permanent International Criminal Court (ICC) is yet another issue on which the U.S. national interests and many other countries' national interests ebb and flow.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that choosing not to participate in institutions such as the ICC is not, as some continue to argue, equal to isolationism. Choosing not to engage in conversations with other leaders on difficult issues can be a form of protest, which President Bush, rightly standing strong against pressure to pursue international agreements and institutions which would be contrary to American interests, has engaged his European counterparts in dialogues on the tough issues and should be commended for doing so.

(From the Omaha World-Herald, July 22)

WHY AMERICA SAYS NO

One of the irritants in President Bush's current dealings with European nations is his administration's opposition to a permanent International Criminal Court. The 15-nation European Union is one of the leading proponents of a United Nations plan to form such a tribunal.

Bush should stand firm. Not because a world court would be a bad thing as a general principle—indeed, in the abstract the idea has appeal. And not even because the trend of recent years toward some kind of world government is a direct affront to American sovereignty, as it surely is.

The U.S. government should continue to be against this proposal because America's potential exposure to the potential misuse of such an entity is greater than that of most other nations.

That is because America is a superpower that is often called upon to be the world's policeman. By tradition and instinct, it has chosen to pursue an active, interventionist foreign policy during many stretches of its history, acting as a force for good in the world. No nation has single-handedly done more to defend down-trodden people against tyranny or to combat the problems of disease, poverty and deprivation.

Accordingly, America has had far-flung military and civilian operations sometimes in circumstances with outcomes sufficiently ambiguous as to make it a target for prosecution in an international court if the people who ran that court happened not to like Americans.

The purpose of the proposed entity would be to try and sentence war criminals, violators of human rights and perpetrators of genocide. Administration officials fear that the machinery of an international court could, if it fell into the wrong hands, mean trouble for American troops or their lead-

ers—trouble caused by someone who tried to paint an American military intervention (Haiti? Panama?) as a violation of human rights or a foreign policy decision (Henry Kissinger on the bombing of Cambodia in 1970 as a war crime. Not everyone sees things through the same eyes. George Bush, the former president, is either a national lib-

erator or a war criminal, depending on whether you are Kuwaiti or Iraqi.

The spectacle of Americans, based on foreign policy differences, being hauled before a foreign court to try and protect the Constitution would be an affront to U.S. sovereignty.

Moreover, standards evolve unpredictably. Just a few years ago, the death penalty was widely used around the world. Recently, moralists all across Europe applauded when enforcement officials stop the scourge of methamphetamine abuse here at home.

I asked my colleague from Oklahoma for joining me in offering this amendment and I ask for your support.

THE PATIENT PRIVACY ACT

HON. RON PAUL
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 2001

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Patient Privacy Act, which repeals those sections of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 authorizing the establishment of a “standard unique health care identifier” for all Americans, as well as prohibiting the use of federal funds to develop or implement a database containing personal health information.

Both components of such a medical identifier, especially when combined with HHS’s misnamed “federal privacy” regulations, would allow federal bureaucrats to track every citizen’s medical history from cradle to grave. Furthermore, it is possible that every medical professional, hospital, and Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) in the country would be able to access an individual’s record simply by entering the patient’s identifier into a health care database.

When the scheme to assign every American a unique medical identifier became public knowledge in 1998, there was a tremendous outcry from the public. Congress responded to the public outrage by including language prohibiting the expenditure of funds to implement or develop a medical identifier in the federal budget for the past three fiscal years. Last year my amendment prohibiting the use of funds to develop or implement a medical ID unanimously passed the House of Representa-

tives. It should be clear to every member of Congress that the American public does not want a uniform medical identifier. Therefore, rather than continuing to extend the prohibition on funding for another year, Congress should simply repeal the authorization of the national medical ID this year.

As an OB/GYN-with more than 30 years experience in private practice, I know better than most the importance of preserving the sanctity of the physician-patient relationship. Often-
times, effective treatment depends on a patient’s ability to place absolute trust in his or her doctor. What will happen to that trust when patients know that any and all information given their doctor will be placed in a data base accessible by anyone who knows the patient’s “unique personal identifier?”

I ask my colleagues, how comfortable would you be confiding any emotional problem, or even an embarrassing physical problem like impotence, to your doctor if you knew that this information could be easily accessed by friend, foe, possible employers, coworkers, HMOs, and government agents?

Moreover, let us admit that the American people have good reason to fear a government-mandated health ID card, but they will claim such problems can be “fixed” by ad-

ditional legislation restricting the use of the