

**FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL**

**VOTER VALUES SUMMIT**

**REMARKS BY  
REPRESENTATIVE RON PAUL (R-TX),  
PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE**

**FRIDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2007  
2:23 P.M.**

**WASHINGTON HILTON AND TOWERS  
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

*Transcript by:  
Federal News Service  
Washington, D.C.*

(Applause.)

REP. PAUL: Thank you. Thank you very much. It's a delight to be here. It's wonderful to see such a good crowd here today and interested in these special values that we hold dear to our heart.

I find that this campaign is awfully fascinating to me because it has for us been one of unbelievable success in the number of people that we have rallied to the campaign through the Internet and through the trips and the visits to our colleges. Our rallies are huge, they're very diverse, and we've very pleased with that. And I'm very pleased with the reception that we are getting from young people and the willingness for them to join the Republican Party. They have not been voters before, and some have dropped out and some have been Independents and some Democrats, but we have found that a lot of people are coming to join for the message that we have been delivering. The message is not complex, it's rather simple, and that is, that freedom is much better than bureaucracy and government socialism. Freedom really works. (Applause.) How do we go about achieving this goal of freedom and recognition of the importance of the individual? Well, we don't have a very tough job to figure out what to do. All we have to do is enforce and obey the Constitution. There's nothing more that's necessary. (Applause.)

I talk a lot about the principle of life and liberty and where that comes from. We all know in a group like this that our life and liberty does not come from our government, that it comes from our Creator, and that is so, so important. But not only that, Jefferson talked about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and the pursuit of happiness means to lead our lives as we choose.

In an economic sense, that means that we should have the incentives to work hard and take care of ourselves and take care of our family, but in order for that to work, I'm convinced that we have to institutionalize once again the principle that if you do work and you do earn something and you do have fruits of your labors, that they belong to you and not the government. (Applause.) If this is the case, the natural consequence of that would be that we reject the entire notion of the income tax and we repeal the 16th Amendment. (Cheers, applause.)

But to have anybody defend liberty I think it's most important that you know and understand how to defend life.

And for my time that I've spent in politics as well as medicine, I've thought this issue through rather seriously and have written even a booklet on the right-to-life issue and the importance of the unborn. And I frequently tell the story about when I was a resident, that this issue came up. It was in the 1960s, when abortions were still illegal, but my professor was doing abortions and permitting abortions to defy the law. And I accidentally walked into a room where they were doing an abortion, and they delivered a two-pound fetus, an infant that was breathing and crying. And they took this baby and put it over in a basket in the corner, and they waited, pretended they didn't hear it and let it die.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh.

REP. PAUL: That is an outrage.

And unfortunately, since that time, our Supreme Court has institutionalized that, and that is why I think one of the most despicable of all court rulings has been the Roe versus Wade, and that should be our goal, is to repeal Roe versus Wade. (Cheers, applause.)

Now, there's a couple of ways that that can be done. Of course, we could wait until we have our Supreme Court justices appointed for them to, when the time comes, to rehear a case like that and rule differently; that's taking a long time. We've been living with Roe versus Wade since 1973, and it hasn't happened.

My approach -- I certainly support that, but my approach is a little bit more direct, and it could happen much quicker, and that is accepting the principle that we can, as a legislative body and as a president -- we can remove the jurisdiction of this issue from the federal courts. (Applause.)

I have a bill called the We the People Act, and this addresses several subjects -- prayer in school, the marriage issue as well as the abortion issue -- which literally just takes it away from the federal courts, which means any state could pass a law passing a prohibition that could not be heard in the federal courts.

Now, the question I have and something I don't have the answer for is I wonder why we haven't done better with this approach in Washington. I don't get the support that I think we should have. We haven't had the support in the Congress. We had the majority for a good many years, we've had a pro-life president, but we have not moved in that direction, and we say, "Oh, yeah, I'm going to appoint judges, and we'll take care of that." This would go into effect immediately, and it occurs only with majority vote of the Congress.

So don't give up on that method. Make sure that when you're promoting your issues and promoting the cause of life, that you remember that principle. It can be found in my bill called We The People's Act.

One area that I've spent a lot of time working on throughout the many years in Congress, as well as my first tour or second tour, has been that issue of national sovereignty. I am very determined that sovereignty of this nation is very important to protect. And unfortunately, in my lifetime I have seen it just disappearing before my eyes. When you think about what's happened since World War II, we've joined the U.N. after World War II, we have a WTO, we have an IMF, a World Bank, we now have NAFTA and CAFTA, and now we're working on a North American Union. I don't believe we should be in any of those organizations, including the United Nations. (Applause.)

