

does have the authority to accomplish this within the bounds of the Constitution. What it cannot do is to agree with the president to ignore the Constitution's requirements—and the accountability they ensure—by allowing him simply to assign American troops to foreign command.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7) to revitalize the national security of the United States, had come to no resolution thereon.

ADDITIONAL TIME FOR DEBATE DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 10-hour time limit for consideration of amendments to H.R. 7 be extended for 26 minutes, and that the debate time for amendment No. 13, 21, 24, 30, or 33, or a germane modification of one of those amendments be extended from 36 minutes to 44 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed, and that the debate time for the Torricelli amendment No. 48, or amendment Nos. 28 or 43 be extended from 36 to 44 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I wish to take this time to pay tribute to the chairman, both chairmen, who have gone out of their way to make sure we accommodate the minority on time that was lost in a previous vote. This effort, I think, shows a commitment on our part to make sure that we do not take time away. There was a vote that was not anticipated in the past, and with the cooperation of the gentleman from California, who I know wants to speak, and the chairman, it has been worked out. I think that speaks to our wanting to work together and allow for a full and open debate of these remaining issues.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I was not planning to speak. I will simply say I accept the offer as appropriate given the inadvertence of what happened. It does not deal with the fundamental problem of a 10-hour time limit.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 83 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 7.

□ 1033

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to revitalize the national security of the United States, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, pending was the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

This amendment would cut a key provision of this bill. The reason we have a Contract With America is because we want to put Congress back into the loop in the decisionmaking process when it comes to peacekeeping. But this amendment would say that Congress is meaningless whenever the President claims that he is acting as Commander in Chief.

The consequence is that the President can keep sending troops into Somalia, Haiti, Rwanda, the Balkans without congressional approval. What we are saying in the Contract With America is that Congress must be involved. We cannot abdicate our power.

Now, this is a key provision of this bill. The American people on November 8, when they voted for the Contract With America, one of the key provisions was that Congress was going to get more involved in our peacekeeping decisions. How the tax dollars are spent is important, also when young Americans are put into harm's way. This Congress has an obligation, speaking for the American people, to give either our approval or nonapproval, but under this amendment, Congress would be totally irrelevant.

Do you remember the Somalia debacle where we lost some 44 young Americans? When the bodies were dragged through the streets of Mogadishu? Do

you remember that? This House went wild, and the Senate went wild. Does the gentleman from California remember we all went over to HC-5, had a big confab, and Congress said, "Why were we not involved?" That is what the American people were asking. That is why we have a Contract With America. That is why we are putting the Congress back in.

I remember the meeting at HC-5 that day. You know, we cannot just abdicate our power to the President and then, when things go bad, we all meet at HC-5 and we scream at the Secretary of Defense and we holler at the Secretary of State, and one of them has to lose his job. Then it is too late.

If we are going to be there for the crash landing, we have got to be there for the takeoff, too, and that is all we are saying in the Contract With America.

I want Congress to no longer abdicate its power. We made a commitment. We made a commitment on November 8. We said that Congress would be involved, but with this amendment, we would renege. We are stepping back. We cannot renege on our promises.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the Leach amendment. The Leach amendment, I think, simply restates the President's constitutional power as Commander in Chief.

The language that he seeks to strike from this bill can certainly be construed as a limitation on the President's Commander in Chief powers. It says specifically, "Nothing in this section may be construed as authority for the President to use any element of the armed forces in any operation." That is a limitation on the President's power.

It also says nothing in the section may be construed as authority for the President to place any element of the Armed Forces under the command or operational control of a foreign national. A President has done that over and over and over again in our history. The implication of this language that the gentleman from Iowa seeks to strike is to limit the President's Commander in Chief powers. It micromanages and restricts the President's powers.

The Pentagon says if this language had been in effect you would not have been able to have D-Day, because you would not have been able to put together a collective effort that was so successful there.

The point here, my friends, is we have our job to do. The gentleman from Wisconsin stated that quite accurately. We have our constitutional responsibilities. But in exercising our responsibilities, we must not cut into the Commander in Chief powers. We need to allow the President to do his job as Commander in Chief.

I support the gentleman's amendment, and I commend him for offering it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I am the last Member of the House or Senate to have been in Haiti. I am the last Member of the House or Senate to have been in Somalia.

I did not bring out the flag in either case. I wish I had in Somalia.

I went to Somalia within a few days following my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], to find out why 18 of America's best-trained soldiers had died in what they called the firefight from hell.

Three days later, Sergeant Matthew Rierson was killed with an unlucky mortar shot at the headquarters of the Rangers, and a dud landed at the feet of a U.S. two-star general, or we would have lost one of our best Special Forces major generals.

Now, I am standing here to tell you and to tell about 12 to 18 to 20 Republicans, including 2 or 3 freshmen, that we are starting to lose some of you on the Contract With America.

□ 1040

Please pay attention to why this is one of the core items of our Contract With America. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] had this chart made up. This is as of about May 1994. I do not want to distract you from my remarks, but please come down and take a look at this utter madness, what happens when our troops are under foreign command. Here is what I discovered within an hour of landing in Somalia, that we had a two-track chain of command. Major General Montgomery, with whom I just had lunch in Bastogne just a couple of weeks back at the 50th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge, an excellent general, now one of the 3-star deputy commanders of our forces in Europe.

But I asked him about where was the rescue column? I told him I had just come back with him from an overflight in a Black Hawk, taking pictures with my camera, of Russian-license, built-in-India T-72 main battle tanks, 14 of them, and I said where were these Indian tanks to blow through the road blocks? He said, "You will have to talk to the other commander."

The whole thing is so complicated we simply must vote against the Leach amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution includes this language: "The Congress has the power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." That is to say that what we are doing in the Contract is

completely consistent with the Constitution and with our right to say as Representatives of those families who are visited by Navy and Marine Corps and Army teams when they have sons who are killed in combat, that that is to say to those families, "We will have a direct chain of accountability, you can always count on that up to an American commander and down from that American commander right down through the platoon and squad level to your son when he is in combat."

Let me just say there has been a lot of confusion about this. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] talked about not being able to have D-day. D-day was not a United Nations operation. There has been confusion about Korea. The commander in Korea, General Luck, has a straight American chain of command. If we go into some type of a preemptive operation, should there be an invasion from the north then you move to a joint American-Korean command, but that is not under United Nations sanctions. So that section, that operation, is not applicable to this section with the Contract With America.

This is constitutional, it is appropriate, in response to our people.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE].

Mr. MCHALE. I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Leach amendment.

As stated by Mr. BEREUTER a few minutes ago, the defect of this amendment is not contained in its actual text but rather in the deletion it makes to the underlying bill.

I have no objection, Mr. Chairman, if American forces are integrated at the strategic level into an overall command structure. We have heard references made to D-Day. I participated in Operation Desert Storm, which was indeed an operation involving the integration of international cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, at the battlefield level, where American forces are under fire, it requires a shared patriotism and peacetime training. That bond between American forces requires American leadership.

I rise in opposition to the Leach amendment.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude with two points: First, I think everybody in this room must understand there is an emotive aspect of this issue that we all share a common sympathy.

But also at stake is the Constitution of the United States, which is very precise on who the commander in chief is and what the command function is.

This is a constitutional issue.

The second point I make is it is also a policy issue. Let there be no misunderstanding, this bill, as currently crafted, drives a stake into the United States leadership in multilateral diplo-

macy. If this kind of approach happened in all other countries in the world, peacekeeping comes to an end, burden sharing comes to an end. We do not have a prospect of expanding the rule of law in a reasoned way.

So I would urge the Members of this body to understand that there is a symbolism as well as a constitutionalism with regard to this particular amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let us be clear about just what is at issue with regard to this amendment. The Leach amendment waters down the restrictions on foreign command of U.S. forces in this bill. While couched as an effort to protect the President's constitutional authority, it deletes other language in the bill and effectively creates loopholes in the foreign command restrictions.

This bill includes language in section 401 protecting the President's constitutional authority. Accordingly, the new language added by the Leach amendment is unnecessary.

The fact is that the foreign command restrictions in the bill have been carefully crafted so as not to unduly constrain the President's authority. Let us not upset this carefully crafted balance.

