

safety. My bill, "The Children Gun Safety and Adult Supervision Act," is a comprehensive gun safety proposal, but I still encourage the Conferees to first pass the current Juvenile Justice Bill so that affirmative action will finally be taken.

Through enhanced penalties for reckless supervising adults, gun safety education programs and limitations on the admittance of children into gun shows, my legislation seeks to prevent tragedies like the one that most recently occurred in Mount Morris Township, Michigan. This child shooting is the latest in a series of preventable shootings that occurred as a result of adults recklessly leaving firearms in the presence of children.

It is a shame that political maneuvering is still stalling even a non-binding resolution like Senator BOXER's that simply supports child gun safety legislation. Yet, I would like to say how delighted I was to hear of Senator DURBIN's amendment that would offer more funding for providing gun safety education.

In the past few weeks my office has received many calls and letters from constituents who believe that we support legislation that will take away their guns.

It is obvious that the propaganda machine of the National Rifle Association is working to change our focus from the issue of children and guns and gun ownership in general. Like many of my colleagues, I do not oppose responsible gun ownership.

However, like President Clinton, I am concerned about children and their access to guns. I am concerned that guns are not regulated in the same way that toys are regulated. I am concerned that we do not have safety standards for locking devices on guns. I am concerned that we do not prohibit children from attending gun shows unsupervised. I am concerned that we have not focused on the statistics on children and guns.

This motion to instruct urges the conferees to act immediately on the Juvenile Justice Bill. We cannot wait for another tragedy to occur. I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 205, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—218

Abercrombie	Berry	Cardin
Ackerman	Bilbray	Carson
Allen	Blagojevich	Clay
Andrews	Blumenauer	Clayton
Baird	Boehert	Clement
Baldacci	Bonior	Clyburn
Baldwin	Borski	Condit
Barrett (WI)	Brady (PA)	Conyers
Bateman	Brown (FL)	Coyne
Becerra	Brown (OH)	Crowley
Bentsen	Camp	Cummings
Bereuter	Campbell	Davis (FL)
Berkley	Capps	Davis (IL)
Berman	Capuano	Davis (VA)

DeFazio	Kennedy
DeGette	Kildee
Delahunt	Kilpatrick
DeLauro	Kind (WI)
Deutsch	Kingston
Diaz-Balart	Klecza
Dicks	Kucinich
Dingell	Kuykendall
Dixon	LaFalce
Doggett	Lantos
Dooley	Larson
Doyle	Leach
Dunn	Lee
Edwards	Levin
Ehlers	Lewis (GA)
Ehrlich	Lipinski
Engel	Lofgren
Eshoo	Lowey
Etheridge	Luther
Evans	Maloney (CT)
Farr	Maloney (NY)
Fattah	Markey
Filner	Matsui
Foley	McCarthy (MO)
Forbes	McCarthy (NY)
Ford	McDermott
Frank (MA)	McGovern
Franks (NJ)	McHugh
Frelinghuysen	McKinney
Frost	McNulty
Gallegly	Meehan
Ganske	Meeke (FL)
Gejdenson	Meeke (NY)
Gephardt	Menendez
Gilchrest	Millender
Gilman	McDonald
Gonzalez	Miller, George
Greenwood	Minge
Gutierrez	Mink
Hall (OH)	Moakley
Hastings (FL)	Moore
Hilliard	Moran (VA)
Hinchee	Morella
Hoeffel	Murtha
Holden	Nadler
Holt	Napolitano
Hooley	Neal
Horn	Northup
Hoyer	Nussle
Inslee	Oberstar
Jackson (IL)	Obey
Jackson-Lee	Olver
(TX)	Ose
Jefferson	Owens
Johnson (CT)	Pallone
Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell
Jones (OH)	Pastor
Kanjorski	Payne
Kaptur	Pelosi
Kelly	Pomeroy

NAYS—205

Aderholt	Coburn
Archer	Collins
Armey	Combest
Baca	Cooksey
Bachus	Costello
Baker	Cox
Ballenger	Cramer
Barcia	Crane
Barr	Cubin
Barrett (NE)	Cunningham
Bartlett	Danner
Barton	Deal
Bass	DeLay
Biggett	DeMint
Bilirakis	Dickey
Bishop	Doolittle
Bliley	Dreier
Blunt	Duncan
Boehner	Emerson
Bonilla	English
Bono	Everett
Boswell	Ewing
Boucher	Fletcher
Brady (TX)	Fossella
Bryant	Fowler
Burr	Gekas
Burton	Gibbons
Buyer	Gillmor
Callahan	Goode
Calvert	Goodlatte
Canady	Goodling
Cannon	Gordon
Castle	Goss
Chabot	Graham
Chambliss	Granger
Chenoweth-Hage	Green (TX)
Coble	Green (WI)

