

Then something unforeseen happened. Contrary to predictions, the Indian parliamentary elections resulted in the defeat of the BJP and Prime Minister Vajpayee, who had made market reform a pillar of his economic policy. A new party now claims the seat of prime minister and is working to build a majority coalition in the legislature.

The sudden, unexpected change made investors nervous and sent them into a large selling spree, in fact, the largest sell-off in the 129-year history of their market. The Sensex, the Bombay Stock Exchange's benchmark index, shed over 11 percent of its value on Monday, following 6 percent losses on the previous Friday. The 2-day loss to investors was over \$65 billion.

Now, I am certainly not prepared to write off economic growth in India just yet, and despite the recent dismal days for the market there, I do not believe the Indian people are either; but the sudden uncertainty over India's long-term economic outlook reveals what this debate on foreign investment should have been about all along. The threat to the U.S. economy was never, never that the India economy is growing too much. The danger is that it might not be able to sustain and continue such economic growth.

This was a lesson we all learned, or should have been learned, in the 1980s. The economic isolationists told us that the rapidly expanding German and Japanese economies were going to devastate us, leaving America in the economic dust. But we soon discovered that if those two countries posed any economic threat to the U.S., it was that they were not able to sustain their economic growth.

Although the economic prophets of doom may have substituted India or maybe China for the Germany and Japan of the 1980s, the fundamental economic lesson is the same today as it was 20 years ago: Rapid and sustained growth by emerging trading partners is unquestionably in our best interest. A strong and growing Indian economy provides opportunities for U.S. companies to invest and become more competitive and create jobs right here at home. A growing Indian middle class demands more and more U.S. goods and services. And a prosperous India helps bring stability to that region of the world.

Most important, growth and job creation is helping to lift millions out of poverty in India, another compelling reason for us to encourage a thriving Indian economy, not a weakened one.

It is vitally important that we encourage India's new leadership to continue the market reforms that have successfully put India on the path to economic strength. So far, there have been some promising signs. The new governing Congress Party has pledged to continue the economic liberalization efforts of their predecessors. It is worth noting that this is the party that first introduced market reforms under Mr. Singh, who will likely be the new prime minister, back in the early 1990s.

Like the U.S. workers and consumers who have benefited from a stronger Indian economy, the 250 million Indians who are living in poverty have everything to gain from opening their markets even further. India has made tremendous strides in liberalizing its economy, but the fact is that India's economy is still not open enough. Significant obstacles to U.S. participation in India's economy persist: nontariff trade barriers, high tariffs, and weak protection of intellectual property rights, to name just a few.

The greater liberalization of the Indian economy will have a significant and positive impact on Americans and Indians alike. As the new government organizes and sets an economic agenda, I urge them to continue the work they began over a decade ago.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 17, 2004]

INDIA DIMMING?

(By Swapan Dasgupta)

The Indian election upset that has unseated Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee may have one unintended victim: John Kerry. After making the loss of American jobs from outsourcing to countries like India a key part of his presidential campaign, the Democratic challenger may no longer have an easy scapegoat to rail against. Now, his suspicion of tech-savvy Indians who are speeding up their country's global integration will be shared by the new government in Delhi.

The world's largest democracy has given an astonishing verdict in an election whose outcome was thought to be a foregone conclusion. The voters rejected the Bharatiya Janata Party-led alliance that had governed since 1998. The winner was a combination of the Congress Party led by the Italian-born Sonia Gandhi, a doctrinaire Marxist bloc, and a motley group of regional outfits that have come together to assemble an alternative government.

India is no stranger to crazy coalitions forged out of sheer expediency. Since 1989, when Rajiv Gandhi was voted out of power, it has witnessed a series of coalition governments. What marks the latest experiment is not merely the uniqueness of a naturalized citizen at the helm—a development that has contributed to a flurry of Italian jokes being circulated on the mobile phone circuit—but the circumstances of its creation.

In the past, incumbents have been voted out for either their high-handedness or the perceived corruption of their governments. This was the case with Congress Prime Ministers Indira Gandhi in 1977, Rajiv Gandhi in 1989, and Narasimha Rao in 1996. This time, the rejection of Mr. Vajpayee was grounded in policy. The 2004 election was dominated by two themes: his leadership and the slogan "India shining." This last may have been the creation of a clever copywriter, but it reflected the difference the Vajpayee government made over the past six years.

