imperial age from a menace as multiform as the empire itself.''

The empire itself? Whose empire? In whose interests? Political analyst Craig B. Hulet, in his book titled ''Global Triage: Imperium in Imperio'' refers to this new global regime as Imperium in Imperio, or power within a power: a state within a state. His theory proposes that these new sovereigns are nothing short of this, and I quote him: ''They represent the power not of the natural persons which make up the nations' peoples, nor of their elected representatives, but the power of the legal paper-person recognized in law. The corporations themselves are, then, the new sovereigns.

And in their efforts to be treated in law as equals to the citizens of each separate state, they call this ''National Treatment,'' they would travel the sea; and wherever they land ashore, they would be citizens here and there. Not even the privateers of old would have dared to impose this will upon nation-states.

Can we claim to know today what this rapid progress of global transformation will portend for democracy here at home? We understand the great benefits of past progress. We are not Luddites here. We know what refrigeration can do for a child in a poor country; what clean water means to everyone everywhere; what free communications has already achieved. But are we going to unwittingly sacrifice our sovereignty on the altar of this new god, ''Progress''? Is it progress if a cannibal uses a knife and fork?

Can we claim to know today what this rapid progress of global transformation will portend for national sovereignty here at home? We protect our way of life, our children's future, our workers' jobs, our security at home by measures often not unlike our airports are protected from pistols on planes. But self-interested ideologies, private greed, and private powers' bad ideas escape our mental detectors.

We seem to be radically short of leadership where this active participation in the process of diffusing America's power over to and into the private global monopoly capitalist regime is today pursued without questioning its basis at all. An empire represented by not just the WTO, but clearly this new regime is the core ideological success for corporatism.

□ 1745

The only remaining step, according to Harvard Professor Paul Krugman, is the finalization of a completed Multilateral Agreement on Investments, which failed at OECD.

According to OECD, the agreement's actual success may come through, not a treaty this time, but arrangements within corporate governance itself, quietly being hashed out at the IMF and World Bank as well as OECD. We are not yet the United Corporations of America. Or are we?

The WTO needs to be scrutinized carefully, debated, hearings, and public participation where possible. I would say absolutely indispensable, full hearings.

We can, of course, as author Christopher Lasch notes, peer inward at ourselves as well when he argued, ''The history of the twentieth century suggests that totalitarian regimes are highly unstable, evolving toward some type of bureaucracy that fits near the classic fascist nor the socialist model.

None of this means that the future will be safe for democracy, only that the threat to democracy comes less from totalitarian or collective movements abroad than from the erosion of psychological, cultural, and spiritual foundations from within.''

Are we not witness to, though, the growth of a global bureaucracy being created not out of totalitarian or collectivist movements, but from the autocratic corporations which hold so many lives in their balance? And where shall we redress our grievances when the regime completes its global transformation? When the people of each Nation and their State find they can no longer identify their rulers, their true rulers? When it is no longer their State which rules?

The most recent U.N. Development Report documents how globalization has increased inequality between and within nations while bringing them together as never before.

Some are referring to this, Globalization's Dark Side, like Jay Mazur recently in Foreign Affairs. He said, ''A world in which the assets of the 200 richest people are greater than the combined income of the more than 2 billion people at the other end of the economic ladder should give everyone pause. Such islands of concentrated wealth in the sea of misery have historically been a prelude to upheaval. The vast majority of trade and investment takes place between industrial nations, dominated by global corporations that control a third of the world exports. Of the 100 largest economies of the world, 51 are corporations,'' just over half.

With further mergers and acquisitions in the future, with no end in sight, those of us that are awake must speak up now.

Or is it that we just cannot see at all, believing in our current speculative bubble, which nobody credible believes can be sustained for much longer, we missed the growing anger, fear and frustration of our people; believing in the myths our policy priests pass on, we missed the dissatisfaction of our workers; believing in the god ''progress,'' we have lost our vision.

Another warning, this time from Ethan Kapstein in his article ''Workers and the World Economy'' in Foreign Affairs, Vol. 75, No. 3:

''While the world stands at a critical time in post war history, it has a group of leaders who appear unwilling, like their predecessors in the 1930's, to provide the international leadership to meet economic dislocations. Worse, many of them and their economic advisors do not seem to recognize the profound troubles affecting their societies.

''Like the German elite in Weimar, they dismiss mounting worker dissatisfaction, fringe political movements, and the plight of the unemployed and working poor as marginal concerns compared with the unquestioned importance of a sound currency and a balanced budget. Leaders need to recognize their policy failures of the last 20 years and respond accordingly. If they do not, there are others waiting in the wings who will, perhaps on less pleasant terms.''

We ought to be looking very closely at where the new sovereigns intend to take us. We need to discuss the end they have in sight. It is our responsibility and our duty.

Most everyone today agrees that socialism is not a threat. Many feel communism, even in China, is not a threat, indeed, that there are few real security threats to America that could compare to even our recent past.

Be that as it may, when we speak of the global market economy, free enterprise, massage the terms to merge with managed competition and planning authorities, all the while suggesting that we have met the hidden hand and it is good, we need to also recall what Adam Smith said but is rarely quoted upon.

He said, ''Masters are always and everywhere in a sort of tacit, but constant and uniform, combination, not to raise the wages of labor above their actual rate. To violate this combination is everywhere a most unpopular action, and a sort of reproach to a master among his neighbors and equals. We seldom, indeed, hear of this combination, because it is usual, and, one may say, the natural state of affairs. Masters too sometimes enter into particular combinations to sink wages of labor even below this rate. These are always conducted with the utmost silence and secrecy, till the moment of execution.''

