

United States. It is imperative that the administration uphold these important trade laws at the upcoming WTO Seattle Round. It is this conference that will launch a new round of trade negotiations. It is said that these talks will focus on reshaping WTO rules regarding agriculture, services and intellectual property. However, the concern of those of us here this morning is that other issues may surface on the agenda.

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming clear that a number of foreign countries are seeking to expand the agenda allowing for debate on WTO's antidumping and countervailing duty laws. This effort must be stopped. This is why the MUST law is so important, because its passage will allow the administration to attend the Seattle negotiations with a unified statement from the Congress declaring that the United States must not agree to reopen negotiations on any of these antidumping and countervailing duty laws.

The MUST law resolution will call upon the President to not participate in any international negotiation in which antidumping rules are a part of the negotiation agenda. Further, it will insist that he refrain from submitting for congressional approval any agreements that require changes to the current antidumping and countervailing duty laws and enforcement policies of the United States, and that our government must vigorously enforce these laws in all pending and future cases. This is the type of direction that we must insist upon.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a district from western Pennsylvania. It is the heart of steel country. In fact, I was born and raised there, so believe me I know that area pretty well. Because of that, I have been very involved in attempting to mitigate our ongoing steel crisis, and I am sure some people might see me speaking here this morning and think that this is just another steel issue again. Nothing could be further from the truth though. This is not just about steel. Instead, as I stated earlier in my remarks, it is about all American industry production and workers.

It could be agricultural products ranging from raspberries to rice to chilled Atlantic salmon, or industrial products like dry-cleaning machinery, brake rotors, or roofing nails, manufacturing materials such as silicon metal or uranium, or even electronic products like color television receivers or cellular telephones. All of these products and hundreds more are protected by the antidumping and countervailing duty laws.

This is why we need everyone to join with us and insist that our administration hold firm on this issue when those talks kick off in Seattle.

We have an obligation to protect our American workers and producers from unfair foreign trade practices. It is an old line but it still rings true: We can have free trade, but only if it is fair trade. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker,

I add my voice to urging the House leadership to bring the MUST law resolution to the floor as soon as possible.

H. RES. 298: A VALUABLE TOOL TO PROTECT AMERICAN WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I and over 200 of my colleagues are cosponsors of House Resolution 298. The Seattle discussions on international trade will begin on November 30. Unfortunately, some nations wish to circumvent the agreed upon list of topics and reopen the very contentious issue of World Trade Organization rules against dumping and against subsidies.

In the U.S. we already make our workers compete against foreign workers whose governments do not enforce the same standards on wages, on environmental protection, safety laws, and legal protections. Furthermore, we have flung open the doors of the American market. Let us not kid ourselves. Foreign governments will respect the U.S. worker only to the extent that the U.S. Government forces them to.

In these trade talks there is nothing left to give away except competitive, productive American jobs and that is unacceptable. Some in this body would define free trade by actions that amount to unilateral economic disarmament. Yet I would point out that every Member of Congress whose State benefits from a manufacturing plant built by a foreign company and employing U.S. workers owes a debt to President Ronald Reagan who knew how to get tough on trade when necessary.

If a foreign trade negotiator in Seattle proposes weakening U.S. laws, our administration officials need to say we will discuss nothing until they put that proposal back in their folder.

The passage of this resolution will be a valuable tool for the administration to protect American workers at these talks. I urge the House leadership to put H. Res. 298 on the schedule as soon as possible.

IN SUPPORT OF H. RES. 298, THE "MUST" LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MASCARA) is recognized during morning hour debates for 4 minutes.

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Speaker, in November, representatives from across the globe arrive in Seattle to negotiate changes in the international trade agreements of the World Trade Organization, the WTO.

Trade has worked well for our country. We sell 30 percent of our agricultural products to foreign trading part-

ners. In fact in Pennsylvania, my home State, \$16 billion of farm products are exported annually.

Our country relies on its ability to trade. And while I generally support free trade, I also insist upon fair trade. If other countries can produce products cheaper than we can without abusing its workers and without breaking international trade laws, so be it. They have every right to access our markets. But a successful global economy depends upon a level playing field. Everyone must play by the same rules: Rules against illegal subsidies, rules against illegal dumping, and rules against discrimination.

Unfortunately, there have been a number of recent trade violations that our country has had to respond to. They include illegal steel dumping, bans on U.S. beef and bananas and other products. Our airlines and aviation manufacturers have been discriminated against and the Congress continues to deal with these inequities and justifiably so. Fortunately, we can respond to these violations because we have strong American antidumping and antisubsidy laws. These laws conform to the WTO laws and provide our only means to fight this illegal trade. They are our trading Bill of Rights. Without them we would be defenseless.