Aimed at kindling patriotism with feel-good economics, "India Shining" stressed India's IT and telecom revolutions, the roads program that will link the four corners of India, and the promise of becoming a global power by 2020. Deputy Prime Minister L.K. Advani, the government's ideologue, went on a bus journey across India publicizing "India Shining" and promising a government that would unleash India's potential and creative energies. To gum-chewing 21-year-olds working in call centers and poor farmers in drought-affected India, he invoked the same vision of India as one of the five largest economies in the next 20 years.

Traditionally, capitalism in India has lacked political advocacy. The BJP, a party that built itself on Hindu nationalism, tried to break the mold by grafting the image of a tremendously successful 79-year-old Mr. Vajpayee onto a buoyant economy. For years, intellectuals had complained about development not featuring on the election agenda. The BJP leadership tried to talk real economics to an electorate used to being promised state jobs and welfare schemes.

The outcome was a debacle on a scale that baffled pollster and politician alike: Mr. Vajpayee was swept out of office. In simultaneous local polls held in the southern states of Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka, two of India's most ardent champions of the IT industry, chief ministers Chandrababu Naidu and S.M. Krishna, were roundly defeated. Mr. Naidu was attacked for having more time for Bill Gates than for farmers and mocked for having transformed the state capital Hyderabad into "Cyberabad."

As the results poured in, the political class seemed united in treating the verdict as a resounding rebuff of "India Shining" and its symbols. On the TV, commentators joined politicians in interpreting the verdict as a rejection of the Vajpayee government's pro-business policies. "You can't build highways bypassing the slums," concluded one critic of the BJP. Even the BJP's own allies were scathing. Dripping with sarcasm, Bal Thackeray, chief of the ultra-Hindu Shiv Sena, thanked Finance Minister Jaswant Singh and privatization czar Arun Shourie for contributing to the Congress victory.

Predictably, the left is gung-ho. With the Congress dependent on its 60 legislators for a majority, the two Communist parties are expected to put their regressive stamp on economic policy. Even before the celebrations were over, leftists called for an end to the privatization of the public sector, the abolition of the Disinvestment Ministry and a review of the reforms program. Regardless of whether or not the left joins in government, it will leave its antediluvian mark on the policies of the new regime.

An already jittery stock market panicked. On Friday, the Bombay Sensex fell 6% in one day and wiped out \$22 billion of investors' wealth. Since the specter of political uncertainty and a possible defeat for Mr. Vajpayee first appeared on the horizon, the Sensex has fallen from 5712 and April 27 to 5069 on May 14. Foreign institutional investors have pulled out millions of rupees from the markets since the election results.

The fear of capital flight may quiet the left for a bit, but it is going to be a temporary respite. The manner in which the verdict has been interpreted will also encourage the old-style socialists within the Congress to press for higher taxes on corporate profits and luxury goods, as well as for more subsidies and government expenditure on welfare projects. The Vajpayee government's initiatives for the creation of world-class highways, reduction of the role of government and the cautious initiation of labor reforms look set to be modified, if not completely junked.

Over the past six years, India has tried to dance to a different tune. The Vajpayee government encouraged modernity and entrepreneurship, and boosted the self-confidence of a growing middle class. It tried to turn the country away from a Third World trajectory, from the sloth and mediocrity of the past, into a new India that is so feared by protectionists in the U.S. and Europe. Well, those protectionists can breathe a little easier now. India's ancient regime has struck back with a vengeance.

A DRAFT BY ANY OTHER NAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa). Under a previous order

of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the President came to Capitol Hill today to rally his Republican troops. Why did he need to do that? Well, a District Work Period is about to begin, that is why. Members of Congress are going home to face questions from their constituents. Here are some of the questions the Republicans are going to have to answer:

Why did a Republican President send our soldiers off to war without a plan? Almost 800 brave American soldiers have died and several thousand soldiers have been injured in Iraq. Well over half the casualties have occurred since the President's PR stunt on the deck of the Abraham Lincoln to announce that combat was over. If combat ended months ago, what exactly is going on in Iraq today?

Here is another question on the minds of Americans: How did the President's team in the Pentagon allow the worst atrocities in our history to occur in Iraq? New abuse revelations surface every day, but the administration keeps looking the other way as if hoping the crisis will go away is an effective strategy. It is the President's favorite tactic.

There is another question just beginning to emerge that the President and Republicans will consider radioactive, that means deny, deny, deny. The question is: Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, why did the President not tell the American people we were going to reinstitute a military draft? Why did the Congress not have an opportunity to debate the issue?

Why did you reinstitute a draft without considering the bill that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and I cosponsored? At least, under our bill, young Americans would have a choice about whether they fight in Iraq or perform public service.

America needs to understand the President is not calling it a military draft. That is the White House way, call it something else and hope you get away with it. But as the saying goes, if it looks like a duck, walks like a duck, and quacks like a duck, then it is a duck. It is a silent draft.