We have been reluctant -- at least too many of our leaders in Washington on both sides of the aisle have been too reluctant to enforce our borders. And yet the people want the borders enforced,

the members of Congress say they want it enforced, and yet we're working on this elimination of our borders with a North American Union, the introduction of an Amero currency, and it never seems to stop.

Now, my approach to this problem and dealing with illegal aliens -- we all want to stop the illegals coming in. We all know we need more border guards. But -- for instance, I don't like border guards from our country being sent over to Iraq. They don't need to be in Iraq. They need to be here, protecting our borders. (Applause.)

But I believe you have to eliminate the incentives for illegal aliens. Automatic birthright citizenship or amnesty; no wonder they come and bring their families. Then what happens? We have federal mandates on the states to give free medical care and free education at the same time we force bilingualism on our districts.

We have hospitals in Texas going bankrupt and going out of business because of these mandates. I say we eliminate all the economic benefits and all these incentives for people to be subsidized to come over here: no food stamps and no Social Security and no mandates to get free medical care and free education. (Cheers, applause.)

Most of you here probably know that I have had a different position on the war and foreign policy. My foreign policy is that of the Founding Fathers. The Founding Fathers said that we should mind our own business; not get involved in the internal affairs of other nations; don't get into nation-building; don't police the world because it wasn't good for us. It hurts our national defense, and I've maintained that. It's not that I'm against war per se; I'm against unnecessary undeclared wars. If this country needs to go to war, it should be done in the proper constitutional manner. We should go to the Congress, Congress should declare the war, and we should fight the war and get it over with, but not get into war to enforce U.N. resolutions like we have done too many times. (Applause.)

But our foreign policy is something that we won't be able to afford. We can't afford our entitlement policies, and we can't afford our foreign policy. We are in now 130 countries around the world. We have 750 bases around the world, and it's costing us a lot of money. Our national debt is going up \$500 billion per year, and we can't afford it. How do we get away with it? Well, it's been sort of a gift to us that we're getting away from it -- away with it, but it's coming to an end. We taxed to the hilt; we can't tax anymore. Then we borrowed to the hilt. We can't run our foreign policy or our domestic spending policies without borrowing from China. This is a failed policy, and it's going to collapse.

And all you have to do is go out and -- even today, look at the financial news, and look at what's happening to the dollar. That is a bad sign. And this is what has happened historically throughout hundreds, if not thousands, of years of history; is that countries that overdo things, overseize and they overdo things at home -- it used to be called bread and circuses and guns and butter -- eventually the money is destroyed. The Soviet system came down not because we beat them in a hot war; they defeated themselves because they had an economic system that failed.

We have an economic system that is very friable, and it cannot last because it's based on deficit financing, borrowed money and printing press money. The biblical admonition of fair weights and measures was worked into our Constitution when the Founding Fathers said: Nothing but gold and silver should be legal tender, there should be no central bank, and you can't create money out of thin air. (Applause.)

The great danger of overspending is that of a runaway currency and a devaluation of the dollar. And because that is coming, we can anticipate that we are in for a lot more economic problems before us. At the same time that we do all this and we run into troubles, whether it's troubles overseas, the threat of terrorism or whatever, these are the conditions that have been set up so often through history when we lack our concern about our personal liberties. And we do not have to sacrifice liberty. The argument is that oh, now, because we're threatened, that we have to be under these concern; we have to give up so much freedom in order to be safe and secure.

You know, Benjamin Franklin was explicit, and I think he was absolutely right. If you do that, if you give up personal liberties for more safety, you end up with nothing, neither one. There's no reason ever to give up personal liberty in order to be safe and secure.

This is like saying, you know, we have an emergency down in New Orleans. Oh, well, we need safety down in New Orleans and we need to make sure that we take care of it. We're going to rely on central economic planning in Washington. We'll appropriate \$50 billion.

And where did the \$50 billion go? It went down a rat hole. I mean, they bought trailers that were left out in the weather and not used. They passed out money to people who didn't even exist. Central economic planning doesn't work.

But what else did they do? Because of the concern and the fright of this emergency, the federal government came in and took away the guns from the property-owners and kept the property-owners from going in and protecting their property. So once we become so fearful that the government will take care of us, it's too easy to give up our liberties.

