

Washington (Mr. INSLEE) made about the cost and some of the choices involved. It is interesting, business leaders throughout this country have come together and agreed with a lot of the items we have talked about tonight, agreed with the importance of education, the importance of job training, the importance of investment in research and development, the importance of another item we have not talked about, which is an investment in infrastructure, a building of roads and improving our energy system so that we can have a sustainable strong economy; and they know we need to do those things, and they consistently advocate for them and I appreciate that support.

But it is also tied into the issue of how do we pay for these things, and as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) pointed out, the tax cut choice. We have heard a lot already in this campaign about taxes and tax cuts; and the general approach of the President and his party is that, look, any tax cut there is has to be lower, anyone who is for higher taxes is by definition not worth being elected, but we have to take a step back and look at this in terms of choices, and take a look at those issues that I just talked about, the business leaders and many Republicans say they support, funding for education, funding for job training, funding for infrastructure.

There is the little problem of paying for these things, and we have to look at the choice that is being presented. The President wants to make his tax cut permanent, all of his tax cut, including the portion of that tax cut which is a pretty substantial portion of it that goes to people making over \$200,000 a year, also the portions of the tax cut that go to people who are paid dividends; and, yes, I know average Americans earn some dividends, too. If you look at the percentage of where dividend income goes, it goes almost entirely, 75 to 80 to 90 percent, to people again making a great deal of money; and I understand the philosophy behind that, give these people money, they will invest and everything will be fine.

It has not quite worked over the course of the last 3 years at this point, but more importantly it is a matter of choices. If the business community, other folks out there, want us to make that investment in education, job training and research and infrastructure, there has got to be some money left somewhere to do that; and when we are sitting here with an over-\$400 billion deficit due this year to pile on top of a \$7 trillion debt, to say that we are going to make the tax cuts permanent at the cost of somewhere around 2 to \$3 trillion, over the course of the 10-year period, and still make these investments in our workers, an investment in our economy, it does not add up.

It is a matter of choices, what is the best investment of that money. Is it really best to make sure that the top tax rate for people who make, it is

about \$250,000 before you hit that top tax rate, goes down from 39 to 35 percent? It goes down to 4, I guess, critical percentage points. Or is it best to take some of that money to get us back towards fiscal responsibility and to get us back towards making an investment in our workers that they can fairly compete? Looked at in that context, I think it is a pretty obvious choice; and I hope that we will make those choices.

We absolutely need tax cuts. Senator KERRY supports a number of tax cuts targeted to the middle class, the child tax credit, elimination of the marriage tax penalty, a number of different issues; but, absolutely, we have got to give those tax cuts to hardworking Americans.

When you look at the total package of tax cuts, these are some choices we can make to better invest in our workers and better invest in our country. We hope that we can make those choices so that we can deal with the challenges we face from outsourcing, from offshore, so that American workers can have that level playing field, can have that opportunity to grow our economy and to benefit from that growth.

I thank you very much for the time.

#### PAKISTAN NAMED MAJOR NON-NATO ALLY

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the House floor this evening to discuss Pakistan's recent designation as a major non-NATO ally.

Last week, Secretary of State Colin Powell visited India and Pakistan to support the efforts that have been made by both nations to seek peace. For the first time in decades, relations between India and Pakistan were easing; and as a result, confidence-building measures were being established, such as transportation across the border and cricket games between the two countries.

Although both countries are on a slow, yet steady, path for improved economic defense and political relations, unfortunately that balance has been damaged, in my opinion, by the Bush administration's favorable treatment of Pakistan in naming it a major non-NATO ally.

Mr. Speaker, although we have advocated for the U.S. to view India and Pakistan as two separate, distinct nations, at the same time we have advocated for fair treatment based on record of democracy, commitment to ending terrorism, and a variety of values important to the United States. India is a strong, vibrant democracy of over 50 years, and Pakistan is a rogue nation under military rule. India's nuclear program is civilian controlled, and Pakistan's nuclear program was sold to nations such as Libya, Iran, and

North Korea to assist illegal, covert nuclear weapons programs. India is protecting its citizens from terrorism in Kashmir, and Pakistan has sponsored terrorist activity in its own backyard.