Here are some of the headlines and news stories that America should know about before the Republicans arrive home to say they are doing a great job. In Seattle, "Military Says It Might Return Some Former Soldiers to Duty." Here is the lead sentence. "Hundreds of Washington residents who thought they might be done with their days in the Army may be pulled back into service in the weeks ahead."

The Oregonian newspaper says, "Army Does About-Face on Call-Up Readiness." The story says, "Thousands of recent U.S. Army veterans nationwide were told to choose by Monday a new assignment in the Army Reserve or National Guard, meaning a potential return to active duty, or the military would decide for them."

Rumsfeld blind-sided the Congress and the American people and the Supreme Court on the prisoner atrocities in Iraq. The Vice President and Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz did it this time. They never mentioned the new order when they briefed the Senate Committee on Armed Services the other day. Maybe they can update the Congress and comment on something else the Pentagon has ginned up.

UPI reports today that the Pentagon may use the IRS to find the Reservists. Imagine, soon American men and women can get a tax refund and orders to report for duty in one envelope. That is real government efficiency.

Thousands of soldiers were recently denied what President and the Defense Secretary promised, a one-way ticket home after a year of combat in Iraq. They were not asked, they were ordered to stay. That is no choice. That is a de facto military draft.

The President has reinstituted a military draft, but he will not tell the American people he needs more soldiers to fight his war in Iraq because he has no plan and the fighting gets bloodier every day. The President is keeping soldiers in combat for over a year. That is more than twice as long a stretch as was expected of people in the Second World War.

The United States today has a draft. No wonder the President was on Capitol Hill today trying to rally Republicans. Maybe he should draft them. At least they would see real shared sacrifice and shared risk.

Today, America's minorities bear an unfair share of the consequences of this war. The President and the Republicans will not tell us that, they will say the war is going well, the department of war is doing perfectly. Watch the evening news, read the newspaper, decide for yourself whether the President's war is going well.

Make no mistake about it, they need more soldiers and they are taking the steps to get them, whether they volunteer or not. That is the definition of a draft, Mr. Speaker. You ought to tell the President that he ought to just come right out and say it, he is going to draft people any way he can to avoid talking about it before the election.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim my Special Order speech at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ABORTION EXCRUCIATINGLY PAINFUL TO UNBORN

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, abortion is excruciatingly painful

to unborn children. It hurts. It hurts the children.

In expert testimony provided to the Northern District of the U.S. District Court in California on April 15, during the partial birth abortion trials, Dr. Sunny Anand, Director of the Pain Neurobiology Laboratory at Arkansas Children's Hospital Research Institute, explained, "The human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks of gestation, if not earlier, and the pain perceived by a fetus is possibly more intense than that perceived by term newborns or older children."

Dr. Anand further describes before the court that the "highest density of pain receptors per square inch of skin in human development occurs in utero," while still in the womb, "from 20 to 30 weeks gestation. During this period, the epidermis is still very thin, leaving nerve fibers closer to the surface of the skin than in older neonates and adults."

He went on to explain that the pain inhibitory mechanisms, in other words fibers which dampen and modulate the experience of pain, do not begin to develop until 32 to 34 weeks of gestation. Thus, Dr. Anand concludes, a fetus 20 to 32 weeks of gestation would experience a much more intense pain than older infants or children or adults when these groups are subjected to similar types of injury.

Dr. Anand points out on the question of fetal consciousness that more than 3 decades of research show that preterm infants are actively perceiving, learning and organizing information, and are constantly striving to regulate themselves, their environment and their experiences. All preterm infants actively approach and favor experiences that are developmentally supporting and actively avoiding experiences that are disruptive.

So, today, Mr. Speaker, Senator BROWNBACK and I have introduced legislation. In the House it is H.R. 4420, the Unborn Child Pain Awareness Act. This bipartisan piece of legislation, which now has over two dozen House sponsors and 22 Senate sponsors, would require that those performing abortions at or beyond 20 weeks gestation provide the mother with certain information regarding the capacity of the unborn child to experience pain during the abortion and offer the mother the option of having pain-reducing drugs administered directly to the unborn child to reduce the baby's pain.

Mr. Speaker, before an abortion involving a pain-capable child begins, the abortionist would have to provide the woman with an oral statement at this stage of development of the unborn child, saying that the child has physical structures to feel pain and that the abortion would likely cause pain to the unborn child.

□ 2000

The bill ensures that the mother has the option of choosing to have anesthesia administered directly to the unborn child if she so desires in order to