I urge a vote against the Leach amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 267, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

AYES—158

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Abercrombie | Dicks | Hilliard |
| Ackerman | Dingell | Hinchee |
| Baesler | Dixon | Houghton |
| Baldacci | Doggett | Hoyer |
| Barrett (WI) | Dooley | Jackson-Lee |
| Beilenson | Doyle | Jefferson |
| Bentsen | Durbin | Johnson, E. B. |
| Berman | Engel | Johnston |
| Bishop | Eshoo | Kanjorski |
| Bonior | Evans | Kennedy (MA) |
| Borski | Farr | Kennedy (RI) |
| Boucher | Fattah | Kennelly |
| Brown (CA) | Fazio | Kildee |
| Brown (FL) | Fields (LA) | Klecicka |
| Brown (OH) | Filner | Klink |
| Bryant (TX) | Flake | LaFalce |
| Cardin | Foglietta | Lantos |
| Chapman | Ford | Leach |
| Clayton | Frank (MA) | Levin |
| Clement | Frelinghuysen | Lofgren |
| Clyburn | Frost | Lowe |
| Coleman | Furse | Luther |
| Collins (IL) | Gejdenson | Manton |
| Conyers | Gephardt | Markey |
| Costello | Gibbons | Martinez |
| Danner | Gonzalez | Mascara |
| DeFazio | Gutierrez | Matsui |
| DeLauro | Hall (OH) | McCarthy |
| Dellums | Hamilton | McDermott |
| Deutsch | Hefner | McKinney |

Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)

Petri
Porter
Poshard
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Stark

Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Thompson
Torres
Torrice
Townes
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate

Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker

Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Becerra
Clay
Collins (MI)

Green
Hastings (FL)
Lewis (GA)

Maloney
Thornton
Wilson

NOT VOTING—9

□ 1105

Mr. METCALF, Mrs. THURMAN, and Messrs. JOHNSON of South Dakota, BROWDER, DE LA GARZA, and LAUGHLIN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. ROUKEMA changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider the amendments of the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN]; amendments Nos. 13, 21, 24, 30, 33, and a germane modified amendment No. 13.

The Clerk will designate amendments Nos. 13, 21, 24, 30, and 33.

MODIFIED AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BERMAN

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I offer amendment No. 13, as modified, which is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. BERMAN: Beginning on page 37, strike line 7 and all that follows through page 39, line 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 501. CREDIT AGAINST ASSESSMENT FOR EXPENDITURES IN SUPPORT OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.

(a) PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.—The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287 et seq) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 10. (a) CREDIT AGAINST ASSESSMENT FOR EXPENDITURES IN SUPPORT OF PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.—

"(1) ANNUAL REPORT.—The President shall, at the time of submission of the budget to Congress for any fiscal year, submit to the designated congressional committees a report on the total amount of incremental costs incurred by the Department of Defense during the preceding fiscal year to support or participate in United Nations peacekeeping operations. Such report shall include a separate listing by United Nations peacekeeping operation of the amount of incremental costs incurred to support or participate in each such operation.

"(2) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—(A) In addition to the annual report required under paragraph (1), the President shall submit quarterly reports to the designated congressional committees on—

"(i) all assistance provided by the United States during the preceding quarter to the United Nations to support peacekeeping operations; and

"(ii) all assistance provided by the United States for any operation conducted by the

Department of Defense in support of activities authorized by United Nations Security Council resolutions, including the identification of the element within the Department of Defense that provided such assistance.

"(B) Each report submitted pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall describe—

"(i) the assistance provided for each such operation, listed by category of assistance; and

"(ii) copies of all billings requesting payment by the United States of any contribution for United Nations peacekeeping activities.

"(C) The report for the fourth calendar quarter of each year shall be submitted as part of the annual report required by section 4(d) and shall include cumulative information for the preceding calendar year.

"(3) LIMITATION.—Funds may be obligated for payment to the United Nations of the United States assessed share of United Nations peacekeeping operations for a fiscal year only to the extent that the amount of such assessed share exceeds the amount equal to—

"(A) the total amount identified in the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) for the preceding fiscal year, reduced by

"(B) the amount of any reimbursement or credit to the United States of any contribution for United Nations peacekeeping activities.

"(C) The report for the fourth calendar quarter of each year shall be submitted as part of the annual report required by section 4(d) and shall include cumulative information for the preceding calendar year.

"(3) LIMITATION.—Funds may be obligated for payment to the United Nations of the United States assessed share of United Nations peacekeeping operations for a fiscal year only to the extent that the amount of such assessed share exceeds the amount equal to—

"(A) the total amount identified in the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) for the preceding fiscal year, reduced by

"(B) the amount of any reimbursement or credit to the United States by the United Nations for the costs of United States support for, or participation in, United Nations peacekeeping operations for the preceding fiscal year.

"(4) EXEMPTIONS.—Paragraph (3) shall not apply to—

"(i) costs for which the Department of Defense has been otherwise reimbursed;

"(ii) the costs of deployments under the auspices of the United Nations Security Council which the United States has undertaken to support its national security interests, in which United States Armed Forces served under United States command, and for which the United States has sought the approval of the Security Council under the United Nations Charter;

"(iii) the enforcement of United Nations sanctions and enforcement of no-fly zones which are in the national security interest of the United States;

"(iv) the provision of humanitarian assistance; or

"(v) the costs of deployments related to the provision of emergency medical care rendered by United States Armed Forces when United States Armed medical personnel or medical care facilities are in the theater of operations in which a United Nations peacekeeping mission is being conducted.

"(5) WAIVER.—(A) The President may waive the application of paragraph (3) for a United Nations peacekeeping operation if the Secretary of Defense reports to the President that support for such peacekeeping operation will not endanger the readiness of the United

NOES—267

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English

Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot

Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinar
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)

States Armed Forces and if the President consults with the Consultative Group 15 days in advance of such waiver.

“(B) If the President determines that an emergency exists which prevents compliance with the requirement of subparagraph (A) and such waiver is in the national security interests of the United States, such consultation shall occur as soon as practicable but no later than 48 hours after such obligation.”

“(6) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘designated congressional committees’ shall include the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of section 10(a) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as added by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to United Nations assessments for peacekeeping operations after fiscal year 1995.

(c) Definitions.—For purposes of the amendments made by this section—

(1) the term “incremental cost” shall mean those additional costs incurred directly as a result of a peacekeeping operation, but shall not include personnel costs or other costs that would have been incurred otherwise in the regular course of peacetime operations, such as training exercises, maintenance, and logistical support; and

(2) the term “Consultative Group” means the Standing Consultative Group established by section 501A of this Act.

SEC. 501A. CONSULTATION.

(a) STANDING CONSULTATIVE GROUP.—There is hereby established a Standing Consultative Group (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the “Consultative Group”).

(b) PURPOSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) The purpose of the Consultative Group shall be to facilitate improved consultation between the executive branch and the Congress with respect to United States participation in peacekeeping activities.

(B) Consultations in accordance with this section shall occur prior to the United States making commitments to the United Nations, any regional organization in which the United States participates, or any other countries, on United States participation in peacekeeping operations, including in particular any participation under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

(C) Such consultations shall also include details of operational command and control arrangements governing United States participation in peacekeeping operations.

(2) REGULAR CONSULTATIONS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Consultative Group and the President or his designee shall meet regularly for discussions and consultation, but in no event less frequently than once a month.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The conduct of consultation pursuant to subsection (b)(2) with respect to possible or ongoing United States participation in a peacekeeping operation which may involve the use of United States Armed Forces shall not be construed as a grant of authority to the President under the War Powers Resolution (87 Stat. 555).

Mr. GILMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the modified amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California will be recognized for 22 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 22 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume up to 5 minutes.

(Mr. BERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is addressed to section 501 of the bill. I am not going to spend a lot of time talking about the amendment because I am not going to ask for a recorded vote on the amendment, but for the reasons I will state, I believe in and of itself section 501 as put forth in this bill is reason enough for every Member in this Chamber to oppose this legislation.

Section 501, if it were ever signed into law, would totally wipe out—let me repeat that—totally wipe out every single regularly assessed peacekeeping operation now incurred or which may ever in the future be incurred by the United Nations.

□ 1110

Let me repeat that one more time: Not one single current U.N.-assessed peacekeeping operation now in place would continue if section 501 were to pass, because section 501, by requiring an automatic offset. For every dollar that is spent on U.S. voluntary contributions, incremental costs to U.N. peacekeeping activities would be deducted from our assessment. We would pay zip, zero, nothing to the United Nations for the regularly assessed peacekeeping operations. They would fall apart. They would end.

I say this in the context of trying to explain the kinds of operations we are talking about. We are talking about U.N.-assessed peacekeeping operations which, as the chart next to me shows utilize, of all the operations and the forces utilized, only 1.4 percent are American Forces. We are talking about a U.N.-assessed contribution that we pay that was legislated by the bill that the majority last year passed and was signed into law by President Clinton, that unilaterally reduces our assessed contribution from the extraordinarily high 31 percent to the 25 percent that we regularly pay for all other U.N. dues.

We are talking about a series of operations, and I want to just tell you the kinds of operations we are involved in, that will be eliminated if this were to happen. We are talking about the peacekeepers on the Golan Heights that help preserve the peace between Israel and Syria. We are talking about the U.N. peacekeepers on the Kuwait border, not American, mind you, who continue to constrain Saddam's ability to threaten his neighbors. We fought Desert Storm, Saddam still survives. Are we going to walk away from that Kuwait border before he is in full com-

pliance with the U.N. resolutions, before it is clear that we have an Iraq that no longer has any aggressive intentions on its neighbors?

We are talking about U.N. peacekeepers who have been for 30 years in Cyprus to help prevent war between two NATO allies, Greece and Turkey. In former Yugoslavia, the United Nations is providing critical humanitarian assistance and helping prevent the conflict from spreading to other parts of Europe. In Mozambique, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Namibia we have U.N. observers. Out of the total forces I have just talked about, 1.4 percent are American Forces. The rest are other countries' contributions through the assessed contribution scheme.

