

opinion, inappropriate and, therefore, the reason why this Member will vote against House Joint Resolution 41.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Under House Resolution 118, an amendment in the nature of a substitute, if printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and if offered by the minority leader or his designee, would be in order at this point. The Chair is aware of no qualifying amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 118, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 189, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

YEAS—232

Aderholt	Culberson	Hastings (WA)
Akin	Cunningham	Hayes
Andrews	Davis, Jo Ann	Hayworth
Armey	Davis, Tom	Hefley
Bachus	Deal	Herger
Baker	DeLay	Hilleary
Ballenger	DeMint	Hobson
Barcia	Diaz-Balart	Hoekstra
Barr	Doolittle	Horn
Bartlett	Duncan	Hulshof
Barton	Dunn	Hunter
Bass	Ehlers	Hutchinson
Berkley	Ehrlich	Isakson
Berry	Emerson	Issa
Biggert	English	Istook
Bilirakis	Etheridge	Jenkins
Bishop	Everett	John
Blunt	Ferguson	Johnson (IL)
Boehner	Flake	Johnson, Sam
Bonilla	Fletcher	Johnson (NC)
Bono	Foley	Keller
Boswell	Fossella	Kelly
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Kennedy (MN)
Brown (SC)	Gallegly	Kerns
Bryant	Ganske	King (NY)
Burr	Gekas	Kingston
Burton	Gibbons	Kirk
Buyer	Gilchrest	Knollenberg
Callahan	Gilman	Kolbe
Calvert	Goode	LaHood
Camp	Goodlatte	Largent
Cannon	Gordon	Latham
Cantor	Goss	LaTourette
Capito	Graham	Leach
Castle	Granger	Lewis (CA)
Chabot	Graves	Lewis (KY)
Chambliss	Green (TX)	Linder
Coble	Green (WI)	LoBiondo
Collins	Greenwood	Lucas (KY)
Combest	Grucci	Lucas (OK)
Condit	Gutknecht	Maloney (CT)
Cox	Hall (TX)	Manzullo
Cramer	Hansen	McCarthy (NY)
Crane	Harman	McCrery
Crenshaw	Hart	McInnis
Cubin	Hastert	McIntyre

McKeon	Reynolds
Mica	Riley
Miller (FL)	Roemer
Miller, Gary	Rogers (KY)
Moran (KS)	Rogers (MI)
Myrick	Rohrabacher
Nethercutt	Ros-Lehtinen
Ney	Roukema
Northup	Royce
Norwood	Ryan (WI)
Nussle	Ryun (KS)
Osborne	Sanchez
Ose	Sandlin
Otter	Saxton
Oxley	Scarborough
Pallone	Schaffer
Paul	Schrock
Pence	Sensenbrenner
Peterson (PA)	Sessions
Petri	Shadegg
Pickering	Shays
Pitts	Sherman
Platts	Sherwood
Pombo	Shimkus
Portman	Shows
Pryce (OH)	Simmons
Putnam	Simpson
Quinn	Skeen
Radanovich	Skelton
Ramstad	Smith (MI)
Regula	Smith (NJ)
Rehberg	Souder