Porter	LoBiondo
Price (NC)	Lucas (KY)
Quinn	Lucas (OK)
Ramstad	Manzullo
Rangel	Martinez
Reyes	McCollum
Rivers	McCrery
Rodriguez	McInnis
Roemer	McIntosh
Rogan	McIntyre
Ros-Lehtinen	McKeon
Rothman	Metcalf
Roukema	Mica
Roybal-Allard	Miller (FL)
Sabo	Miller, Gary
Sanchez	Mollohan
Sanders	Moran (KS)
Sawyer	Nethercutt
Saxton	Ney
Schakowsky	Norwood
Scott	Ortiz
Serrano	Oxley
Shaw	Packard
Shays	Paul
Sherman	Pease
Slaughter	Peterson (MN)
Smith (NJ)	Peterson (PA)
Smith (WA)	Petri
Snyder	Phelps
Spratt	Pickering
Stabenow	Pickett
Stupak	Pitts
Tancredo	
Tauscher	
Thompson (CA)	Boyd
Thompson (MS)	Cook
Thurman	Hinojosa
Tierney	John
Towns	
Udall (CO)	
Udall (NM)	
Upton	
Velazquez	
Vento	
Visclosky	
Waters	
Watt (NC)	
Watts (OK)	
Waxman	
Weiner	
Weller	
Wexler	
Weygand	
Wilson	
Wolf	
Woolsey	
Wu	
Wynn	

Pombo	Spence
Portman	Stearns
Pryce (OH)	Stenholm
Radanovich	Strickland
Rahall	Stump
Regula	Sununu
Reynolds	Sweeney
Riley	Talent
Rogers	Tauzin
Rohrabacher	Taylor (MS)
Royce	Taylor (NC)
Ryan (WI)	Terry
Ryun (KS)	Thomas
Salmon	Thornberry
Sandin	Thune
Sanford	Tiahrt
Scarborough	Toomey
Schaffer	Trafficant
Sensenbrenner	Turner
Sessions	Vitter
Shadegg	Walsh
Sherwood	Wamp
Shimkus	Watkins
Shows	Weldon (FL)
Shuster	Weldon (PA)
Simpson	Whitfield
Sisisky	Wicker
Skeen	Wise
Skelton	Young (AK)
Smith (MI)	Young (FL)
Smith (TX)	
Souder	

NOT VOTING—11

	Klink	Stark
	Mascara	Tanner
	Myrick	Walden
	Rush	

□ 1600

Mr. COLLINS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. COX, and Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CAMPBELL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 396

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor of H. Res. 396.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2372, THE PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 2000

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-525) on the resolution (H. Res. 44) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2372) to simplify and expedite access to the Federal courts for injured parties whose rights and privileges, secured by the United States Constitution, have been deprived by final actions of Federal agencies, or other government officials or entities acting under color of State law; to prevent Federal courts from abstaining from exercising Federal jurisdiction in actions where no

State law claim is alleged; to permit certification of unsettled State law questions that are essential to resolving Federal claims arising under the Constitution; and to clarify when government action is sufficiently final to ripen certain Federal claims arising under the Constitution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

Mr. MCHUGH. addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO PAKISTAN IS NO ENDORSEMENT OF MILITARY COUP

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. Mr. Speaker, as President Clinton prepares for his historic trip to South Asia, I wanted to address some of the key concerns that are sure to arise during his visit to Pakistan. While most of the President's trip will be spent in India, the world's largest democracy, and in Bangladesh, the President will also be traveling at the end of his trip to Pakistan. He will meet with General Musharraf, who seized power from the democratic, civilian government in a military coup last October.

Mr. Speaker, recently, Lally Weymouth of the Washington Post conducted an interview with Pakistan's military dictator, General Musharraf, and in the interview the general made some statements that cannot go unchallenged.