Now, these issues were raised in the Committee on National Security, and I want to take one moment to just compliment the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], because one other part of title IV which was clearly unconstitutional on its face has been deleted by virtue of an amendment passed unanimously last night. But 501, while it does not raise constitutional problems, is the most foolish, self-defeating kind of provision we could want to adopt.

When we raised these issues in the Committee on National Security, people scrambled around, they made an adjustment, they added a waiver. What kind of waiver did they add? They added a waiver that said that we will not deduct those voluntary contributions that the United States now pays, those incremental costs, if the President can certify, and only if the President can certify, that those chapter 7 operations, there is no waiver for chapter 6 operations, those chapter 7 operations he would have undertaken on his own.

What foolishness that waiver is. That waiver, talk about enforcing a boycott against Iraq. By definition an economic boycott enforced by a blockade cannot be done unilaterally. One has to get Turkey to stop letting Iraq use its pipeline for oil. One has to bring in the multilateral nations.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition?

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I seek to control the time in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], the senior member of the Committee on International Affairs.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, Liddell Hart, in writing about strategy and how you win wars, said, “Never do directly what you can do indirectly.” So I want to compliment the gentleman from California, because what he is doing is gutting this bill; but he is not doing it directly, he is doing it indirectly.

You know, in this Contract With America we say we will reduce our peacekeeping spending to a fair share. Last year, according to the General Accounting Office, the investigative arm

of Congress, the American taxpayer paid 80 percent of the expense for peacekeeping. We are projected now to pay about 31.7 percent. What we are saying in the Contract With America is we are reducing it to 25 percent. Out of the 182 countries in the world, we will still be paying one-fourth of all the peacekeeping.

Now, what this amendment does is put in exceptions. By the time you get done with all the exceptions, you have gutted the bill. So it is an indirect way of gutting it. Let me say that the issue here is: Do you believe that we are paying our fair share, or do you think that we are paying more than our fair share? Let me repeat again. One hundred and eighty-two countries in the world; one Nation, ours, pays 31.7 percent. What we are saying is we want to reduce it to 25 percent.

We are still paying 2½ times more than any other nation. Last year, again, we paid 80 percent, and that is according to the General Accounting Office. I want to underscore that.

There are those who believe that the U.S. taxpayer should go on paying more and more for all of these peacekeeping missions. In the Contract With America we pledged fairness. For one Nation to pay 80 percent and for its soldiers to do most of the heavy lifting, to do the fighting, I do not think is fair, and the American people do not think it is fair. Eighty percent of the money, our soldiers. That is why on November 8 the American people did affirmatively vote for the Contract With America.

Now, I want to say that you win wars not with op-ed pieces; you win wars with treasury and with soldiers. And that is why it is very important for us to look at this particular bill.

The issue here is whether you want to put the American taxpayer ahead of the United Nations. Do you? Or do you believe that the American taxpayer must automatically keep on paying more and more and more for whatever operations are dreamed up at the UN.

If we vote for this amendment, we will be renegeing on our Contract With America. Keep that in mind. We will be retreating from our Contract With America.

Did you read the headlines this morning in the Washington Times? You do not read the Washington Times? Let me tell you, there it is. "George Stephanopoulos, senior adviser to President Clinton, said yesterday that the Republicans in this House are retreating from their promises." And my dear friends, do not think for 1 minute, not on the 110th day or the 105th day, but on the 101st day, and in fact it is already started and we are only in the 43rd day.

My friends, we are not even at the 50th day. Can you imagine what is going to happen on the 101st day?

Do not be hornswoggled by these amendments. I have been telling you these guys are very deceptive over here. What does he go on to say? He

says, "The Republicans are retreating from their promises they made in their Contract With America," and it says "He accused them of tackling easy elements of the pact and ducking the tougher votes."

Mr. Chairman, this is only the 43d day. The President's senior adviser went on to say that he is predicting that the voters will enact punishment on the Republicans for being reticent and not enacting their provisions of the Contract With America.

Mr. Chairman, let us stick with the Contract With America. That is what the people voted for. Let us not jump up and vote for these amendments that would indirectly gut the Contract With America. Believe me, you will be shown no mercy on the campaign trail or in the 1-minute or at any other time, any time we step away from the Contract With America. We do not want to end up with the contract just enumerating 10 issues and having it gutted, do we? No. Do not vote for the Berman amendment. Stick with the contract.

□ 1120

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, in the 8 years that I chaired the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations, I received three letters from Presidents Reagan and Bush, threatening to veto the foreign aid bills which we reported out of our subcommittee because they said we did not spend enough money. So I think my record in trying to save dollars in foreign aid is clear.

Section 501, just defended by my colleague from Wisconsin, is intended to reduce cost. That is obvious. But the fact is, it will have just the opposite effect. In fact, it will raise costs, because section 501 applies unless, unless the President certifies that a peacekeeping operation is so important that we would do it alone.

That is an open invitation to other countries to simply step back and say: "OK, let Uncle Sam go it alone, let Uncle Sam be uncle sucker." Just brilliant.

I tell you what confuses me about this proposal. I cannot figure out whether this bill was designed to be so dumb or whether it just happened that way by accident.

What when I see it coming from the party of Vandenberg, I do not know whether to cry or laugh.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], a member of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the criticisms that have been leveled against section 501, I believe, are misplaced. The Committee on International Relations carefully considered the objection and amended the reim-

bursement formula in an effort to ensure that funds would be available for true peacekeeping operations even after the offsets. We have received preliminary estimates from GAO of the amount of unreimbursed incremental chapter 6 peacekeeping expenses from fiscal year 1994. These are the only true peacekeeping expenses and the only ones for which legislation, as amended, would strictly require and offset. The total amount of these expenses is about \$227 million. This is some \$300 million less than the administration's budget request for peacekeeping in fiscal year 1996, and about \$800 million less than the peacekeeping budget for fiscal year 1995, including the supplemental appropriation.

The remaining \$1.5 billion in unreimbursed chapter 7 expenses for operations such as Desert Storm, Operation Deny Flight, and Uphold Democracy, which are more aptly described as peacemaking, would not require an offset provided that the President provided the necessary certification to Congress. In essence, this is a certification that the U.S. role in these operations was in its own strategic interest and not solely at the behest of the United Nations. As long as the United States remains prepared to contribute between \$300 and \$800 million per year to true international peacekeeping operations, it is inaccurate, and I would submit it is unfair, to say that we have removed peacekeeping as an option.

The second way in which the administration's criticism misses the mark is that it incorrectly assumes that the President would be required to certify in advance that we would unilaterally undertake the action in order to exempt it from the offset requirements. The administration then argues that if other nations knew the United States would undertake an operation of its own, there would be no need for them to cooperate in such inaction. This argument simply misreads the bill. There is no requirement that we act unilaterally, or even that we certify after the fact that we did act unilaterally, in order to avoid the offset requirement.

Rather, the President need only certify after the operation that it was the sort of operation that we would have undertaken in the strategic interest of the United States, even if we had been able to secure U.N. cooperation.

This formula, Mr. Chairman, leaves the President the flexibility he needs to protect the U.S. interests wherever he can certify in good conscience that such interests are at stake. Provided only that he can make such a certification, he need not fear that the cost of an operation will be offset against next year's peacekeeping budget.

Some of the proposed amendments would even go further, exempting practically everything from the offset, but that is something we did not have to deal with today.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for Members to vote against this amendment. I believe

that the underlying language is sufficient and will positively serve peacekeeping for the United States and our allies.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Under the theory that inaccurate statements should be refuted as quickly as possible, I ask everyone to read the waiver section of section 501. There is an automatic deduction unless the President certifies as to chapter 7 only, not chapter 6, operations, that the activity is of such importance to the national security the United States will undertake the activity unilaterally, unilaterally. Not in our strategic interest. Not in our national interest. Unilaterally.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me just stress I think the big question is not whether there is a modification—it is probably too harsh to call it a retreat—from a quasi-party platform, the contract.

The big question is whether there is going to be a retreat from international leadership, from the traditions of at least half a century of American involvement in world affairs.

I would only ask, as we look at this particular amendment that has been offered by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], two questions:

Is it cheaper and more effective to advance the interests of the United States through international burden sharing, or is it cheaper and more effective to go it alone?

The second question is, How can we, in times of trauma, ask others to serve with us if we refuse to serve with them?

It is in this context that I think this particular amendment would add modestly to the bill and make it something that would be more acceptable to more Members of this body.

But I would stress to everyone, this has become a flawed bill in the final measure. With great regret, I am going to have to vote against it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, one of the things I think that needs to be stressed is how much money the United States is paying for U.N. operations, peacekeeping and otherwise.

According to the General Accounting Office, the United States paid 80 percent, 80 percent of the worldwide peacekeeping operations for the United Nations last year. Out of \$3.4 billion, we paid, the American taxpayers ponied up \$2.7 billion.

And on the regular administrative cost of the United Nations, we pay between 25 and 33 percent. Of all the countries in the world, we are picking

up almost a third of all the costs. I do not think it is unreasonable to want a complete accounting for the President to tell us about all these costs. And if we feel it is extremely high, we should be able to do something about it. This is a very, very good amendment.