NAYS—189

Abercrombie	Hilliard	Murtha
Ackerman	Hinchey	Nadler
Allen	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Baca	Hoeffel	Neal
Baird	Holden	Oberstar
Baldacci	Holt	Obey
Baldwin	Honda	Olver
Barrett	Hookey	Ortiz
Becerra	Hostettler	Owens
Bentsen	Houghton	Pascarell
Bereuter	Hoyer	Pastor
Berman	Hyde	Payne
Blagojevich	Inslee	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Israel	Peterson (MN)
Boehlert	Jackson (IL)	Phelps
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Borski	(TX)	Price (NC)
Boucher	Jefferson	Rahall
Boyd	Johnson (CT)	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Reyes
Brown (FL)	Jones (OH)	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Capuano	Kaptur	Ross
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Rothman
Carson (IN)	Kildee	Rush
Carson (OK)	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Clay	Kind (WI)	Sanders
Clayton	Kleczka	Sawyer
Clement	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Clyburn	LaFalce	Schiff
Conyers	Lampson	Scott
Costello	Langevin	Serrano
Coyne	Lantos	Shaw
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Slaughter
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lee	Snyder
Davis (FL)	Levin	Solis
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Spratt
DeFazio	Lipinski	Stark
DeGette	Lofgren	Stenholm
Delahunt	Lowey	Strickland
DeLauro	Luther	Stupak
Deutsch	Maloney (NY)	Tanner
Dicks	Markey	Tauscher
Dingell	Mascara	Thomas
Doggett	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
Dooley	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McCarthy (MO)	Thurman
Dreier	McCollum	Tierney
Edwards	McDermott	Towns
Engel	McGovern	Turner
Eshoo	McKinney	Udall (CO)
Evans	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Farr	Meehan	Velazquez
Fattah	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Filner	Meeks (NY)	Waters
Ford	Menendez	Watt (NC)
Frank	Millender	Waxman
Frost	McDonald	Weiner
Gephardt	Miller, George	Wexler
Gillmor	Mink	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Wu
Hastings (FL)	Moore	Wynn
Hill	Morella	

NOT VOTING—11

Capps	McHugh	Smith (TX)
Cooksey	Moakley	Vitter
Gutierrez	Moran (VA)	Watts (OK)
Hall (OH)	Roybal-Allard	

□ 1322

Messrs. FORD of Tennessee, CUMMINGS, TURNER, ACKERMAN, and THOMAS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. PORTMAN, BARTLETT of Maryland, and McKEON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the joint resolution was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote on final passage of H.J. Res. 41, the Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment (recorded vote No. 87). If I had not been detained, I would have voted “aye” on this important bill.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

A NEW CHINA POLICY

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, President Bush deserves much credit for the handling of the spy plane crisis. However, he has received significant criticism from some of his own political supporters for saying he was very sorry for the incident. This seems a very small price to pay for the safe return of 24 American military personnel.

Trade with China, though, should be credited with helping to resolve this crisis. President Bush in the diplomatic handling of this event avoided overly strong language and military threats which would have done nothing to save the lives of these 24 Americans.

This confrontation, however, provides an excellent opportunity for us to reevaluate our policy toward China and other nations. Although trade with China for economic reasons encourages both America and China to work for a resolution of the spy plane crisis, our trading status with China should be reconsidered.

Mr. Speaker, what today is called “free trade” is not exactly that. Although we engage in trade with China, it is subsidized to the tune of many billions of dollars through the Export-Import Bank, the most of any country in the world.

We also have been careless over the last several years in allowing our military secrets to find their way into the

hands of the Chinese government. At the same time we subsidize trade with China, including sensitive military technology, we also build up the Taiwanese military, while continuing to patrol the Chinese border with our spy planes. It is a risky, inconsistent policy.

The question we must ask ourselves is how would we react if we had Chinese airplanes flying up and down our coast and occupying the air space of the Gulf of Mexico? We must realize that China is a long way from the U.S. and is not capable nor is showing any signs of launching an attack on any sovereign territory of the United States. Throughout all of China's history, she has never pursued military adventurism far from her own borders. That is something that we cannot say about our own policy. China traditionally has only fought for secure borders, predominantly with India, Russia, Japan, and in Korea against the United States, and that was only when our troops approached the Yalu River.

It should not go unnoticed that there was no vocal support from any of our allies for our spy missions along the Chinese coast. None of our allies bothered to condemn the action of the Chinese military aircraft, although it technically was cause of the accident.

Do not forget that when a Russian aircraft landed in Japan in 1976, it was only after many months we returned the plane to Russia, in crates.

