

want a bipartisan remedy turn a deaf ear, Madam Speaker, I think particularly to the latest effort to help us save and strengthen Medicare: to a bipartisan Commission, with noteworthy Americans from coast-to-coast, and in particular representatives of both parties, the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. BREAU, and my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), who took a long, hard look at Medicare, especially in the wake of the courageous steps this Congress took in the face of withering propaganda which the press accurately described as Medicare, intent on scaring our seniors and obscuring the choices, and yet, despite that, we came back, we saved Medicare, and yet we want to strengthen it in additional ways.

How interesting it was, Madam Speaker, to observe the labors of that bipartisan commission, and how wonderful it was to see Senator BREAU and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) truly fashion a bipartisan solution. How sad it is to report, Madam Speaker, the unfortunate efforts of some to avoid a solution, to avoid helping the neediest seniors, and instead, attempt to invent an issue.

Madam Speaker, in a few short days a Star Wars prequel will be released, it may already have been in the theaters, with wonderful flights of fantasy and fiction, but Madam Speaker, we have not a prequel but a sequel about to be unfurled, Medicare II.

Because in the wake of the bipartisan solution that Senator BREAU, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), and others from both sides of the aisle fashioned, the word went out from the White House: A supermajority of 11 members of this Commission had to vote to approve the Commission's recommendations to take those good ideas and move them into the realm of sound public policy.

Sadly, Madam Speaker, the word went out from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, from our president, that by actually embracing the bipartisan solution, some in this Chamber of the liberal persuasion would be deprived of an issue, an issue to drive a wedge among Americans, an issue to again scare seniors.

Thus, Medicare II took flight, because 10 members of the Commission voted for this commonsense solution to help the neediest seniors, but the presidential appointees from this body refused to vote for the program.

How ironic it was, Madam Speaker, that our president, one who has come to this Chamber again and again and offered words of reconciliation and the term "bipartisanship," how sad it is that he sent those instructions, and how unfortunate it is that our president, the afternoon the Medicare Commission's recommendations were voted down, had the audacity to appear on television and say again, we have to solve the Medicare question in a bipartisan way.

Madam Speaker, we spoke yesterday of teachers, and our first teachers are our parents. A fundamental lesson most Americans learn is that we should do what we say, live up to our words, and mean what we say.

How unfortunate it is that our president continues to be engulfed not in a credibility gap, but sadly, in a credibility canyon, where his words and his deeds, whether personal, political, or in terms of policy, fail to reconcile with his actions; the latest example, of course, being this Medicare II.

And I appreciate the words of my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas. But let me also say that we should really work in a bipartisan fashion. I would welcome my friends on the left to truly embrace a bipartisan solution.

But as we have heard from pundits in this town and nationwide, some folks here are not interested in solving problems. Some folks here do not want to embrace a solution that would strengthen Medicare and save social security. Some folks would rather have an issue that they believe can hang like a sword of Damocles over the commonsense, conservative majority.

Madam Speaker, we all confront many challenges in Washington, and we are thankful for the give and take on this floor. But Madam Speaker, to those who would embrace the cynical politics of overpromising and failing to truly live up to their mission, I believe history will render a harsh verdict.

I believe the very people they claim to want to help are the people who will suffer the most. We will hear more Orwellian speeches from the left in the days to come. How mindful it is of George Orwell's novel 1984, and the phrase, "Ignorance is strength."

I do not believe that is true. I believe the facts will reign, and I look forward to working in a truly bipartisan fashion to save Medicare and help our neediest seniors.

#### PROCEED WITH CAUTION BEFORE BANNING SCIENTIFIC TIES WITH INDIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to draw my colleagues' attention to legislation that has been introduced in the other body that could have the potentially destructive effects of cutting off important exchanges between American scientists and their counterparts from other countries.

The legislation in question, offered by Senator SHELBY, would impose a moratorium on visiting scientists from so-called sensitive countries in American nuclear labs. The Senator's proposal comes on the heels of recent reports of compromises to our national security with regard to the Peoples' Republic of China.

While I agree that Chinese espionage activities should cause us to be more

vigilant with regard to that country, I am concerned that this proposed legislation casts a wide net and would give too much discretion to officials at the Department of Energy. The result could be a cutting off of positive scientific exchanges that do not affect our national security, depriving all of us of valuable knowledge and disrupting the types of scientific contacts that actually promote security and cooperation.

One country, Madam Speaker, that could be affected by this legislation is India. While the Senate legislation does not mention any countries by name, a recent report in the newspaper India Abroad quotes an Energy Department official that the list of seven sensitive countries includes, in addition to China and Russia, India and Pakistan.

The official indicated that different criteria were used for putting countries on the list, and that India and Pakistan were included because they are not signatories to the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty.

Madam Speaker, I, too, am deeply concerned about the persistent pattern of China's theft of our nuclear secrets. I have come to this floor on several occasions to call for more safeguards against Chinese espionage, as well as to focus more attention on China's documented actions with regard to nuclear proliferation, which include providing nuclear and missile technology to unstable countries like Pakistan.

But in the case of India, we clearly do not have the facts to support the conclusion that India is involved in the same types of activities as China. Thus, I would urge Members of the Senate and the House, as well as the administration, not to jump to any conclusions about India without the facts.