The American people want us to participate and do what we can to make sure there is peace and harmony in this world, but they do not want to pay the whole enchilada. And 80 percent of the cost last year was paid for by the U.S. taxpayer.

In addition to that, the year before that, we paid 44 percent of the peacekeeping cost. Think about that. Forty-four percent is a lot when we consider all the countries in the world that are in the U.N. But it was almost doubled last year. This is a move that should be taken.

I think it is a good amendment. I hope my colleagues will support it.

□ 1130

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I certainly commend him for his amendment, which I strongly support.

Section 501, as it is drafted in H.R. 7, limits the U.S.-assessed contributions to U.N. peacekeeping to only the amount that exceeds DOD's costs in support of U.N.-authorized operations.

Mr. Chairman, the provision says in effect that DOD costs include not only DOD support to regular U.N. peacekeeping operations, such as Cyprus, but to any U.N. peacekeeping activity. By that definition, Mr. Chairman, we would include a lot of things that the United States today is doing under the rule; for example, 15,000 United States personnel enforcing no-fly zones in Iraq, very much in the interests of the United States; troops in Operation Provide Comfort, helping the Kurds in Iraq; troops in South Korea, and many other areas.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the impact of all of that would be that, as drafted, it would prohibit the United States from making its assessed U.N. peacekeeping contribution, and will, in effect, kill U.N. peacekeeping. That is the judgment, I think, of all of the experts in the administration that have looked at it carefully. One of the problems here is that the language is so broadly drawn that it includes all kinds of DOD costs.

Another problem here, Mr. Chairman, is we simply do not know what the costs are, so we have very vague language, and the result is that U.N. peacekeeping, our assessment, we would be owed money by the United Nations.

We would not pay our assessment, other countries would note that, they would not pay their assessment, and we would effectively destroy U.N. peacekeeping.

Mr. Chairman, what the Berman amendment does is to define those DOD costs much more narrowly. We have two purposes that are sought here, it seems to me. The first is that the Defense Department be fully reimbursed for these reasonable expenses. That is the concern that the majority is emphasizing, and it is a perfectly legitimate concern, but they have overdrawn their amendment much, much too broadly.

The second concern, I think, is that we maintain U.N. peacekeeping capabilities. The advantage of the Berman amendment is that it accomplishes both purposes, DOD reimbursement on a reasonable basis, a limited basis, but at the same time not destroying American national interest.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge support of the Berman amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, we are not anti-United Nations, we are not anti-reasonable peacekeeping operations. There are some good peacekeeping operations, we have to say. There have been some bungled ones, obviously. Those are the ones we need to focus on.

However, let me say this, Mr. Chairman, three points. There must be some fairness in the sharing of the burden of peacekeeping in the world. The United States is being overburdened in this process. The direct contribution that we make is, as has been noted, almost a third of the total cost, not to mention the extra costs of the Department of Defense and the others in support of those missions.

It is reasonable to say we are paying upwards of 60 to 70 percent of the total cost of peacekeeping missions. That is unfair. That must be addressed by the United Nations. The only way to get them to address those kinds of questions is for this Congress to be obstinate on funding. That is what we will be doing.

Two, the ineptitude of the United Nations operations, both its regular operations and peacekeeping. There are some 40,000 employees of the United Nations in New York alone. Until recently, only 40 of those people were trying to oversee 17 peacekeeping military operations with 70,000 soldiers around the globe, 5 days a week, 8 hours a day. It absolutely was inept; there is some improvement, but not nearly enough.

Fairness to the Congress, fairness from the administration to the Congress. The administration votes for these peacekeeping missions in the United Nations. We do not know in the Congress how much it is going to cost,

when it is going to cost it, when we are going to get out, how we are going to get out, how we are going to pay for it.

They simply—the United Nations—simply sends the U.S. Congress the bill, after the fact. In former years it was a fairly small amount, \$40 million a year 5 years ago. Now it is \$1.2 billion for 1995 plus another \$672 million supplemental they have just sent up here, so that is \$1.8 or \$1.9 billion, not counting DOD expenses. That is a significant figure.

We have to regularize this process. We simply cannot run the Government in that fashion. The Congress has to be in on the operation from the outset, so we can plan, at least financially, how to deal with it.

Mr. Chairman, the \$672 million supplemental they have just set up for what the United Nations says are 1995 cost overruns is not offset. The administration says "We are not going to ask you to cut other spending, just give us out of the clear blue sky this money."

I say, "This must be offset. You have to pay for it. Then we will think about it."

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I think again we have to understand the fundamental principle. What the U.N. does in the post-cold-war era is carry out American foreign policy interests. If it is not in America's foreign policy interests, we use our veto to stop it.

Therefore, the choice here is we continue to operate within the United Nations or we will end up having to do these things unilaterally; or even worse, we will wait until a crisis in a region explodes to a far greater crisis, to far greater costs in both human life and dollars.

Mr. Chairman, the principal impact of this piece of legislation and this section would be that Saudi Arabia would not pay its U.N. dues for the next 50 years. Japan, France, and the Soviet Union, along with the United States, would ask for additional payment from Bangladesh and other impoverished countries.

Think about what we are saying here. These are our national policy interests. The President of the United States, President Bush, mobilizes the world through the United Nations to stop Saddam Hussein's cut off of oil. Because it is a United Nations operation, rather than an American unilateral operation, we are able to get the Saudis and the Japanese and others to pay for the major portion of this activity.

Now we would all go back to the United Nations and ask the most impoverished countries of the world to pay for our military action, to protect the West's oil supplies.

Mr. Chairman, it would not just stop with the French and the British and the Americans and the Japanese and the Saudis. The Russians would be at

the U.N. immediately as well, because they would say "Look what the Americans have done. We are in Tajikistan and we are in Georgia under U.N. authorization. We want to be paid for that."

Now we would have the Saudis, the Japanese, the French, the British, the Russians, and the Americans coming to the United Nations telling Bangladesh that they owe more dues to pay us for our involvement in the gulf war.

Mr. Chairman, let us be straight about it. If Members are where Congress was at the end of World War I and they believe we should not have been in the League of Nations and they believe we should not be in the United Nations, then get up and tell us to get out of the United Nations, but do not continue to try to either hamstring the President's ability to operate within multilateral organizations, or bankrupt the organization through this budget maneuver.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

□ 1140

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. All of it or half of it or three-fourths of it, how much?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I think that the present law that we passed in the previous year is adequate, 25 percent. I think we are heading in the right direction on our payments. But clearly it should not be Bangladesh subsidizing the Saudis.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Committee on National Security.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, let us be straight with the American people our colleagues. This amendment is not about getting out of the United Nations nor is it against peacekeeping. It is about fairness, to our taxpayers and military.

We heard debate earlier today about saving \$1.5 billion for a commission. Two hundred two Members, largely of the minority party, voted "yes" for that huge savings in defense spending for the readiness of our troops. We had a big vote on missile defense. The key issue was savings. This year we are spending almost \$2 billion of American taxpayer money on the United Nations and its operations around the world, \$2 billion. We simply want to have some accounting and we want to have some credit for what we put in.

Let me use Haiti as an example. We had no debate before our troops were committed to Haiti, I might add, not 1 minute of debate on this floor before the troops went in. Yet we have in fact spent \$1.5 billion of American taxpayers' money. Even more outrageous and the purpose of the three flags in

my lapel, Bangladesh, Guatemala, and Nepal. Here we are right now paying the full salaries, benefits, and housing costs of the troops of these three countries. Yes, my colleagues we are paying with DOD dollars the benefits, the salaries, and the expenses of the troops from these nations in Haiti. At the same time that 600 troops from the Second Armored Division of Fort Hood, TX, had to conduct 10 training exercises in the range walking together pretending they were in tanks because we do not have enough money for fuel and maintenance.

The new slogan of that battalion of 600 troops that used tanks in training is to march together and say, "Clank, clank, I'm a tank." While we are paying the full benefits of troops from Bangladesh, Nepal, and Guatemala.

This has got to stop, Mr. Chairman. We want fairness. That is all we want. We are not saying pull out of the United Nations. We are not saying isolate ourselves. We are saying what our colleagues said. Let us have some concern about the taxpayers' money. It is not a bottomless pit. Two billion dollars is what we are spending. Is that enough? I think it is too much.

I think the provision in the bill allows us to get a hold of the money that we are spending and better use those dollars for American troops so that from time to time we can go together with out allies. But I really have a problem using American DOD dollars to pay the salaries and benefits of foreign troops when we cannot even take care of our own readiness needs as so many of our National Security colleagues mentioned today.

I might add for the RECORD, I just have to insert this letter from one of my constituents serving in Haiti who is absolutely outraged at what role he is paying there now.

Mr. Chairman, the letter referred to is as follows:

HONORABLE CURT WELDON: I am stationed here in Port-au-Prince Haiti, with the U.S. Army. As a local constituent I am writing you concerning several issues about the armed forces and our involvement here in Haiti.