It seems clear that the U.S. and India are natural allies based on our shared values. The reason why the U.S. and Pakistan are now allies is a result of the shared effort to end global terrorism. However, based on all the reasons I just stated above, I am taken aback by the new designation that the U.S. has bestowed upon Pakistan as a major non-NATO ally. Not only was I surprised, but India as a nation was surprised as well. Secretary Powell had just met with India's leaders, but he did not mention the new status of Pakistan that was soon to be announced.

Naming Pakistan a major non-NATO ally is completely inconsistent with U.S. policies. Pakistan is not a democratic nation. Pakistan supports terrorism in Kashmir, and Pakistan has engaged in nuclear activity for which it has recently pardoned a key scientist who aided covert nuclear programs to rogue nations. The result of this new designation, I think, has the potential to be devastating.

Not only was India surprised and disappointed, but further, Pakistan's new role will lead to severe implications in the South Asia region. It is unclear what the title "major non-NATO ally" means and what it means in legal terms, but the most immediate concern is that a rapid and large-scale supply of American military equipment could flow from the United States to Pakistan, including the possibility of F-16s. In accordance with the Pressler amendment of 1990, Pakistan was not afforded major military supplies until post-9/11, in which case specific counterterrorism supplies had been provided.

But this is very concerning because U.S. military supplies given to Pakistan for use against Russia and China have been historically used against India. Given the current climate of the conflict between India and Pakistan over Kashmir, any additional weapons provided to Pakistan will likely be used to escalate this conflict between the two nations and has the potential to build up a full-scale arms war.

In addition, this new designation has the impetus for breaking down negotiations in peace talks between the two nations that have just gotten underway. Pakistan's newly established access to U.S. military supplies could serve as an impediment to any further Indo-Pakistani talks.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why the U.S. has afforded Pakistan this major non-NATO ally status. Pakistan has a history of abusing military and nuclear equipment, and yet we are allowing them to have access to depleted uranium ammunition, special privilege in bidding for certain U.S. Government contracts, radar systems, attack helicopters, and airborne early warning systems.

In exchange for Pakistan's assistance to the U.S. in the war against terrorism, the U.S. has already allocated \$3 billion worth of assistance, half of which is directed toward Pakistan to buy military equipment from the United States. The Bush administration must reevaluate their policies towards Pakistan. The new designation of major non-NATO ally is unfair, inappropriate and, most importantly, in my opinion, dangerous given the volatile nature of the South Asia region.

#### FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in this country, in this city, sometimes the American media just does not get it. Tonight I rise to lay in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and for the American people two stories that have not gotten the attention they deserve regarding foreign policy and regarding the actions of two nations in two regions that are extremely important to the security of America and the world.

The first, Mr. Speaker, involves Serbia. Mr. Speaker, this nation went to war and for the first and only time convinced our NATO allies to use NATO as an offensive military entity to invade a non-NATO country in 1999 to remove a sitting head of state, Milosevic, from office for war crimes for which he is now being tried.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight not to question whether or not Milosevic committed war crimes. I am convinced that he did, that he committed ethnic cleansing and that he did unthinkable harm to individual people in the former Yugoslavia.

He is now being held accountable for his actions in a trial that has been going on for several years; but, Mr. Speaker, we cannot have a double standard, and this is what we have today, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2215

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when we invaded Serbia and we went in with our military and the NATO military, I did not support the President's actions, as did many of our colleagues in this body. Not because I felt support for Milosevic, but because I was convinced we had not allowed Russia to play the role that they could have and should have played in getting Milosevic to agree to the terms that the NATO and other nations wanted after the meetings at Rambouillet, and I said so publicly. It was not that those of us who opposed President Clinton supported Milosevic, but rather that we thought there was a better way that would have avoided the kind of atrocities that were committed by our own bombing in Belgrade and other cities in the former Yugoslavia. But the fact is that we did bomb that country, and we continued it for a matter of weeks.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I was the one who assembled a delegation of 10 of our colleagues and myself, five Democrats, all supporters of President Clinton, and five Republicans to travel to Vienna after having discussed with Strobe Talbot, the number two person at the State Department, the offer of the Russians to me to help Russia play a role in resolving the crisis in Yugoslavia on the terms that the U.S. and NATO wanted. I also, Mr. Speaker, had access to a memo that had been prepared secretly by Strobe Talbot, which was briefed to both Sandy Berger and Vice President Gore. So I knew what the policy of the U.S. was with regard to Russia's involvement. And I also knew full well that we were not giving Russia the opportunity to play the kind of constructive role that it could have and should have.