Although there is no doubt that we technically have legal grounds for making these flights, the question really is whether or not it is wise to do so or necessary for our national security. Actually, a strong case can be made that our national security is more threatened by our patrolling the Chinese coast than if we avoided such flights altogether.

After a half century, it is time to reassess the need for such flights. Satellite technology today gives us the ability to watch and to listen to almost everyone on Earth. If there is a precise need for this type of surveillance for the benefit of Taiwan, then the Taiwanese ought to be involved in this activity, not American military personnel.

□ 1330

We should not feel so insecure that we need to threaten and intimidate other countries in order to achieve some vague psychological reassurance that we are still the top military power in the world. This is unnecessary and may well represent a weakness rather than a strength.

The Taiwanese Relations Act essentially promises that we will defend Taiwan at all costs and should be reevaluated. Morally and constitutionally a treaty cannot be used to commit us to war at some future date. One generation cannot declare war for another. Making an open-ended commitment to go to war, promising troops, money and weapons is not permitted by the Constitution.

It is clear that war can be declared only by a Congress currently in office. Declaring war cannot be circumvented by a treaty or agreement committing us towards some future date. If a previous treaty can commit future generations to war, the House of Representatives, the body closest to the people, would never have a say in the most important issue of declaring war.

We must continue to believe and be confident that trading with China is beneficial to America. Trade between Taiwan and China already exists and should be encouraged. It is a fact that trade did help to resolve this current conflict without a military confrontation.

Concern about our negative trade balance with the Chinese is irrelevant. Balance of payments are always in balance. For every dollar we spend in China, those dollars must come back to America. Maybe not buying American goods as some would like, but they do come back as they serve to finance our current account deficit.

Free trade, it should be argued, is beneficial even when done unilaterally, providing a benefit to our consumers. But we should take this opportunity to point out clearly and forcefully the foolishness of providing subsidies to the Chinese through such vehicles as the Export-Import Bank. We should be adamantly opposed to sending military technology to such a nation or to any nation, for that matter.

It is interesting to note that recent reports reveal that missiles coming from Israel and financed by American foreign aid were seen on the fighter plane that caused the collision. It should be equally clear that arming the enemies of our trading partners does not make a whole lot of sense either. For American taxpayers to continue to finance the weaponry of Taiwan and to maintain an open commitment to send troops if the border dispute between Taiwan and China erupts into violence is foolhardy and risky.

Don't forget that President Eisenhower once warned that there always seems to be a need for a "monster to slay" in order to keep the military industries busy and profitable. To continue the weapons buildup, something we are always engaged in around the world, requires excuses for such expenditures—some of these are planned, some contrived, and some accidental.

When we follow only a military approach without trading in our dealings with foreign nations, and in particular with China, we end up at war, such as we did in the Korean War. Today, we are following a policy where we have less military confrontation with the Chinese and more trade, so relations are much better. A crisis like we have just gone through is more likely to be peacefully resolved to the benefit of both sides. But what we need is even less military involvement, with no military technology going to China and no military weapons going to Taiwan. We have a precise interest in increasing true free trade; that is, trade that is not subsidized nor managed by some world government organization like the WTO. Maintaining peace would then be much easier.

We cannot deny that China still has many internal moral, economic and political problems that should be resolved. But so do we. Their internal problems are their own. We cannot impose our views on them in dealing with these issues, but we should be confident enough that engaging in free trade with them and setting a good example are the best ways for us to influence them in coming to grips with their problems. We have enough of our own imperfections in this country in dealing with civil liberties, and we ought not to pretend that we are saintly enough to impose our will on others in dealing with their problems. Needless to say we don't have the legal authority to do so either.