First I would like to mention about our military mission here in Haiti. Several of my fellow service members and I find no purpose in Clinton's administration policy to reinstall Aristide, a communist leader, back into this country. Since when do the U.S. forces work for a communist leader who has always denounced the United States as evil. A leader who has stolen tens-of-millions of dollars from his citizens, which the U.S. tax payers may have to pay back to the people of Haiti. This also does not include the enormous expenses of this entire military operation, to the American tax payers to which there will be no benefits. Now, since this military operation is done and over with, and our mission of restoring Aristide finished, we all should be getting back home. But, now due to the effort of the United Nations and the Joint Staff Commanders, several thousand U.S. service members are staying and we shouldn't be. Staying because the United Nations and the Joint Task Force commanders say they need us. This country is now safer to walk the streets than most

cities back in the states. The Joint Task Forces, under the United Nations are fully capable of keeping the peace here. What my fellow service members and I want to know from you, is what are you doing to end Clinton's U.S. involvement here in Haiti. And to keep future U.S. forces out of the control of the United Nations.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

When the gentleman talks about Haiti, he talks about a United States decision that we went to the United Nations and obtained authorization for under chapter 7. It is an incremental cost. There is nothing in 501 that would do anything about who pays for that. What would happen is every dollar of that would deduct and wipe out the peacekeeping costs for every regularly assessed operation which we supported in the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, it is time we accept the reality. We are a world power. We are a world power. We defeated communism, and no, we cannot expect Nepal and Bangladesh to pay the same amount of money that we do. Yes, we are going to have to take the leadership, and part of that burden means we are going to have to pay more.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would submit that this is a very wise investment, which is why I believe this bill is mistaken when it attempts to undermine funding for U.N. peacekeeping activities. The point I am trying to make is that we have very legitimate and vital national interests which are protected by U.N. peacekeeping.

What are our interests? We have an interest in the global marketplace, that markets are allowed to thrive and not be disrupted by localized aggression and by petty dictators. We do not want to set the precedent that might makes right. We do not want to see our markets disrupted by petty dictators. We want to have the ability to work collectively within the world community to thwart these kinds of efforts.

We have an interest in oil. Our recent efforts in Desert Storm magnify the fact that we need to work collectively and we need to have the resources of other countries join with ours to fight to help protect our specific interests.

We have a very important interest, Mr. Chairman, in fighting terrorism internationally. With the exception of the very unfortunate bombing in New York, we have had the good fortune of not having very much terrorism on our shores. It is better, I submit, to fight terrorism on other shores in a preemptive manner rather than have it come to this country.

What does this have to do with U.N. burdensharing? The gentleman was saying that we are paying for Napalese soldiers. I would submit that is probably a wise investment. Better to have other soldiers involved in the fight

than to have all U.S. soldiers, because this bill provides us with an unfortunate option. We either go it alone or do not go at all. We have got interests that mean we have to go. I submit we are better off if we go with others.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, a lot has been said about this subject and I think there may be some confusion, but I hope some Members focused on the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] a few minutes ago when he said that recently the United States, when you consider all costs, was paying over 80 percent of the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations. It is incredible.

What I am suggesting and what I was able to do in the committee is to assure that at least incremental costs are to be offset. We have a tremendous expenditure of funds.

We have an important role to play in peacekeeping. But as I suggested to the Secretary of State when he appeared before us, the status quo is not acceptable. We have to have some changes in the way our assessments are calculated.

Mr. Chairman, I would be absolutely convinced that even though our peacekeeping assessment is 30.7 percent, and even though the last Congress said by resolution that we are going to reduce it to 25 percent, supporters of the United Nations, perhaps even the Clinton administration, will come to us later this year and say again next year, and perhaps next year, "You are in arrearage," even though we had expressed our clear intent to pay no more than 25 percent.

That is a very generous share, because when we consider all of our other calculated costs, incremental costs and others, we are paying far, far beyond 25 percent. We are paying more than 50 percent. Recently we paid 80 percent. I think it should be clear to our colleagues that we can ask for some different procedures to be established when it comes to our contributions to peacekeeping.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for his allowance of time.

Make no mistake about it. Title V is a gilt-edged, hand-engraved invitation to adventurism. It would effectively end U.N. peacekeeping with catastrophic consequences. It would be an open invitation to would-be aggressors and rogue states all around the world. Wars and conflicts with all their suffering and chaos would multiply. Gorazde and Sarajevo would be just a hint of things to come. We would be left with

a stark choice, intervene unilaterally or do nothing at all.

Mr. Chairman, the fundamental problem with the measure as it is written is that it presents a false tradeoff, fulfilling our collective security obligations versus maintaining the readiness of our Armed Forces. In reality, as a practical matter, they are two sides of the same coin.

By leveraging our forces through the United Nations, we ease the demands on our Armed Forces in the same way a high state of readiness bolsters the credibility of a collective security system. But trying to maintain a high state of readiness when we are constrained to unilateral action is simply untenable.

In the period between the wars, we had neither an adequate state of readiness nor credible collective security. The result was unprecedented global disaster.

□ 1150

It was in that period that arch-isolationist, Arthur Vandenberg, was transformed into one of the most formidable advocates of collective security through the United Nations. Today we discard the lessons we learned at our great peril. The conflicts, no matter where they are, no matter how distant, left unattended can affect us all.

John Dunne was absolutely right. The bill's greatest flaw is that it fails to recognize that U.N. peacekeeping promotes our national interests.

Arthur Vandenberg said it best. Let me just share this observation from him.

Much as we might crave the easier way of lesser responsibility, we are denied this privilege. We cannot turn back the clock. We cannot fail by the old and easier charts. That has been determined for us by the march of events. We have no choice as to whether we shall play a great part in the world. We have to play that part. We have to play it in sheer defense of our own self-interest. All that we can decide is whether we shall play it well or ill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Berman amendment. It fails the minimal truth-in-labeling standard required for any provision that calls itself a credit against our peacekeeping assessment.

After all the exemptions in this amendment are added up, the U.S. taxpayer will still be paying roughly the same amount for U.N. peacekeeping.

Our legislation merely seeks to get a handle on our spiraling direct and indirect costs for peacekeeping which amounted to some \$2.8 billion last year. Our bill provides that a portion or our unreimbursed Defense Department expenditures in support of peacekeeping will be deducted from our U.N. assessment.

What we are now considering in this amendment is a so-called credit that has so many loopholes that virtually every peacekeeping mission we support

in the world today would be exempted. It guts the provisions now in the bin.

Adopting this amendment would move us further from our goal of getting credit for the rapidly escalating indirect costs—\$1.7 billion at last count—of DOD support for U.N. peacekeeping. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

This amendment does not in any manner end our support for U.N. peacekeeping. It does undertake a modest first step in ensuring that we get credit for all of our direct and indirect support for any U.N. peacekeeping operations.

I urge my colleagues to delay the Berman amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of our time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, to try to put the debate in perspective of the language in section 501, if 501 had been in place in 1990, \$60 billion that we spent in incremental costs on Desert Storm, \$60 billion that was authorized by the United Nations because we went to the United Nations and got them to authorize it, would have been deducted and wiped out every peacekeeping cost for the next 50 years, even though the vast majority of that money was reimbursed by other countries.

This inflexible, silly language makes no provision for costs that are reimbursed for other countries that have to be reimbursed for the United States.

Second, yes, we can construe U.N.-authorized operations and attribute percent of the costs. It does not cover what is wiped out. You have wiped out U.N.-assessed costs where after this fiscal year we will only pay 25 percent. The other costs are operations we want to help ourselves diplomatically, politically, and militarily in terms of enforcing embargoes we got the United Nations to authorize so other countries would help us, help us. Penny-wise, pound-foolish, this amendment.

Finally, to remind Members, nothing is undertaken by the United Nations unless the United States decides it. If we do not like a specific U.N. operation, whether it is Somalia or Haiti, fight on that issue. Do not wipe out all of the good because of one thing you do not like.

It is the end of the cold war. We are at a point where America's security environment is more complicated than ever, and we are asked with this language in 501 to choose isolationism.

This so-called National Security Revitalization Act is billed as a cost-saving move to limit foreign adventurism, but its effect would be to undermine our national security by gutting our ability to use the United Nations as a tool to pursue U.S. interests.

Vote for the amendment. Defeat the bill. H.R. 501 is wrong.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the distinguished chairman of

the Subcommittee on Procurement of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding me the time and for his great work.

My colleagues, let us look at this part of the Contract With America for what it is. This is a taxpayers' credit, and here is what it says: It says if you have U.N. operation going on, and we are paying almost 30 percent of that, or almost a third of that, we are helping the U.N. operation. We may be undertaking at the same time an American airlift that we are paying entirely out of U.S. taxpayer funds. We have undertaken this airlift in Bosnia now longer than the Berlin airlift, and all we are saying is that we would like to get a little credit for this in-kind contribution.

We spent about \$1.4 billion in DOD airlifts and incremental costs, and at worst case, if the President exercises his exemptions, the U.S. taxpayers are only going to the credited for about \$240 million out of the fiscal year 1994 incremental costs for peacekeeping requirements, we are only getting a credit of 240 million. The gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] wants to cut the \$240 million credit down lower.

The U.S. taxpayers have a right to get this tax credit. They are paying two ways. They are paying through the United Nations and they are also paying for U.S. unilateral actions.

Please reject the Berman amendment or we are going to water this doggone thing down to the point where U.S. taxpayers do not get any credit at all for American unilateral actions carried out by DOD.

