citizens of this great nation and their representatives at all levels with a call to consider adopting this approach. We will hold panel discussions and town meetings so as to invite, engage and incorporate the wisdom and experience of Americans everywhere. There will be retreats and, by year's end, there will be a book with all the details. We do not underrate the magnitude of the step we are proposing, but we honestly believe that it will make life a great deal easier. With a simple stroke, it will become clear that one cannot take an oath upon the Constitution and support group rights. One cannot take an oath upon the Constitution and support the confiscation of property without compensation. One cannot take an oath upon the Constitution and support measures which are clearly at odds with the mandate for national defense.

We cannot have it both ways. We have to choose our compass and remember the four points. They are, as we have seen, inseparable. Therefore: Only if the answers are NO is the bill a GO.

I do not believe that last November the people of this country voted for the lukewarm bath of bi-partisanship. I believe the people of this country said: If you don't give us a real choice, we won't give you a real election. Yes, people probably have grown tired of the "issues," but they are, I am certain, eager to partake in an effort to choose either a return to our original path, or a clean and honest break with the past.

Those who feel that the time has come to change the supreme law of the land should come forward, say so, and engage in an open debate. But let us not continue a pattern of self-delusion. We are heirs to a remarkable group of men who, two hundred plus years ago, had every reason to feel similarly overwhelmed by the number of decisions they had to make. Their response was to make very few laws, for they knew that the fewer the laws, the broader the agreement. They knew people find it hard to agree on everything. So they sought agreement on core principles they held to be non-negotiable.

Today, we propose the four that ought to be non-negotiable. They are, as we have seen, inseparable. We call them the four points of the compass. Together, they can and will restore America's sense of direction.

HONORING MORRIS TISCHLER

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely fitting that in honor of Valentine's Day tomorrow I rise to honor the work and outstanding record of achievement of Morris Tischler. As the inventor of the cardiac pacemaker, Mr. Tischler has done more than any other individual to keep the human heart ticking throughout the world.

Morris Tischler, who we are fortunate to have as a resident of the great city of Baltimore, has made medical history. In addition to his pioneering work in developing the pacemaker, he has been instrumental in designing instrumentation for heart surgery, monitoring systems, a nerve stimulator, a blood analyzing monitor, among other innovations.

As a teacher, consultant innovator, inventor, and businessman, Mr. Tischler has charted new territory in the field of medical electronics. In his desire to save lives, he has been generous in sharing his knowledge and expertise with the medical community around the world through lectures and visits.

Born in Newark, NJ, Mr. Tischler attended the Johns Hopkins University and graduated from the University of Maryland. An outgrowth of his research at Johns Hopkins University and the University of Maryland has been his pioneering work in science education. He has used his talents to develop and design educational materials and training programs that have been used in teaching science and electronics in elementary and secondary schools, colleges, universities, and technical schools. He has succeeded in his goal of simplifying very complex systems as an aid to teaching.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Morris Tischler, a true Renaissance Man, on his outstanding career as inventor, teacher, innovator. His energy and creativity have made medical history and helped save millions of lives around the world. His contribution to the field of medical science has set an example of dedication and caring that is hard to match.

THE NATIONAL PARKS CHECKOFF ACT

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced the National Parks Checkoff Act today.

The National Parks Checkoff Act will amend the Internal Revenue Code to require the IRS to place a line on income tax forms which will allow taxpayers to donate one or more dollars toward the care of our national parks. This legislation will provide more money for the care of our national parks at no cost to the Federal Government.

I introduced this bill during the 104th Congress, and I heard from a number of people and organizations from around the country who supported this legislation.

In addition, this bill had bipartisan support and it was also backed by the National Parks and Conservation Association, the American Hiking Society, the National Tour Association, American Outdoors and other organizations.

A study released by the National Parks and Conservation Association indicated that nearly 8 out every 10 people surveyed would be willing to increase their tax contribution by \$1 to benefit the National Park System.

A similar checkoff for Presidential campaigns has raised over \$200 million in the last 3 years. I believe that our national parks are far more popular than Presidential campaigns. Therefore, I think we could raise hundreds of millions of dollars for our national parks through this type of checkoff on income tax forms.

I believe there is at least one easy choice that can be made which will provide our parks with additional funding—the choice to allow taxpayers the opportunity to donate money for the care of our national parks.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation which will help us improve the quality of our national parks.