It is apparent from the general's comment that Pakistan is trying to create the appearance that the visit by the President of the United States constitutes an endorsement of the military coup. In particular, Mr. Speaker, General Musharraf stated of the President's decision to go to Pakistan, and I quote, "It is also recognition of the righteousness of our stand in Kashmir."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the White House has tried to make it clear that the trip does not represent an endorsement of the overthrow of Pakistan's civilian, elected government by General Musharraf.

In case there is any doubt, I would like to quote from President Clinton directly. Last Thursday, March 9,

President Clinton said of his upcoming visit to Pakistan, and I quote, "I think it would be a mistake not to go, but it would be a grave mistake for people to think that my going represents some sort of endorsement of a nondemocratic process which occurred there."

The President went on to say that his visit is a "recognition that America's interest and values will be advanced if we maintain some contact with the Pakistani government." But he added, "I think that our ability to have a positive influence on the future direction of Pakistan in terms of the restoration of democracy, in terms of the ultimate resolution of issues in the Indian subcontinent and in terms of avoiding further dangerous conflicts, will be greater if we maintain our cooperation."

I want to emphasize that in this statement by the President and in all statements from the White House and the State Department about the President's decision to visit Pakistan, it has been stated and reiterated that the restoration of democracy is a key objective.

In her statement yesterday to the Asian Society, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said that "The President will make clear our support for an early return to democratic rule as well as our ongoing friendship with the Pakistani people."

Mr. Speaker, what is even harder to take seriously is the General's statement about the righteousness of Pakistan's stand in Kashmir. Pakistan's involvement in Kashmir has consisted of supporting an ongoing terrorist campaign that has cost the lives of thousands of innocent civilians, mostly Hindus, but also many Muslims. Last year Pakistan further escalated tensions in the region by launching an attack against India's side of the line of control in Kashmir in the area of Kargil. This disastrous military campaign was condemned by the United States and other major nations.

It has been widely reported that General Musharraf was the architect of the Kargil attack. In his response to a question on this from the Washington Post the general said, "Whatever happened was the government's decision." That is an interesting admission, given Pakistan's earlier insistence that the hostilities in the Kargil area were the work of indigenous Kashmiri forces. Clearly, the fact that this was a government decision indicates that the Pakistani armed forces were directly involved, and General Musharraf was the army chief of staff at the time.

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has stated that the U.S. will not mediate the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan unless and until both countries agree to U.S. mediation. He clearly is not taking sides on the issue of whether India vs. Pakistan is more righteous with regard to Kashmir.

Mr. Speaker, I hope President Clinton's upcoming meeting with General

Musharraf will be an opportunity to demonstrate to General Musharraf that he and the regime that he leads cannot continue with the current policy of suppressing democracy and on provoking a conflict with India over Kashmir.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) shares many of the same concerns that I have about General Musharraf's recent statements, and on the important issues that the U.S. has to stress in our relationship with Pakistan.

I would also like to associate myself with the remarks that I believe he will be making later this evening.

H.R. 1055 WILL HELP MILITARY PERSONNEL AND THEIR FAMILIES ON FOOD STAMPS

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to start my comments by reading from an ABC 20/20 transcript that aired on June 25, 1999. The headlines of the feature were "Front Lines, Food Lines." Highlights of the show: Low-paid military families cannot make ends meet. I am going to read a couple of the statements from the show.

Tom Jarriel, ABC News: "In Kosovo, American troops again face danger from snipers and patrols through villages littered with landmines. It is a familiar example of American military troops deployed for peacekeeping while risking their lives serving on the front lines."

I further quote Tom Jarriel in this script. He says, "On this day, 115 families searching for clothing for their infants and food for their tables. Among them, Corporal Victor Miller and his wife, Deborah."

Corporal Victor Miller said, "We got lucky, we got a 10-pound ham."

Mr. Speaker, we have too many of our men and women in the military that are willing to die for this country on food stamps. It is absolutely unacceptable that this Congress will not do something about it.

Let me further quote Tom Jarriel: "Our men and women in service who carry the flag into battle, standing in line for a hand-out. It's a depressing reality. The reason—many in the military's lower enlisted ranks tell us they can barely support their families on government pay alone."

Mr. Speaker, I introduced several months ago House Resolution 1055. This would help our men and women in the military who are on food stamps with a small, modest \$500 tax credit. I believe sincerely that when we have men and women in the military that are willing to die for this country, and they are being deployed as frequently and as often as men and women are