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 judiciary is in turmoil. Defense attorneys are being gunned down, and judges are being forced to acquiesce to oaths of personal fealty to the strongman general. The total lack of justice as evidenced by the fate of Nawaz Sharif, the man who was elected by the people of Pakistan and overthrown by Musharraf.

In a recent interview by the Washington Post and Newsweek, Musharraf was asked why Sharif was on trial for attempted murder and hijacking, not just corruption. Musharraf answered, ''Because he did do that.'' His guilt was not decided in a court of law, it was an edict from a military leader. Nawaz Sharif will be found guilty and executed in accordance with the general's law.

The degradation of the rule of law in Pakistan defies the sensibilities of the world, and contradicts the definition of a modern Nation State. If Pakistan is to take its rightful place in the community of nations, Pakistan must reestablish the judicial process.

With the rule of law suspended, Pakistan's military and intelligence service, the ISI, has conducted illegal operations that are inciting violence and tension in South Asia. Musharraf said in the interview that he has total control over the intelligence service, and that they are not involved in terrorist activities. This contradicts what is commonly reported in the world media and Musharraf's previous statements about the ISI activities in Kashmir.

I ask Members again, how can Pakistan take its place in the world community if it constantly allows its services to defy international law by conducting military and terrorist activities? That is why I am concerned about the President's visit. Many experts have said that the Pakistani general hopes to use Mr. Clinton's trip to persuade the United States of what Musharraf calls ''the righteousness of Pakistan's position on Kashmir.''

I call upon President Clinton to refrain from any involvement in the Kashmir dispute until both sides ask for our help. Instead, Mr. Clinton should put aside the gentle language of diplomacy and use this opportunity to demand that Pakistan move without pause towards full and fair elections.

Pakistan is a sick state. Democratic elections will not cure what ails Pakistan. However, the healing process cannot begin without them.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ADDRESSING THE ISSUE OF H1B VISAS

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I joined a number of colleagues this morning, some of whom will be speaking here this afternoon, about the importance of addressing the issue of H1B visas.

As I visit with local business leaders in central Texas, I know that the number one high technology issue in our community, and I think across this country, is work force development, the fact that we could have and do have already some serious shortages of skilled workers that can slow down the expansion that has fueled our economic growth throughout the country.

From offices regularly assisting our local high-tech companies in securing H1B visas, I also know that this is one of the answers that can assist us in addressing this worker shortage.

One of the reasons that central Texas prospers is that we live the lyrics of a great Lyle Lovett song: Oh, no, you are not from Texas, but Texas wants you anyway. And it is because we have been able to reach out and bring the best and brightest, not only from all over the country but from all over the world, that we have been able to keep our high-tech economy booming.

I support this bipartisan effort to get increases in the number of visas for highly-skilled high-tech workers to address this problem of worker shortage. It is a stopgap measure, however. We are only at March and we are already running out of the H1B visas. We need to solve the problem for our high-tech companies now, but we need to realize that this is not a permanent solution.

That is why this legislation also increases the fees for getting these visas, and then will plow that money back into developing our domestic work force and helping our teachers and our young people pursue careers in technology.

I believe that it is important also that we not only focus on the amount or the number of visas, or the amount of the money that will be charged to get them, but on the entire system that the Immigration Service and the Department of Labor use in addressing this issue.

I find it a system that is so plagued with bureaucracy that it is almost a daily problem for my office in Austin, as well as for the many companies with whom we work. It is time that that bureaucracy move into the electronic age in which our businesses operate at present.

□ 1630

So a principal focus of this bill is to see that the Immigration Service and the Department of Labor recognize that many people search for jobs now over the Internet and recognize those postings to fulfill the statutory requirements, and that we move to a system where one can file for an application on-line, where one can track an application on-line, and we reduce the level of bureaucracy in this entire process.

I am pleased to join in this bipartisan effort. I believe that it will be successful. There is already some legislation moving in the Senate. The White House has recently announced an interest in this topic. With good bipartisan support here, there is no reason that we should not be able to act and fulfill this very definite need in the very near future.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

H–1B VISAS

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise also to talk about the H–1B visa issue. I think it is of critical importance that we expand those visas. But that is only part of the solution to that problem.

The bill we introduced this morning that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) referenced has a package of ideas that I think will help deal with the larger issue, which is basically filling the high-tech jobs that we have a crushing need for in this country.

If we talk to any tech business, they will tell us their number one biggest concern is finding the people to do the work that they have to be done. We have to understand that the technology sector of our technology is the faster growing sector out there. It is generating jobs and generating a strong economy. If we can find the scientists and the engineers and the biologists to fill these jobs, we could grow our economy even more and secure our economic future. We need the people to fill these jobs.

The H–1B visa bill that we introduced this morning attacks this in two different directions. One, we go out and try to attract the best and the brightest from around the world. That is just common sense. Why would not we want the best, brightest, and most capable minds in the world here in the U.S., growing our economy and generating jobs for us. We need to expand those numbers and bring those folks in.

But we also increase the fee for those H–1B visas and will, therefore, generate $200 million in money to invest in educating our own population to fill those jobs as well. Because this is a long-term problem. Bringing in people from other countries is a short-term solution. We heed to educate our own workforce so that they want to be scientists and engineers and have access to those jobs so they start filling them as well.

This is absolutely critical to the future of our economy. I think we should support this bill in the House and in the Senate and hopefully move forward with our economic situation so that we can fill those jobs that need to be filled.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be joining the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and a number of other Members in the new Democrat coalition that are advancing a policy we think is very, very important, to allow the United States to maintain its relative advantage in terms of clearly being the leader in the world in technology.

This is absolutely critical for the United States, because when one looks at that technology sector, it is an area where we have created more jobs, where we have created more wealth, where we are creating more opportunities for our families.

What the H–1B legislation that we are introducing today is, in many ways, is going to ensure that the United States has the top 200,000 draft choices, the top 200,000 draft choices for the brightest, the most intelligent, the most capable engineers throughout the world.

We should feel fortunate as a country that these bright minds are interested in coming and investing their time and energy in creating jobs, in creating opportunities which are so important to the longer term future of this country.

We have also have made the commitment to ensure that we are investing in education and job training programs, which are going to ensure that we are developing the domestic talent that can eventually fill these positions.

We have come forth with a balanced approach, one which will continue to ensure that the United States is providing the leadership in the technology sector and also a commitment to provide up to $200 million, in education for