Yet, the WTO agenda in Seattle includes an item that might strip away these very rights. That is, denying our ability to deal with these illegal trade activities.

Mr. Speaker for this reason, the House must bring House Resolution 298 to the floor. We must let the world know that we will not stand for foreign interference with our trade laws. Our country is the bedrock of global trade. We should not permit our trading partners to strip away our rights to free trade. We must insist that the WTO provide language that protects us against unfair trade and illegal dumping.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Visclosky-Ney resolution, House Resolution 298.

THE COUP IN PAKISTAN AND THE IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING THE PRESSLER AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 3 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation to prevent the administration from waiving the Pressler amendment, a provision of law which prohibits U.S. military assistance to Pakistan. I would like to take this opportunity to urge my colleagues to join me in this initiative. While I have offered this legislation as a free-standing bill, I am also looking into other legislative vehicles that my proposal could be attached to.

Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 2000 Defense Appropriations Conference Report approved by the House last week

contains provisions giving the President broad waiver authority over several sanctions against India and Pakistan, including the Pressler amendment. There are indications that the President will veto this bill, although for unrelated reasons.

The intent of my legislation is essentially to return to the status quo on the Pressler amendment. It is my hope that last week's military coup in Pakistan, which certainly is very regrettable, may help to refocus congressional attention to the danger of the giving military aid to Pakistan and result in renewed congressional support for retaining the Pressler amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I have long supported lifting the economic sanctions against India and Pakistan, which is also accomplished in the Defense Appropriations Conference Report.

I also want to thank the conferees for another positive provision: a Sense of the Congress Resolution that the broad application of export controls to nearly 300 Indian and Pakistani entities listed on the so-called "Entities List" adopted by the Bureau of Export Administration (BXA) should be applied only to those entities that make "direct and material contributions" to weapons of mass destruction and missile programs and only to those items that so contribute.

But I am concerned that other provisions in the conference report could result in renewal of U.S. arms transfers to Pakistan, a government that has engaged in an ongoing pattern of hostile and destabilizing actions. Indeed, keeping the Pressler amendment on the books is the best way to accomplish the goal behind the entities list: Namely for the United States not to contribute to Pakistan's drive to develop or acquire weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, it does not make sense to apply sanctions against commercial entities that have barely a passing relationship with weapons programs while waiving the Pressler amendment and thereby allowing for direct transfer of military technology.

It has been widely reported, Mr. Speaker, last week that the Pakistani Army Chief of Staff led a military coup against the civilian government. Ironically, we have seen several recent efforts from Pakistan to win concessions from the U.S. as a means of propping up Prime Minister Sharif's government and forestalling a military coup. These include the ill-advised attempts to have a special mediator appointed for the Kashmir conflict as well as efforts to reopen the supply of U.S. military equipment to Pakistan. But in light of the latest Pakistani coup, the futility of the strategy is apparent.

The Pressler amendment, named for the former Senator from South Dakota, was invoked by President Bush in response to Pakistan's weapons development program. It was good law when it was first adopted and it is still good law today. Earlier this year we were reminded about why the Pressler amendment was needed because of the way

Pakistan instigated the hostilities in the Kargil region of Kashmir. In fact, it was the same generals who masterminded last week's coup who pressed for the disastrous military campaign in Kashmir, and we are continually confronted with evidence of Pakistani involvement in nuclear weapons and missile proliferation in other hostile or unstable regions. Last week's coup only further reminds us of the danger of renewing U.S. military ties with Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to register my concern over recent published reports attributing to State Department officials the suggestion that a resumption of arms supplies to Pakistan would be considered as an incentive for the return to civilian rule. On this point I want to reiterate that the purpose of the legislation I have introduced is to make sure that this administration and future administrations do not provide arms to Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday The New York Times columnist, A.M. Rosenthal, who once covered South Asia, wrote a column called "The Himalayan Error." He focused on something I have often criticized, namely the pronounced tilt toward Pakistan in U.S. foreign policy. This tilt has resulted in neither democracy for Pakistan nor stability for the region.

On Sunday, another New York Times op-ed writer, Steven R. Weisman, wrote an article entitled, "Pakistan's Dangerous Addiction to Its Military." And quoting from that piece, "[A] major reason Pakistan has such a stunted political tradition compared with India is that the Army has run the country for nearly half of its short history."