This is what's been going on, and we've been good as conservatives condemning the liberals who say, well, somebody might fall through the cracks, so therefore we have to sacrifice economic liberty; we have to concede to have this excessive taxation and these deficits and the inflation. But it doesn't work. Eventually the country goes bankrupt. This is what we're facing today. We're on the verge of a bankruptcy.

The other night when we had a debate, the questioners introduced a question by saying that 70 percent of the American people believe we're either in recession or going into recession. And to put our heads in the sand and say, oh, that's not true; everything is okay, I think, will hurt us as a political party. It will not help us solve our problems whatsoever. And if we do the right thing and recognize these problems, the answers are not that difficult. All we have to do is live within the bounds of the Constitution.

Now, there will be disagreements on many issues. For instance, the issue of education: I take the position that most Republicans took for a long time. They're not so adamant anymore. But I don't even think we should have a Department of Education, period. (Cheers, applause.)

But if we are going to have a Department of Education, if we are going to have the federal government involved, we should never do it by just ignoring the Constitution.

No, the Constitution deserves to be changes -- deserves to be modified, but it was meant to be slow and tedious. And when it's necessary, we should do that. But just to ignore it -- and that is what's happening, whether it's with the declaration of war, taking over medical care, taking over the educational system. What is left? What is left to our First Amendment? What are we saying about it today that our ministers can't even say certain things in the pulpit? Where's the First Amendment? They have no right to come down on our ministers. (Applause.)

There's been a movement in Washington for several years now that I have fought -- and many of you in this audience, I'm sure, have tried to help me -- and I thought I was making progress, but unfortunately, we did not win this issue. Several years ago, they introduced this notion that we will have mandatory mental health testing of every single child in public school. I condemn that. We should not permit that. (Applause.) We now today have over 2 million kids under -- taking these psychotropic drugs. I'm a physician. I understand some of the problems. I also am sympathetic that -- I've known some children that have been helped.

But when the government gets in the medical business, mandating inoculations, preventing you from alternative health care and taking your nutritional items and putting those into the hands of the drug companies, or mental health testing which ends up putting more kids on these drugs, there's something wrong with that. And the principle is unsound. The principle that has been violated -- that we as a people have permitted our government to become the parents. The parents are in charge of the children, not the government. (Applause.)

I strongly endorse the notion of personal liberty. That is what our government and our country and our Constitution is all about. I am also one of great confidence that if we were left alone, that we have responsibility for ourselves -- both personally, what we study and read and our religious values, as well as what we put into our bodies -- that we would act more responsibly than the federal government and the bureaucrats. But I'm also convinced that they don't know what to do, and they don't know how to run our lives, they don't know how to run the economy, and I don't believe they know how to run the world, either.

So if we do this, we will have a much better society. Sure, some people are going to make mistakes. Sure, some people, even though they think they're self-reliant, might not take care of themselves as well as they should. But in freedom -- freedom assumes responsibility for one's own actions, whether it's in the material sense or in the spiritual sense. We're all responsible for our action; to assume otherwise means that we concede way too much to the government.

Now, if we want to be humanitarians, we have to argue we're for freedom and liberty and the marketplace and sound money and no eminent domain and all these issues which are dear to us. If we could argue that case, then we become the humanitarians. Because if you look at economic

history, the only way famine was ended, the only way that poverty was ended was with capitalism and freedom and property rights. And how come we have lost this fight? How come so often we, as conservatives and Republicans, have conceded to the Democrats and have gone along with their entitlement system? Because they're -- we're fighting to say, "Oh, you lack compassion and you don't care, and therefore we -- if you vote against the prescription programs, if you vote against SCHIP, therefore you don't care about the children."

Well, if you truly care about the children, if you truly care about and be compassionate about the well-being of everybody and then putting the responsibility on each and every one of us as individuals and believe in the family and responsibility of the parent, then we argue the case for freedom and free markets and sound money, and we stick to the Constitution, and we don't rely and say, "Well, there will be a few that will be needed." The truth is when you have free markets and sound money, there's a greater amount of prosperity.

I started medicine when we didn't have the government involved. Medical care was a lot cheaper and the government wasn't involved. I worked in church hospitals -- nobody was ever turned away. Today, no charity hospitals, very often anymore -- and everybody gets charged the maximum. Medical care is in shambles because the corporations have taken over, and now the alternative -- it looks like the government's taking over.

We have to look at each and every one of these problems and say, "Let freedom take over, let the individuals assume responsibility. We can do it; all we have to do is believe in America, believe in freedom and believe in the Constitution."

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

(END)