And now precisely, whose responsibility is it to keep an eye on the masters?

I urge my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, left and right on the political spectrum, to boldly restore the oversight role of the Congress with one stroke and join my colleagues in supporting H.J. Res. 90 in restoring the constitutional sovereignty of these United States.

STATE DEPARTMENT CITES PAKISTANI LINK TO TERRORIST GROUPS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, yesterday the U.S. State Department released its annual report on terrorism worldwide called ''Patterns of Global Terrorism, 1999 Report.''

The report provides some very interesting and very troubling findings about where the threats to U.S. interests, U.S. citizens, and international stability have been coming from during the past year.

One of the most dramatic findings of the report is that Pakistan, traditionally an ally of the United States, is guilty of providing safe haven and support to international terrorist groups.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, the State Department stopped short of adding Pakistan to the list of seven nations that are described as state sponsors of terrorism.

Madam Speaker, at the beginning of this year, I introduced legislation calling on the State Department to declare Pakistan a terrorist state. I believe that the information made public this week gives added urgency to that effort.

To quote, if I may, Madam Speaker, from the section of the State Department's report dealing with South Asia, it says, ''In 1999, the locus of terrorism directed against the United States continued to shift from the Middle East to South Asia.'' The report goes on to cite the Taliban, which controls significant areas of Afghanistan, for providing safe haven for international terrorists, particularly Usama Bin Ladin and his network.

As the report points out, ''Pakistan is one of only three countries that maintains formal diplomatic relations with and one of several that supported Afghanistan's Taliban.''

The report goes on to say, ''The United States made repeated requests to Islamabad,'' the Pakistan capital, ''to end support for elements harboring and training terrorists in Afghanistan and urged the Government of Pakistan to close certain Pakistani religious schools that serve as conduits for terrorism. Credible reports also continue to indicate official Pakistani support for Kashmiri militant groups, such as the Harakat ul-Mujahedin, or HUM, that engaged in terrorism.'' This organization has been linked to the hijacking late last year of the Air India flight, and one of the hijackers' demands was that a leader of the HUM be freed from prison in India in exchange for the innocent hostages on the aircraft. That leader has since returned to Pakistan, according to the State Department.

I might also add, Madam Speaker, that this organization, the HUM, under a previous name has been linked to the kidnapping of Western tourists in Kashmir. Two of those Westerners have been murdered; and several others, including an American, remain unaccounted for.

The region of Kashmir has been ground zero for much of the Pakistani-supported terrorist activity. The State Department report notes that, ''Kashmiri extremist groups continue to operate in Pakistan, raising funds and recruiting new cadre.'' It blames these groups for numerous terrorist attacks against civilian targets in India's State of Jammu and Kashmir.

After last summer's U.S. diplomatic intervention to end Pakistan's incursion onto India's side of the Line of Control in Kashmir, Pakistani and Kashmiri extremist groups worked to stir up anti-American sentiment.

As my colleagues can imagine, Madam Speaker, at yesterday's briefing on the release of the report, Michael Sheehan, the State Department's Coordinator for counterterrorism, was put on the defensive as to why Pakistan was not designated as a state sponsor of terrorism when the report contained such damning information.

The agency's response is that Pakistan has sent mixed messages, on the one hand cooperating on extradition and embassy security, while, on the other hand, having relationships with the Kashmiri groups and the Taliban.

But, Madam Speaker, Ambassador Sheehan warned, ''for state sponsorship or the designation of foreign terrorist organizations, you can do it any time of the year.''

Madam Speaker, the U.S. Counter-terrorism Policy is very simple: First, make no concessions to terrorists and strike no deals; second, bring terrorists to justice for their crimes; third, isolate and apply pressure on states that sponsor terrorism to force them to change their behavior; and fourth, bolster the counter-terrorism capabilities of those countries that work with the United States and require assistance.

Madam Speaker, I hope that the State Department will pay particular attention to the third and fourth points with regard to Pakistan and South Asia.

President Clinton, during his recent trip to South Asia, tried to appeal to the Pakistani military junta to cease support for terrorist organizations and activities. The pressure on Pakistan must be maintained and strengthened. Pakistani leaders should be reminded that the threat that their country could be designated as a terrorist state is a real one that could be invoked at any time.

India has been the prime victim of terrorism emanating from or supported by Pakistan. Thus, in keeping with the fourth point of the State Department's stated policy, we should strive to work much more closely with India, a democracy, on counter-terrorism efforts.

We can only hope that reason will prevail in Islamabad and that the Pakistani Government will see that the result of its present course will be increased isolation from the world community. If not, then we must be prepared to follow through and declare Pakistan a state that sponsors terrorism, with all of the stigma and isolation that goes with such a declaration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCHUGH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 2:00 p.m. on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. INSLEE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOOLEY of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JEFFERSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WHITFIELD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 8, 2000, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7456. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Arkansas [Docket No. 97–108–2] received March 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7457. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Abolishment of the Franklin, PA, Non-appropriated Fund Wage Area (RIN: 3206–AJ00) received March 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7458. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Abolishment of the Lebanon, PA, Non-appropriated Fund Wage Area (RIN: 3206–AJ01) received March 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.