During the Cuban missile crisis a resolution was achieved under very dangerous circumstances. Quietly, President Kennedy had agreed to remove the missiles from Turkey that we pointed at the Soviets, making the point that American missiles on the Soviet borders was not unlike the Soviets missiles on the American borders. A few months later, quietly, the United States removed these missiles, and none suffered. The Cold War was eventually won by the United States, but our national security was not threatened by the removal of those missiles. It could be argued that the fact that our missiles were in Turkey and pointed at the Soviets was more of a threat to our national security because that motivated the Soviets to put their missiles in Cuba. It would do no harm to our national security for us to quietly, in time, stop the potentially dangerous and unnecessary spy missions that we have pursued for over 50 years along the Chinese border.

James Bamford recently wrote in *The New York Times* of an episode that occurred in 1956 when Eisenhower was president. On a similar spy mission off the Chinese coast the Chinese Air Force shot down one of our planes, killing 16 American crewmen. In commenting on the incident President Eisenhower said, "We seem to be conducting something that we cannot control very well. If planes were flying 20 to 50 miles from our shores we would be very likely to shoot them down if they came in closer, whether through error or not."

We have been pursuing these missions near China for over 50 years. It's time to reconsider the wisdom and the necessity of such missions, especially since we are now engaged in trade with this nation.

Bellicose and jingoistic demands for retaliation and retribution are dangerous, and indeed are a greater threat to our national security than relying on satellite technology for gathering the information that we might need. A policy of peaceful, non-subsidized trade with China would go a long way to promoting friendly and secure relations with the Chinese people. By not building up the military arsenal of the Taiwanese, Taiwan will be forced to pursue their trade policies and investments with China, leading to the day where the conflict between these two powers can be resolved peacefully.

Today, it looks like there's a much better chance of North and South Korea getting together and solving their dispute than was the case in the 1950s, when we sent hundreds of thousands of troops and millions of bombs to resolve the conflict—which was unsuccessful.

We should have more confidence that peaceful trade is a much stronger weapon

than all the military force that we can provide. That same argument can be made for our dealings with Vietnam today. We did not win with weapons of war in the 1960s, yet we are now much more engaged in a peaceful trade with the people of Vietnam. Our willingness over the past hundred years to resort to weapons to impose our will on others has generally caused a resentment of America rather than respect.

It is now time to reassess our entire foreign policy of military worldwide intervention. Staying neutral in world conflicts while showing a willingness to trade with all nations anxious to trade with us will do more to serve the cause of world peace than all the unnecessary and provocative spy missions we pursue around the globe.

I recommend the following article by Orlando Sentinel columnist Charley Reese for its sober analysis of the recent events of China.

[From the Orlando Sentinel, April 22, 2001]

SO YOU WANT TO GO TO WAR WITH CHINA?

(By Charley Reese)

I've been intrigued by the responses to a column I wrote suggesting that our China policy ought to be spelled out and submitted to the American people for approval.

First, some people irately took issue with my calling the airplane a "spy plane." It is not, they stoutly contend, because it is overtly intercepting electronic signals.

Let's suppose a clearly marked police van parked on the public street in front of your house. Let's suppose the officers began to intercept your telephone calls, whatever information appeared on your computer screen and even your verbal conversations. Now, would you feel spied upon or would you say, "Hey, that's only electronic intercepts, and they are operating openly on a public street."

Then there is the more logical argument that we need to spy on the Chinese in case we have to fight them. My point exactly. Why do we have to fight them?

We certainly should not fight them over Taiwan. Our own beloved Jimmy Carter unilaterally abrogated the mutual-defense treaty. Our own tough anti-Communist Richard Nixon publicly agreed that Taiwan is part of China and, therefore, falls under the category of China's internal affairs. What's to fight about?

If Taiwan declares its independence, I would expect Chinese leaders would emulate Abraham Lincoln and use force to prevent it. For all my little old Southern life, I've heard Yankees say Lincoln was right. What's good for Honest Abe is good for Honest Jiang, right?

Then there is the argument that we must not lose our position as a "Pacific power." Geographically, since we granted independence to the Philippines, we are not a Pacific power.

I see no reason why we should wish to be a Pacific power in a military sense. What's to be gained?

