

NOT VOTING—11

Boyd	Klink	Stark
Cook	Mascara	Tanner
Hinojosa	Myrick	Walden
John	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 PRO-
VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF
H.R. 2372, THE PRIVATE PROP-
ERTY 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 PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO PAKI-
STAN 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 res-

toration 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 FAMILI-
LIES 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 being deployed, that we in Congress, both Democrat and Republican, should not allow men and women in uniform to be on food stamps. We have roughly 60 percent of the men and women in the military who are married.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to say that I think that the Republican and House leadership should come together and pass legislation, whether it be this bill that I have introduced, H.R. 1055, which has 73 Members of the House, both Democrat and Republican, on that bill, but we need to speak during this session of Congress to those men and women in the military who are on food stamps, because I know when I speak to civic clubs in my district, when I speak to church groups in my district and I tell them that men and women in uniform are on food stamps, they cannot believe it. They say that it is deplorable and unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, this Marine that I have in this photograph before me is getting ready to deploy to Bosnia. The little daughter on his feet, her name is Megan. If you can see, she is looking very intently with a worried look on her face. She is only 3 years old. In his arms he has a 6-month-old baby named Brittany. The little girl, I know she does not know that her father is going to be gone for 6 months to Bosnia, but when I look in her face I am seeing a child that might not ever see that father again.

I say to the Members of Congress today, it is absolutely unacceptable that we have men and women in uniform on food stamps. I hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will talk to their leadership and say, let us look at the possibility of moving H.R. 1055, and if not that, then let us use that as a vehicle to speak to those on food stamps.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), who is on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. To add a little to this, when the gentleman says there are young men and women, those who are married, on food stamps, that is absolutely correct. There was testimony in our Committee on Armed Services the other day wherein the former Secretary of Defense, Bill Perry, who is highly respected, regardless of the political party, testified to us that this year's budget, in addition to the budget recommended by the administration, this year's budget on modernization, which of course includes procurement, research, development, and spare parts, should be \$10 to \$20 billion in addition to what has been recommended.

There is also a matter of health care, which I know we are all looking at. I testified before the Committee on the Budget the other day suggesting very strongly that there be an additional \$10 billion for modernization and \$2 billion for health care for military retirees and for the active duty and their families, which of course might very well help in the picture that the gentleman now holds.

This is terribly important that we treat the young men and women fairly. It is a morale problem. We can have the finest barracks in the world, the finest places to work in the world, but if we do not have spare parts to fix the helicopters and trucks, it is a terrible morale problem. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman. I want to say that the gentleman is one of the leaders in this Congress, and I appreciate the support that the gentleman gives our men and women in uniform.

THE PRESIDENT'S UPCOMING VISIT TO PAKISTAN

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor this afternoon to bring attention to the situation in the State of Pakistan. President Clinton has decided to include a stop in Pakistan during his upcoming tour to India and other parts of South Asia.

I do not agree with that decision to go to Pakistan. I do not believe it is right to reward this military government, which forcefully seized power from a democratically-elected government, with such a high level visit.

Pakistan has undergone political upheaval during most of its 52-year history. The military has overthrown the democratically-elected government four times, the latest being in November of last year. General Pervez Musharraf joined a long list of Pakistani generals who have usurped power in the unstable history of Pakistan. But unlike his three predecessors, General Musharraf has not laid out a plan to return to democracy.

He has said he will not allow a democratically-elected government to come to power unless there are major and deep-seated institutional reforms in place. However, he has not acted to institute any of the changes that would help Pakistan's government meet these rather vague requirements. As far as I am aware, he has only instituted minor revenue reforms.

Minor revenue reform is not what Pakistan needs. The Pakistani economy has all but collapsed. The judiciary is operating under loyalty oaths. A small upper class has a stranglehold on land and water, and the military and intelligence services have carte blanche to fly in the face of international law. Pakistan needs major overhauls of its institutions, not minor tax reforms.

Pakistan spends 50 percent of its budget on debt service and 40 percent of its budget on the military. That ratio is stunning. It is particularly alarming when we consider that Pakistan now has nuclear weapons. Economic growth is less than 2 percent, and foreign investment is almost nonexistent.

If the President or the general has not demonstrated his desire to invoke real reforms, it is hard for me to understand why we should go there. If he did, he would tax, for the first time ever, the agricultural sector. This sector contributes 25 percent of the Pakistani GDP, and employs 60 percent of the population, but the general is unwilling to take any steps that would anger the feudal landlords who run Pakistan.

The Constitution and the rule of law have been suspended in Pakistan. The