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. obviously cannot bring about democracy in Pakistan or change the Pakistanis' international behavior overnight, but we can avoid the policies that encourage Pakistan's military leaders to seize power, to foment instability in South Asia, to threaten their neighbors and to collaborate with other unstable regimes in the development and transfer of weapons of mass destruction. Clearly, reopening the American arms pipeline to Pakistan would be a disastrous mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I include those two New York Times articles for the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 15, 1999]

THE HIMALAYAN ERROR
(By A.M. Rosenthal)

Ever since their independence, the U.S. has made decisions about India and Pakistan fully aware that it was dealing with countries that would have increasing political and military significance, for international good or evil.

Now that both have nuclear arms capability and Pakistan has been taken over again by the hard-wing military, the American Government and people stare at them as if they were creatures that had suddenly popped out of nowhere—and as if their crises had no connection at all to those 50 years of American involvement in the India-Pakistan subcontinent.

The destiny of the two countries—war or peace, democracy or despotism—lies with

their billion-plus people, their needs and passions.

But American decision-making about them has been of Himalayan importance—because from the beginning it was almost entirely based on a great error. America chose Pakistan as more important to its interests than India.

Both countries have a powerful sliver of their population who are plain villains—politicians who deliberately splinter their society instead of knitting it, men of immense wealth who zealously evade taxes and the public good, religious bottom-feeders who spread violence between Hindu and Muslim in India and Muslim and Muslim in Pakistan.

But living for about four years as a New York Times correspondent based in India and traveling often in Pakistan, I knew that the American error was widening and catastrophic.

Although there were important mavericks, American officialdom clearly tilted toward Pakistan, knighted it a military ally and looked with contempt or condescension on India. Pakistan—a country whose leadership provided a virtually unbroken record of economic, social and military failure and increasing influence of Islamicists.

Many U.S. officials preferred to deal with the Pakistanis over the Indians not despite Pakistan's tendency to militarism but because of it. Man, the military fellows can get things done for you.

Washington saw the country as some kind of barrier-post against China, which it never was, and against Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The Pakistanis did their part there. But when the Taliban fanatics seized Afghanistan, Pakistan's military helped them pass arms for terrorists to the Mideast.

Pakistan's weakness as an American ally, though Washington never seemed to mind, was its leaders refusal to create continuity of democratic governments long enough to convince Pakistanis that the military would not take over again tomorrow.

Across the border, India, for all its slowness of economic growth and its caste system, showed what the U.S. is supposed to want—consistent faithfulness to elected democracy. Where Pakistan failed to maintain political democracy in a one-religion nation, India has kept it in a Hindu-majority country that has four other large religions and a garden of small ones.

Danger sign: The newly re-elected Hindu-led coalition will have to clamp down harder against any religious persecution of Muslims and Christians. India's real friends will never lessen pressure against that. And the new government is not likely to stay in office long if it does not fulfill its anti-persecution promises to several parties in the coalition.

No, the U.S. did not itself create a militaristic Pakistan. But by showing for years that it did not care much, it encouraged Pakistan officers prowling for power, lessened the public's confidence in democratic government when Pakistan happened to have one and slighted the Indians' constancy to democratic elections.

In 1961, in the U.S. Embassy in Seoul, I heard the ranking U.S. diplomat urge Washington not to recognize the military gang that had just taken over South Korea after ousting the country's first elected government in its history.

But the Kennedy Administration did recognize the military government. That throttled South Koreans with military regimes for almost another two decades.

The Clinton Administration is doing what America should: demand the departure of the generals. Maybe America still has enough influence to be of use to democracy some place or other in Asia. It's the least it can do for

its colossal error on the subcontinent—do for Indians, but mostly for Pakistanis.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 16, 1999]
PAKISTAN'S DANGEROUS ADDICTION TO ITS
MILITARY

(By Steven R. Weisman)

It is always tempting to see Pakistan as an artificial country carved painfully out of the remnants of the British empire, a place of such virulent sectarian hatreds and corrupt leadership that only the military can hope to govern it successfully. That view has returned now that Pakistan has suffered its fourth military coup in 52 turbulent years as a nation. Even some Pakistanis who believe in democracy but were opposed to Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif welcomed military intervention to change regimes.

But if a country is unruly, having generals rule is no solution. Pakistan's last military regime, which lasted from 1977 to 1988, was a useful ally, particularly in opposing the Russians in neighboring Afghanistan. But by crushing dissent, tolerating corruption and having no accountability for 11 years, the military lost credibility among Pakistanis and was eventually overwhelmed by the nation's problems.