What we know, Madam Speaker, is that U.S.-India relations have suffered in the past year because of the nuclear tests conducted by India last May. But one key fact that is often overlooked is that India's nuclear program is essentially indigenous, developed by India's own scientists.

Export controls on supercomputers and other dual use technology have been in effect against India for years, forcing India to develop its own highly advanced R&D infrastructure.

Another very important point, Madam Speaker, is that India has kept its nuclear technology to itself, out of the hands of rogue regimes and international sponsors of terrorism. This is in marked contrast to China, which has not only stolen our technology, but has shared very sensitive information with unstable countries in Asia and the Middle East.

Madam Speaker, I fully agree that we need to be more wary of China. This is an authoritarian country, a one-party state, the Communist party, with a terrible record on human rights and a record of intimidation and aggression against its neighbors.

Indeed, Madam Speaker, some of India's recent actions, including the nuclear tests and the test-firing of the

Agni intermediate-range missile, which have caused diplomatic problems with the U.S., have to be seen in the context of China. India shares a long border with China, the two countries have fought a border war started by China, and India is directly threatened by China's provision of weapons technology to Pakistan.

The bottom line, Madam Speaker, is that India is not China. India is a democracy with multiple political parties. So we need to be careful before we go on a witch hunt against countries, particularly India, which do not pose the same type of security risk posed by China.

The legislation introduced in the Senate is too open-ended, in my mind, allowing the Department of Energy overly broad discretion. At a time when there is an emerging bipartisan consensus that we should lift the sanctions that have been imposed on India, this legislation could end up imposing another punitive sanction that will further set back our relations, to the detriment, in my opinion, of both countries.

The question, should we protect our sensitive nuclear secrets from potentially hostile countries, like China, that have already been shown to have stolen those secrets, I think the answer is absolutely yes, Madam Speaker. But let us not cut off cooperation and scientific exchanges with countries, like India, that have not been stealing our secrets and which could be partners for a more stable and secure world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEMINT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HILL of Montana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SANCHEZ addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. SCHAFFER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BRADY of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1945

#### KOSOVO WAR IS ILLEGAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. NORTHUP). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, it is time to stop the bombing. NATO's war against Serbia left the Congress and the American people in a quandary, and no wonder. The official excuse for NATO's bombing war is that Milosevic would not sign a treaty drawn up by NATO, which would have taken Kosovo away from the Serbs after the KLA demanded independence from Serbia.

This war is immoral because Serbia did not commit aggression against us. We were not attacked and there has been no threat to our national security. This war is illegal. It is undeclared. There has been no congressional authorization and no money has been appropriated for it. The war is pursued by the U.S. under NATO's terms, yet it is illegal even according to NATO's treaty as well as the U.N. charter. The internationalists do not even follow their own laws and do not care about the U.S. Constitution.

The humanitarian excuse for the war is suspect. Economic interests are involved, as they so often are in most armed conflicts. NATO's vaguely stated goals have not been achieved. For the most part, the opposite has. Let me give my colleagues a few examples.

Number one. Milosevic is now more powerful than ever; the Serb's more unified.

Number two. Russia is now alienated from the west. Their hold on a nuclear arsenal is ignored. Along with Russia's economic desperation and political instability, NATO is pushing Russia into a new alliance against the west.

Number three. Innocent Serbs and Albanian citizens are routinely being killed by our bombs.

Number four. Civilian targets are deliberately hit, including water, power and sewer plants, fuel storage and TV stations.

Number five. An economic embargo is now being instituted to starve children and prevent medications from reaching the sick, just as we have been doing for a decade against Iraq.

Number six. This war institutionalizes foreign control over our troops. Tony Blair now tells Bill Clinton how to fight a NATO war, while the U.S. taxpayers pay for it.

Number seven. Greater instability in the region has resulted.

Number eight. We are once again supporting Osama bin Laden and his friends in the KLA.

Number nine. We have bombed Bulgaria. By mistake, of course. Sorry.

Number ten. Our weapons are being depleted, our troops spread too thin, resulting in further undermining of our national defense.

Number eleven. Billions of dollars are thrown down a rat hole and Congress is about to vote for more.

Number twelve. The massive refugee problem, which is essentially a result of NATO's bombing, continues.

Up until now, general defense funds have been spent to wage this war without permission. The President wants to catch up and is asking for \$6 billion, but Congress, in its infinite wisdom, wants to give him \$13 billion for a war Congress rejects. Once we directly fund the war we will be partners in this misadventure. The votes last week were symbolic. They had no effect of law, but appropriations do.

Saying the new appropriations will be used to beef up a neglected defense does not make it so. Defense funds are fungible. The President has proven this by waging a war for a month without any authorization or appropriation. Congress will no more control the next \$13 billion than the money the President has already spent on the war.

Appropriating funds to fight a war, even without a declaration, provides a much more powerful legal and political endorsement of the war than the public statements made against it by non-binding resolutions passed by the House last week. Declaring war and funding war are two powerful tools of the Congress to restrain a president from waging an unwise and illegal war. If the President pursues an undeclared war and we fund it, we become partners, no matter what justification is given for the spending.

Only chaos can come from ignoring the strict prohibition by the Constitution of a president unilaterally waging war. If a president ignores the absence of a declaration, and we are serious, the only option left to Congress is the power of the purse, which is clearly the responsibility of the Congress. We should not fund this illegal and immoral NATO war.