Our meetings in Vienna with five Russian leaders and 11 American leaders resulted, over 2 days, in a framework that allowed the Russians and the Americans to come to an agreement and to agree concurrently that Milosevic had committed ethnic cleansing; that the armed Serbs should be withdrawn from Kosovo; that there should be a multinational force brought in. All of those conditions were what basically the Russians, when they were finally brought in several weeks later, were able to bring to the table to help us end that war.

Now, we were told, Mr. Speaker, that the ending of the war would end the ethnic cleansing. And, boy, were we wrong. The media blasted headlines all over the world with Milosevic's actions, and they still blast the actions of this war criminal and his ethnic cleansing. Where is the media today, Mr. Speaker? Where are the front-page stories in our major newspapers about the ethnic cleansing that took place aimed specifically at Serbs in the last week?

On the March 17, Mr. Speaker, a massive campaign of ethnic violence was carried out against Kosovo Serbs and other non-Albanians that continued for several days. These efforts were carefully planned, orchestrated, and coordinated by the leadership structures of the Kosovo Albanians, and they are unacceptable. Mr. Speaker, the estimates are that tens of thousands of Kosovo Albanians participated in the pogrom which resulted in the destruction of 90 percent of Kosovo's remaining predominantly Serb areas.

Mr. Speaker, 800-year-old churches and monasteries were destroyed. In total, 35 Christian holy sites were decimated. And even though they attempted to avoid personal atrocities against individuals, 31 Serbs were killed. Where is the outrage, Mr. Speaker? Where is the outrage that we saw from President Clinton in 1999 and Madeleine Albright? I have not seen former President Clinton or Madeleine Albright giving speeches today about the ethnic cleansing that was conducted against innocent Serbs, that

were supposedly going to have their freedom and their own safety protected by the U.N. forces, including Americans working in Kosovo. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this entire incident needs the full attention of this Congress, this government and the United Nations, as well as NATO.

There have been suggestions, Mr. Speaker, that there are ties between what occurred beginning on March 17 with al Qaeda, Hamas, the Albanian National Army, and Abu Bakr Sadik, among others. These ties need to be investigated fully. The campaign of ethnic cleansing that just took place against Serbs was conducted in such a way as to result in a little loss of life, although 31 people is significant, but with maximum material and psychological damage.

Why would that take place, Mr. Speaker? Because at a time when America and the world's attention is focused on Iraq and Afghanistan and other parts of the world, there are those with the ties to the groups I just mentioned who saw an opportunity to ethnically cleanse Kosovo, so that at some point in time down the road the position could be made that this nation no longer really has a significant Serbian population.

Mr. Speaker, where is the outrage from America? Where is the story from the American media about what happened in Serbia or in Kosovo last week? Are not the deaths of 31 innocent civilians, is not the burning of major religious institutions a story that deserves national focus in this country? We went to war, Mr. Speaker, in 1999. We went to war, and in fact we used NATO for the first and only time ever in an offensive military mode to remove Milosevic because of ethnic cleansing. Where is our outrage today with the ethnic cleansing that occurred last week against innocent Serbs? The attacks continued unabated for several days. In fact, in some cases they got worse as the attackers went in to all the Serbian enclaves.

Where was the protection that these people were guaranteed when the war ended and President Clinton told us that we had been able to rid the world of a dictator who had committed ethnic cleansing? Where was the protection for the destruction not just of the churches but of the electrical grid system and the damage to the mobile phone relay stations? Where was the protection for the Serbs, the Kosovo Serbs who attempted to seek shelter in churches and monasteries, but were prevented from being able to do so because those very churches and monasteries were the explicit objects of attack?

The estimates are, Mr. Speaker, that as many as 50,000 Kosovo Albanians were involved in this action. Is the world going to sit by and allow this kind of atrocity to occur? Is America going to pass some modest resolution that calls ethnic cleansing wrong? We did not do that in 1999, Mr. Speaker,