Please vote "no" on the Berman amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the modified amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

The modified amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider an amendment by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON].

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and others have talked about the costs of the United Nations, but what has not been talked about is we are talking about percentages, 25 percent of an already bloated budget. They are not cutting back on their costs, they are not addressing budget reductions.

I had planned to offer an amendment which would have placed a monetary cap of \$250 million for the U.S. contribution to the United Nations. Here at home we are making painful budget cuts, we are eliminating wasteful spending and abolishing unnecessary bureaucracies. The taxpayers have insisted that we change the way we do business here in Washington, and I

think that we can accept no less from the United Nations.

I believe we have the right and indeed the obligation to require the United Nations to do this, because the American taxpayer provides it with a quarter of its \$1 billion plus budget. When we add in peacekeeping, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has already said, \$2.8 billion, we are already at \$3 billion plus. That is too much money, and as the largest donor we are the only country capable of effecting positive change at the United Nations.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON] certainly raises a pertinent point on the issue of the U.S. contribution to the U.N. regular budget, and I share the gentleman's concerns about the level of our contributions, particularly in light of the poor management practices and inefficiencies that have been characterizing the U.N. organization. And I can assure the gentleman from Texas that our International Relations Committee will continue to press for reforms and hold the United Nations to no real growth in their budgets.

If the gentleman is willing, I would be pleased to work with him on this issue as part of the State Department authorization process. Our Committee on International Relations will be considering the authorization for the State Department for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 in the next few months, and this is a bill that authorizes the funding for the United Nations and the international organizations.

□ 1200

I am certain our Members would welcome the views of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON] on the U.S. contribution to the U.N. budget, so we would look forward to being of assistance to you in addressing your concerns and interest in the U.N. regular budget consideration.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Chairman. I appreciate him yielding time to me to discuss this, and I will take the chairman's suggestion and not offer the amendment today but will, instead, bring it up at the appropriate time, which will be during the State Department authorization process.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

Page 53, beginning on line 15, strike out "25 percent" and insert "20 percent".

Page 53, line 18, strike out "25 percent" and insert "20 percent".

Page 53, line 21, after "the United States." insert the following new sentences:

For any United Nations peacekeeping operation that is initially authorized by the United Nations Security Council before the date of the enactment of this section, the applicable percentages under the preceding sentence shall be 25 percent. For United Nations peacekeeping operations that are initially authorized by the United Nations Security Council on or after the date of the enactment of this section, the President may increase the percentage limitations under the first sentence of this subsection to a percentage not greater than 25 percent. The President may exercise the authority under the preceding sentence only after transmitting to Congress a report providing notice of the percentage increase under the preceding sentence and a statement of the reasons for the increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be recognized for 2½ minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 2½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I listened very carefully during this debate.

I would just like to offer my little assessment. I think the American people are fed up, fed up knowing that Uncle Sam has become the policeman for the entire world. But what they are really galled about is Uncle Sam then sticks around and organizes a neighborhood crime watch everywhere around the planet.

We happen to have 25,000 murders a year in America. Now, I know that is not germane to this debate. There are 25,000 murders, it is approaching, a year in America and everybody is talking about the borders overseas, controlling borders and patrolling and helping foreign nations.

Somebody better take a look at our borders.

The bill sets a cap of 25 percent for U.N. peacekeeping operations, our share. The Traficant amendment says that it shall be a 20-percent cap as a target, and the President can go to the 25 percent, but he must notify the Congress that they have reached 20 percent expenditure, and he is going to increase it and give us the reasons why the President wants those additional monies.

Now, I have heard everybody saying we are a world power. Ladies and gentleman, we are an almost bankrupt world power, and a bankrupt America does not have much world power in the future. So I do not want the Contract With America to accept the Traficant amendment, go to conference, and throw it out.

I want to take another second to explain it. The Traficant amendment says that somebody in the White House or the Pentagon has to get out an adding machine or a calculator and figure

out what they are spending and say, "Mr. President, we are approaching 20 percent. Now, we have got to send it to the Congress, notify them we are going to use the full 5."

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I seek the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], "You are right on target." I support this amendment.

This amendment further reduces the cap of the U.S. share of U.N. peacekeeping from 25 to 20 percent, and when you see what is taking place in our country, you are right on target. It permits two exceptions, I think, that the Members should know. It grandfather existing operations and it permits the President the flexibility of increasing it to 25 percent where he believes it is necessary.

This is a very well thought out amendment, and the value of this amendment is that it makes it clear a congressional policy is in order that the U.S. taxpayer should not be paying more than 20 percent of the tab. It is time to ensure that the U.S. taxpayer is no longer fleeced.

I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for pointing that out. Eighty percent of the tab, like the Clinton administration paid last year, is grossly unfair to the American taxpayer, and this is a fair amendment. It is a just amendment, and it deserves the support of this House.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. I rise in support of this amendment. A few months ago the front page of the Washington Post said we had our troops in Haiti picking up garbage and settling domestic disputes. Those should not be the mission of the American military, yet those are the kinds of things we are doing in these peacekeeping operations.

I support the amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment which I believe is in keeping with the other provisions of this title providing greater scrutiny and congressional oversight of the funding of U.N. peacekeeping operations. This amendment would establish a 20-percent assessment for new peacekeeping operations which the administration could raise up to the prevailing level of 25 percent to the extent

it reports to Congress on the reasons for our increased financial support.

I would like to commend the gentleman for offering this amendment and the majority accepts the Congressman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DURBIN: Page 63, line 4, strike "In particular," and insert "Numerous Central and East European countries, particularly"

Page 63, line 5, insert a comma after "Slovakia"

Page 66, after line 12, insert the following few paragraphs (and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs accordingly):

(7) that, when any other European country emerging from communist domination is in a position to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area, it should, in accordance with Article 10 of such Treaty, be invited to become a full NATO member, provided it—

(A) meets appropriate standards, including each of the standards specified in clauses (i) through (vii) of paragraph (5)(A); and

(B) remains committed to protecting the rights of all its citizens and respecting the territorial integrity of its neighbors;

(8) that the United States, other NATO member nations, and NATO itself should furnish appropriate assistance to facilitate the transition of other European countries emerging from communist domination to full NATO membership at the appropriate time.

Page 67, line 8, strike the semicolon and insert "including Russia, and"

Page 67, strike line 10, beginning on line 11, strike "cooperation" and beginning on line 12, strike "including the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and" and insert a period.

Page 67, strike line 14 and all that follows through line 21

(8) that the United States, other NATO member nations, and NATO itself should furnish appropriate assistance to facilitate the transition of other European countries emerging from communist domination to full NATO membership at the appropriate time;

Page 67, line 8, strike the semicolon and insert "including Russia, and"

Page 67, strike line 10, beginning on line 11, strike "cooperation", and beginning on line 12, strike "including the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and" and insert a period.

Page 67, strike line 14 and all that follows through line 21.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to say at the outset I want to express my appreciation to the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], who have cooperated in the reparation of this amendment.

Let me try to describe this amendment in very express and succinct terms. This bill envisions the possibility that NATO will be expanded in the future. The North American Treaty Organization, which has been the bedrock of democracy in Europe since World War II, has been a major factor in American foreign policy.

Many countries which were not members of NATO after World War II were under Communist domination and were thereby precluded from participation. Now that we have seen the elimination of the Soviet Union per se and the emergence of new countries in the region, many of them new democracies, we are envisioning the possibility that NATO in the future will embrace these same democracies.

The bill is express in its terms and suggests that we should consider enlarging NATO to include Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia. I have absolutely no objection to that, and feel they are appropriate candidates to be considered for NATO.

Unfortunately, the bill does not list many other nations which were formerly under Communist domination, and I think immediately, but not exclusively, about the Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Ukraine.

What my amendment does is to open the possibility, the potentiality, that other formerly Communist-dominated nations will also be considered for NATO membership.

This a great boost to these countries to know that they, too, are considered potential allies of the United States and all freedom-loving nations.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the other 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by Mr. DURBIN which amends title VI regarding NATO.

This amendment makes clear that there are a number of Central European countries beyond the Visegrad Four which should, at some point, be in a position to become full NATO members. I believe this is a very useful addition to the bill.

As I understand it, this is a consensus amendment worked out by the gentleman from Illinois in cooperation with the Central and East European

Coalition which consists of those prominent organizations that represent Americans of East European lineage.

That coalition has reportedly obtained the approval of Baltic-Americans, Ukrainian-Americans, Armenian-Americans, Hungarian-Americans, Czech-Americans, Polish-Americans, and others for this amendment as introduced.

I would also like to note the amendment includes language urging other NATO nations to furnish appropriate assistance to facilitate the transition of these countries to NATO membership. This is a key point. The U.S. cannot be the sole source of assistance for these countries.

This amendment also deletes language in the bill that has been interpreted—I am certain, inadvertently—as giving Russia a veto over NATO expansion in Central and Eastern Europe.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take further time. I understand there are other amendments and other debates that need to be considered.

I certainly thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York. He has been a pleasure to work with, on a very important issue. I also want to salute the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], who share our feelings on this important issue, as well as my colleague from Chicago, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI], who is a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I rise to express my strong support for the amendment offered by Mr. DURBIN to include other European countries along with Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia, for NATO membership in the future.