TRIBUTE TO LYDIA MALDONADO DIAZ

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce my colleagues to Lydia Maldonado Diaz. Ms. Diaz reflects the type of community commitment and civic duty that our society desperately needs.

After residing in New York City for 32 years, she and her husband moved to the community of Cypress Hills, Brooklyn, where she was confronted with a host of illegal activities. Lydia joined the local block association and began to make a difference.

Today, Lydia is actively involved in the Community Coalition to Restructure P.S. 76, an abandoned school building on her block, and she has presided as the chairman of that organization.

For 24 years she worked for the Cornell University Cooperative Extension as a community educator; a position from which she retired in April 1995. Throughout her personal and professional pursuits, Lydia has been guided by her strong spiritual convictions. She is the proud mother of four adult children, and the grandmother of six. I am pleased to recognize her positive contributions to the Brooklyn community of Cypress Hills.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CHILD PASSENGER PROTECTION ACT

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Child Passenger Protection Act which would prevent injuries to children in motor vehicles and ultimately save lives through improved child passenger education safety programs. This bill would provide grants to experienced child passenger safety organizations to carry out effective child restraint education programs.

With more than 50 different kinds of child restraint designs and numerous seat belt configurations, putting children in properly-used safety seats can be a complex process. As a result, over half of parents who are conscientious and careful enough to use child restraints are unaware that they have made installation errors, putting their young children at risk.

So many combinations of seats and car models exist that parents cannot easily figure out what is safe. A seat that works well in one car may not work well in another. Consequently, too many children riding in child restraint seats are at risk.

I have been working on initiatives to educate families across the country about the safety seat incompatibility problem. I have been working with the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA) in getting the word out about the proper installation of safety seats to parents, grandparents, and anyone who transports a young child. One of my goals is to provide NHTSA with enough money to fully carry out its child passenger safety program.

I also have been working with the D.A.N.A. (Drivers' Appeal for National Awareness) foundation and its founder, Mr. Joseph Colella. D.A.N.A. was "established in memory of Dana Hutchinson, age 3, who died in an automobile accident while secured in a child safety seat."

It was a rainy day in the fall of 1994 when Dana's mother strapped her into her child-safety seat for a trip to her grandmother's house. As always, Dana's father checked to make sure that the seat was held tightly, sure that he was doing everything possible to keep his little girl safe.

Dana's mother was driving; the roads were slick and slippery. Their car collided with a pick-up truck. Dana's car seat pitched forward and her head struck the dashboard. The police report stated an opinion that her child safety restraint was improperly secured.

Dana's father, looking for an answer, called his local dealership and was told that everything he did was correct. Then he looked in his owner's manual. After pages of information he found the answer: the seatbelt system in their car was incompatible with their child safety seat.

Joe Colella is Dana's uncle, and it is through his tireless work and the establishment of the D.A.N.A. foundation that efforts are being made to alert the public about the compatibility and misuse problems that exist between child restraints and vehicle seat belt systems.

I am pleased to introduce the Child Passenger Protection Act, which I call "Dana's bill," and I am committed to continue working with Joe Colella and with NHTSA to encourage parents to properly use child restraints to protect our Nation's children.

ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

HON. JOHN W. OLVER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1997

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to honor the 50th anniversary of Americans for Democratic Action.

Fifty years ago, just after the end of the Second World War, Eleanor Roosevelt gathered with some of America's top leaders and thinkers to discuss the state of liberty, equality, and opportunity in America. From that meeting, Americans for Democratic Action—or ADA—was born.

Some people may not be aware of ADA. They may not be able to recall the succession of ADA's leaders. But every American has seen the results of dedicated ADA work.

In 1948—less than a year after it was founded—ADA was instrumental in including a civil rights plank in the 1948 National Democratic Party platform.

At that 1948 convention, then Minneapolis Mayor Hubert Humphrey and later a distinguished U.S. Senator and Vice President—an ADA founder and vice chairman—called for "the Democratic Party to get out of the shadows of States' rights and walk forthrightly into the bright sunshine of human rights."

While we are still walking toward that bright sunshine of human rights, we are all safe in the knowledge that it was the 1948 Democratic platform—and the work of ADA—that