The two natural Pacific powers are Japan and China.

The funniest response has been alarm about China's "military buildup." I would say that if China did not engage in a military buildup after watching the United States go bomb and missile crazy during the past 20 years that it would be derelict in its duty. But let's keep this in perspective. The Chinese have about 20 ICBMs; we have hundreds. Their defense expenditures are somewhere around \$50 billion; ours, in excess of \$268 billion.

Furthermore, Chinese strategy, as discussed in their own military journals, is to

develop the ability to defeat us in their immediate vicinity. That means clearly that if we keep our nose out of their affairs, no military clashes are likely to occur.

Civilians, too, need to be reminded that military forces are about making war. We should never have changed from the honest name, War Department, to the Newspeak name, Defense Department. Armed forces are either fighting wars, training to fight wars or planning to fight wars. That's what they do.

It's also what the military forces of every other country do. Just because a country's military makes contingency plans to fight some other country doesn't mean that they intend to initiate a war.

Unfortunately America is full of jingoists, usually pot-bellied gray-hairs or 4-F journalists and policy wonks. They are always eager for the teens and twentysomethings to go somewhere and get killed or maimed. In most cases, within five years of their youthful deaths, nobody can remember why they had to get killed.

Korea ended up divided exactly the same way after the war as before the war. Vietnam became communist, which it could have become without 57,000 Americans dying in it. We went to war presumably to preserve the oil contracts with Kuwait Inc., and now Americans are driving around with gasoline refined from Iraqi oil.

As for you "love-it-or-leave-it" blockheads, you leave it and go fight instead of sending someone else if you are such grand warriors. What I love are the people and the land, not the government.

The lives of a nation's youth are its most precious treasure, and I'm damned if I will stay silent while armchair generals propose to risk that treasure in some stupid, ignorant, corrupt or unnecessary war.

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

(Ms. NORTON 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 California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROHRABACHER 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 Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois 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 Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of partisan bickering that goes on in Washington these days. Unfortunately, our constituents are often caught in between us, between the Democrats and the Republicans. They are literally caught in the ropes, strangled by our inability, especially on health care.

An issue as important as quality, affordable and accessible health care is not and should not be a political game played by the Democrats or the Republicans. It ought to be about what is best for the American people, the people who have placed their trust and confidence in us.

Over these past 19 days, I have participated in more than 60 events in my district, as many of my colleagues did during the district work period. All across Arkansas' Fourth District, my constituents told me about the health care crisis they face each and every day in their lives.

A health care issue about which I care deeply is providing a voluntary, but guaranteed prescription drug benefit as a part of Medicare. I believe it is time to modernize Medicare to include medicine. Medicare is the only health insurance plan in America that I know of that does not include medicine, yet it is the plan that nearly every single senior citizen in America relies on day in and day out to stay healthy and to get well.

Mr. Speaker, I own a pharmacy in a small town in south Arkansas, and living in a small town and working with seniors there, I know firsthand how seniors end up in the hospital running up a \$10,000 Medicare bill, or how diabetics eventually lose a leg or require perhaps as much as a half a million dollars in Medicare payments for kidney dialysis. All of these instances are real-life examples that I have seen in my hometown in the small pharmacy that I own back there that I used to work at. Every one of these could have been avoided if people had simply been able to afford their medicine or if they had been able to afford to take it properly.

I did a town hall meeting this past week in Hot Springs, Arkansas, one of the more affluent counties and cities in my district. We had more than 100 seniors at that meeting that I conducted in conjunction with the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare. At that meeting, we said, raise your hand if you have medicine coverage. Less than 10 hands went up in that room.

This is America, and I believe we can do better than that by our seniors, and that is why I will continue to fight to truly modernize Medicare to include medicine, just like we include doctors' visits and hospital visits. It should be voluntary, but guaranteed, and it should be a part of Medicare.

That is why the first bill I introduced as a Member of the United States Congress was a bill that basically tells the