In particular I support restoring the eligibility of the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, as well as Ukraine to join NATO when they are able to meet the necessary requirements.

Since their independence from the Soviet Union, these nations have been working diligently to rebuild internally and establish democratic and free governments. By reaching out to the West, the Baltic states have been striving to develop peaceful relations throughout the global community.

Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Ukraine cannot ignore their neighbor to the east, the Russian Federation. We too cannot help but realize that Russia continues to present a potential threat to these countries. Certainly we all can see that the instability and actions of Russia have heightened tensions within its neighbors who remember all too clearly the history of the past 70 years.

In its current form H.R. 7 sends a message to these nations of Central and Eastern Europe that they are on their own in security

matters. This is a message we surely do not mean and one we cannot risk sending. It threatens to destabilize this region through the implication that NATO expansion would be limited to the four named countries, Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia. Certainly we should not imply that consideration of NATO membership will be limited to just these four countries. When the Baltic states or Ukraine meet the appropriate requirements they should be permitted to, at the least, be considered for NATO membership.

The Durbin amendment resolves this problem in a fair and suitable manner. This language making numerous Central and Eastern European countries eligible for consideration in future NATO expansion extends the same criteria for NATO integration to all the nations of Central and Eastern Europe. I support this amendment and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1410

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BATEMAN

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATEMAN: Page 74, after line 16, strike all through line 20; Redesignate current paragraph (B) as the (A); Add after (A) the following new paragraph (B):

(B) certain countries that were a part of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or that were part of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which the President may designate pursuant to Section 203(d)(2) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] will be recognized for 1½ minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 1½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, in the bill as it comes to the floor, there are terms within the bill, or a phrase, "certain other European countries emerging from communist domination." In a section of the bill thereafter this phrase is defined legislatively. The legislative definition now in the bill is written so as to make eligible for participation in programs that bring additional countries into NATO, territories of the former Soviet Union and territories of the former Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia.

My amendment changes that definition of that phrase, "certain European countries which have emerged from

communist domination." But the nature of the amendment makes no substantive difference in the bill. What it does do, however, is to remove that blanket invitation to have someone possibly construe this that we are thinking in terms of countries as remote from NATO as Kazakhstan or Azerbaijan or Armenia or Turkistan, which I do not think anyone really contemplates is what we have in mind.

Similarly, if you say all of the former territories of the Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] has expired.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee is under a unanimous-consent agreement of the House where it is not in order to ask for additional minutes.

If the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] would like to control the time, he can yield.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment.

I believe it helps to clarify the fact that the President has the discretion to identify certain countries in the former Soviet Union and in the former Yugoslavia which may be eligible for assistance.

Some countries may be designated in those regions. Others may not. It's the President's decision.

I urge my colleague to support Mr. BATEMAN's amendment.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding it is also acceptable by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

(Mr. OBERSTAR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make sure this language does not preclude the possibility of a country like Slovenia, which is independent, has a privatized economy, had had successful free democratic elections, from joining, having the same status as the already named countries in the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the positive response of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], as well as the concurrence and affirmation by the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, Mr. GILMAN, that the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia and the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], clearly open the door for

admission of Slovenia to NATO membership without specifically mentioning that country by name.

Slovenia clearly deserves equal standing with the other countries already named in the pending bill and merits membership on a full equality basis in NATO, because Slovenia obviously has taken its place in the family of nations as a democratic, free market-based, privatized economy. In a December 1990 plebiscite, Slovenes voted 96 percent for independence from what was then Yugoslavia. That plebiscite directed the Slovene Parliament to craft a constitution, based on democratic, representative, government principles and set June 26, 1991, as the date on which independence from Yugoslavia should be formally declared.

Those directives were carried out by the Slovene Parliament, independence was declared; the Yugoslav army invade Slovenia to stifle independence, but, after a 9-day military confrontation with minimal loss of life, the Yugoslav army retreated and the Slovene people prevailed. The United States formally recognized the Republic of Slovenia on April 7, 1992.

Immediately upon the successful establishment of its independence, the Slovene Government began a very intensive privatization of its national economy, much of which already was operating on a market basis.

In January 1993, an international trade journal, International Trade Reporter, said this about Slovenia: "Of all the countries of eastern Europe, Slovenia has the best preconditions for the transition to a market economy and a fast start toward dynamic economic development."

Now, a fully privatized economy, Slovenia is the 20th largest exporter in the world, exporting over \$7 billion in goods each year, which accounts for 60 percent of Slovenia's GNP. Slovenia now enjoys a lively trade with the United States, shipping \$229 million worth of goods to the United States each year and importing some \$180 in United States goods annually.

However, for Slovenes, these are not surprising numbers. Prior to separation from the former Yugoslavia, Slovenia, with a population of 2.4 million, just over 8 percent of the total population of the former Yugoslavia, represented 40 percent of former Yugoslavia's overall GNP and 36 percent of its total tax base. Slovenes are industrious, hard working, committed to democratic principles and a vigorous market economy. They deserve to have their rightful place in the family of nations and, should they choose to do so, a seat in NATO and in the Western European Alliance.

Not only would such status be emphatically embraced by the Slovene Government and its people, but it would also fill with pride the three-quarter million or so of Americans of Slovene descent, including me, who are scattered throughout nearly every one of these United States.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman he is correct. It is written so as not to exclude the possibility of Slovenia.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend

him on his work. It has indeed taken care of some clarification both with respect to the Soviet Union and the Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia. I thank the gentleman for his work, it is very fine work.

I hope we can support it.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TORRICELLI

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TORRICELLI: Page 68, line 4, strike out "shall" and insert "may."

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] will be recognized for 22 minutes, and an opponent will be recognized for 22 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, never in my memory has a more simple amendment been brought before this institution. It hangs largely on one word, "may" the United States establish the new military aid program and expansion of foreign aid in eastern Europe, or "shall" it do so? Is it mandatory?

In my memory of this institution, I have never known this Congress in its enthusiasm for foreign aid to mandate an expansion of that program to other countries. But indeed, unless my amendment is accepted, that is exactly what we will do today: Add 4 countries in eastern Europe on a mandatory basis, requiring military aid.

Now, I know this is a large institution and we represent very different districts with different electoral experiences. But I cannot believe that anyone in this institution feels that it is a mandate from their constituents in the second month of this new Congress as a matter of the highest priority to come here to this floor to expand foreign aid. I do not think anybody knew it was in the contract. I do not think anyone would have been for it if they did.

But you have got one opportunity to take it out today; change the word "shall" expand foreign aid to "may," based on the judgment of the administration.

Now, I know that the intentions of the authors of the legislation are sound, to bring into the western alliance for security purposes the nations of eastern Europe.

And indeed under the Partnership for Peace, \$100 million has already been authorized to work with eastern Europe nations so that one day they might coordinate their defense policies and perhaps eventually enter NATO.

But this is beyond coordinating defense programs. This is providing direct assistance.

Now, the authors may claim that the \$100 million of the Partnership for Peace can be used to fund this new foreign aid program. But indeed there is no reason to believe that this money would be sufficient. It is already being used with other nations. It may already be entirely consumed.

The simple truth is that if we vote to expand this foreign aid program, that money either has to come from withdrawing other eastern European nations from the Partnership for Peace, coming back to expand overall foreign aid money, or taking it from current recipients, most notably the biggest recipients, the Russian program, the Israeli program, or the Egyptian program.

Indeed, those countries could not possibly be unaffected if we are to mandate this foreign aid program because there are no other sources.

I find myself, Mr. Chairman, in a peculiar position. Having served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs all these years, I have come to this floor previously to argue for foreign aid, for poor nations, for nations with security problems, for nations working with the United States on a bilateral basis for our own defense, but considering our other budgetary problems and the other needs before this Congress, our domestic priorities, I cannot argue that we should add any nation on a mandatory basis for American foreign aid.

My amendment would simply allow the administration to look at each of these countries, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland, gauge the strengths of their democracies, the liberalization of their economies, what they are doing for their own security needs, and then make a determination whether or not we want to expand our military assistance.

It is a discretion that makes sense. Indeed, in the underlying legislation, on page 68 and page 69, this is exactly the formula that the authors use for expanding this to other countries beyond the four I just mentioned. They would gauge the progress of democracy in those countries, Ukraine, Baltics. That is what we should do for these.

□ 1220

Indeed, frankly I think of no better evidence than of the four countries mandated for an expansion of military aid, two of them are now led by former communists. One has an authoritative government. All have declining defense budgets.

So the majority would have us have a mandated foreign aid program for countries led by two former communists? Where they themselves are

decreasing their defense spending? With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, who is doing the thinking here? This cannot make any sense.

Let us work together with the administration to determine whether or not they are making progress, and they should be brought into the program.

There are times, Mr. Chairman, when this Congress feels so strongly and the merits are so overwhelming for foreign assistance programs in our security needs that this Congress should mandate, and we do, for Israel, for Egypt. But if I might paraphrase the words of former Senator Bentsen, Slovakia is no Israel. There is no need at this point to write into the law this which in my judgment is the largest expansion in terms of naming the countries involved with American foreign aid in my memory.