Last spring, Pakistan's generals got the disastrous idea of sending forces into Indian territory to occupy the mountains of the disputed state of Kashmir. Indian guns and planes were driving the intruders out, and under American pressure Mr. Sharif wisely agreed to arrange for a facesaving withdrawal. Now the generals, unhappy with Mr. Sharif's retreat, have seized power, suspended the Constitution and imposed martial law, despite the absence of any threats of turmoil in the streets.

Imagine what might have happened in Kashmir had Mr. Sharif's withdrawal agreement not prevailed. The military might well have retaliated by bombing India's artillery positions, a step that probably would have forced Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee to listen to his generals and invade Pakistan. These escalations could very easily have spiraled into a nuclear exchange.

As a nation, Pakistan always had a shaky foundation. Its name, which means "land of the pure," is drawn from some of its constituent ethnic groups. The Bengalis of East Pakistan broke off in 1971 to become Bangladesh, and the other groups have been squabbling since. Islam is not the unifying ideology that Pakistan's founders hoped it could be.

One problem is that the original building blocks of Pakistani society—the clergy, the military and the wealthy feudal lords who owned most of the land—have fractured. Today the military is split into secular and Islamic camps. The landlords' power has flowed to a newly wealthy business class represented by Mr. Sharif. The clergy is split into factions, some of which are allied with Saudi Arabia, Iran, the terrorist Osama bin Laden, the Taliban in Afghanistan and others. Corruption, poverty, guns and drugs have turned these elements into an explosive mix.

To revive the idea of religion as the glue holding the country together, Pakistani leaders have promised many times to enforce Islamic law. But they have never been able to implement these promises because most Pakistanis are not doctrinaire in their approach to religion. Alternatively, the nation's leaders have seized on the jihad to "liberate" fellow Muslims in Kashmir, India's only Muslim-dominated state.

"The Pakistani army generals are trying to convince themselves that defeat in Kashmir was snatched from the jaws of victory by Sharif and his stupid diplomats," said Mi-

chael Krepon, president of the Henry L. Stimson Center. "This theory recurs in Pakistani history, and it is very dangerous."

In his address to the nation, Gen. Pervez Musharraf, the army chief of staff who "dismissed" Mr. Sharif, spoke of the military as "the last remaining viable institution" of Pakistan. But by imposing martial law, he has embarked on a well-trod Pakistani path toward ruining that reputation. Without question, Mr. Sharif blundered in cracking down on dissent, trying to dismiss General Musharraf and relying on cronies and family members for advice. Some Indians like the writer M.J. Akbar, editor of *The Asian Age*, say that it might be easier to make a deal with Pakistan's generals now that they are overtly in charge, rather than manipulating things behind the scenes. But a major reason Pakistan has such a stunned political tradition, compared with India, is that the army has run the country for nearly half its short history. The question remains: If Pakistanis are not capable of governing themselves, why would Pakistanis wearing uniforms be any different?

FASTER INTERNET SERVICE THROUGH GREATER CHOICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 1 minute.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, Internet use and access is booming and competition among Internet service providers is finally beginning to offer consumers real choices. These developments make on-line communication easier, cheaper, and more reliable.

Unfortunately, consumers have not yet fully realized the benefits of increased competition as was predicted with the passage of the Telecommunications Act. One way to give consumers these benefits is to let our local telephone companies enter into Internet competition.

Permitting the Baby Bells to compete in Internet service will spur investment in technology by giving companies the incentive to upgrade their networks.

Consumers will benefit by receiving faster Internet service through a greater choice of providers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to consider legislation to give Internet consumers more access to the Internet.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 37 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

Rabbi Raphael Gold, Savannah, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we pray that Thou mayest endow this august body, the duly elected representatives of the people of these United States, with the power of wisdom which comes from Thee.

In these perilous times, we pray, O Lord, that Thy qualities of mercy endure now and forever in the hearts of this Congress. Infuse them with Thy spirit of compassion, understanding, and Thy spirit of holiness, that they may fulfill their charge. May they speedily address the problems of poverty, hunger and homelessness which afflict such a large segment of this Nation and the world.

May this great land of ours, blessed by God with the resources, both spiritual and material, realize its potential with which it has been created. May all the differences which deflect from the realization of our goals be set aside, so that peace and prosperity, truth and justice, freedom and equality be the heritage and legacy of all peoples, both here and abroad.

May the Members of the Congress, and all Americans, rise to the fulfillment of the motto engraved on our coinage, *e pluribus unum*, that we are one people, created in the image of God, responsible for each other's well-being, so that we might truly dedicate our lives to the words which appear above us, "In God We Trust," and may he always be the guiding light of this Congress. And let us all say, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. 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. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this vote will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.