I cannot believe that any Member of this institution wants to go home this evening, meet their constituents on the streets and say to them, "You can be proud. I recognized our needs. I just voted to on a mandatory basis add four countries to the American foreign aid program."

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is recognized for 22 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], a senior member of the Committee on International Relations and chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong support for the underlying provisions of the legislation, namely title 6, which squarely addresses the issue of NATO expansion. At the outset, let me dispel the notion that this section would somehow hamstring the administration's foreign policy, assuming it has one. Nothing in the National Security Revitalization Act mandates NATO membership for any country or group of countries. Changes in the membership of NATO are determined on the basis of consensus among the alliance's member states as stipulated under article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty, a point reaffirmed in the pending legislation and known to Members on both sides of the aisle.

The crux of the matter is how best to consolidate and build upon the fundamental political changes which have occurred in many of the countries of Central Europe, the Baltics, and some of the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union. On the security front, a veritable "no-man's-land" has emerged between Germany and Russia following the demise of the Warsaw Pact, and the ensuing moves toward

democracy and market economy by many in the region.

The Clinton administration, like the administration before it, the Bush administration, has been slow to move to fill this vacuum. Mr. Chairman, this has been a source of great consternation to the emerging democracies in the region who rightly view it as a source of potential instability.

I think my colleagues would agree that the Partnership for Peace initiative launched a year ago has failed to fill this void. By making the program mandatory, as we do in title 6, we are ensuring that the job gets done. I would urge my colleagues to read the legislation. The legislation clearly states that the program is to assist in the transition to full NATO membership of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and any other European country emerging from Communist domination that is designated by the President, and so on and so forth.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], making the transition optional would make this entire section a sense-of-the-Congress resolution. Mr. Chairman, title 7 of the National Security Revitalization Act I believe provides a reasonable framework for addressing the concerns consistent with U.S. interests in ensuring stability in Europe. Very clearly delineated in the bill is a list of criteria, such as respect for democratic principles and human rights enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act, against which to evaluate the suitability of prospective candidates for NATO membership. In addition, it establishes a program to provide the emerging democracies with the necessary tools to facilitate their transition to full NATO membership, which, as I pointed out earlier, will ultimately be up to the members of NATO to decide.

Given the broad range of our political, economic, and security interests in Europe, strengthening new free markets and democracies in that region benefits the United States. Interestingly two of the most prominent members of the foreign policy establishment, Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski, are ardent supporters of the timely expansion of NATO.

Dr. Kissinger sees the existing vacuum as a threat, not only to NATO cohesion, but the very existence of NATO as a meaningful institution, and he writes, "NATO expansion represents a balancing of two conflicting considerations the fear of alienating Russia against the danger of creating a vacuum in central Europe. A wise policy," he counsels, "would proceed with the membership for Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, and to reject a Russian veto." Dr. Kissinger concludes, "NATO cannot long survive if the borders it protects are not threatened while it refuses to protect the borders of adjoining countries that do feel threatened."

Zbigniew Brzezinski recently urged NATO to formally declare its "criteria for expansion and indicate which countries appear to meet them. This would end the counterproductive debates with Russia over whether NATO should expand. The longer this step is delayed, the more vociferous Moscow's objections are likely to be."

Mr. Chairman, this is precisely the purpose of title 6 of the National Security Revitalization Act.

Rather than dodging the issue of NATO expansion, as it has largely done to date, the Clinton administration, should move on the membership issue before more time is lost. But that requires leadership. We must seize upon today's opportunities which could be gone tomorrow. A steady and deliberate course of action is one thing, obfuscation, which has characterized the Clinton administration's approach to date is another.

Russia, perhaps sensing a certain timidity within the administration, has sought to block NATO expansion. It is instructive to recall that the Soviet Union vehemently opposed German membership in NATO in 1955 and attempted to deny unified Germany continued participation in the Alliance. A democratic Russia has nothing to fear from a defensive alliance founded on democratic principles. It would be foolhardy and dangerous, as Henry Kissinger rightly pointed out, to give Russia a veto over NATO expansion, and, as Dr. Brzezinski observed, failure to act now will only make matters worse.

Let's look at the earlier inclusion of new countries. As my colleagues know, when we look at countries that were included into NATO, Greece and Turkey were hardly stellar democracies when they joined in 1952. I remind Members that Portugal, one of the founding members of NATO, was under a dictatorship in 1949. In this bill we lay out clear markers which we think have to be achieved before this program goes forward. We are trying to promote and push these countries in the direction of democracy, free markets, respect for human rights. I believe title 6, as a mandatory program, goes much further to ensure those objectives, and, hopefully, a safer world, rather than making this title a sense-of-the-Congress resolution by amending it to an optional program.

□ 1230

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman who coauthored this amendment with me, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

I want to remind the body, however, that this amendment does not impact NATO expansion, only the question of whether there should be a mandatory foreign aid program.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I would encourage especially the new freshmen of this body to read this title, pages 61 through 75. All the amendment that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] and I have offered would

do is say that the President may establish this program, not that he has to establish this program as a mandate.

As we read through the next 14 pages, as Members are on the floor or in their offices and they decide whether or not to vote for this amendment, let me say that in title IV what we have been debating is whether or not there should be some accountability and limits to U.S. participation in Somalia, in Haiti, in Bosnia, and other places around the world.

Title VI then says it completely unties that, completely undoes it, and says we are going to possibly send troops and foreign aid to Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, Albania, or Romania.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROEMER. I will not yield until I have finished.

It opens up all these possibilities by mandating to the President that he has to expand NATO and he has to look at providing foreign aid and disarmament aid to these qualifying countries.

I would also argue to my colleagues that in reading through what this legislation says, we read through this and find that on page 71 of title VI, at the top of the page, these countries would be eligible for economic support assistance, they would be eligible for security assistance, and they would be eligible for nonproliferation and disarmament funds.

Where in the Contract for America does it say that we are going to mandate that we expand NATO, that we list to the President of the United States all these countries that have to join, according to this legislation, in title VI, and that the American taxpayer is then going to fund this new expanded NATO? I do not think that that is what the elections in November were about.

I would further argue that whether or not we intended this, the gentleman from New Jersey and I are in complete adherence to what the contract says. The Contract With America at page 108 says, and I quote, "With respect to this program, the President is given authority to establish a program to assist Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic," et cetera, not mandate it to the President.

That is exactly what the Torricelli-Roemer amendment does. It does not mandate. It says the President may. It gives the President authority. It is in complete agreement with what the contract says. It gives the President authority.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROEMER. I will not yield yet.

I will just conclude by saying that I am delighted that somebody did not stick Chechnya in this. What would that mean? Where would we be then? What would that commit us to? What about Albania and Romania? Will the gentleman answer that question? They do not even have an organized military. Yet Title 5 of the NATO treaty

requires mutual cooperation between the countries.

How much does this cost? What would be the financial burden to the United States to start funding this under these three or four different accounts, and would the United States be required to send troops to Albania and Slovakia?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] has expired.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, first of all, perhaps we have had too many discussions on the floor about mandates because mandates seem to be on the brain.

There is nothing in this bill that mandates that any country join NATO. That has to be made very clear. What we are doing is saying that the program that would assist nations like Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia and other European nations means that these nations would be designated for transitional help. There is \$100 million being requested for the President by the President for this kind of thing. We want to encourage expansion—that is what we are talking about.

As I have said, we have had a lack of leadership with regard to this, and we are saying that Congress should speak up and say these countries are worth it. A window of opportunity exists and we do not want to see that window closed.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If I have the time, I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Again I ask, what is the cost of this? Have we had hearings on this?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As the gentleman knows, there is no cost figure stated in the legislation.

Mr. ROEMER. There certainly is not.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. At a later date we will talk about it, but already we have \$100 million for the fiscal year requested by the President in the Partnership For Peace.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Torricelli amendment.

There is a lot of confusion around here. Nowhere is there a requirement that the President enlarge NATO. Nowhere is there a requirement that the United States support an enlargement

of NATO under all conditions. Section 604 tries to provide some leadership. It is assisting, and it would encourage NATO expansion.

This has been unfairly characterized as mandatory foreign aid, even mandatory military aid. There is nothing about it that is mandatory. If the President decides to create an office but uses no funds, he has that authority.

But what has the President done? He has offered the Warsaw Initiative last July, and in the budget document we submitted, we have \$100 million for the Warsaw Initiative. We would expect that under section 604 as written the Warsaw Initiative funds would be channeled through this source.

Nowhere is it restricted to military assistance. If in fact we talk to the State Department, they will talk to us about transportation improvements and other kinds of ESF related expenditures. There may in fact not be a single penny spent on military aid as a result of this.

What I think we are doing is trying to provide some guidance. If in fact we are going to enlarge into the Visegrad Four countries or other eligible countries for a period of time when they meet the criteria spelled out in title VI, then we would have an opportunity to expand NATO, with the approval of our 15 additional NATO allies.

But what we are attempting to do with this program is to provide some guidance to the executive branch. That is an entirely appropriate activity of the Congress of the United States. The President is proposing to spend \$100 million on the Visegrad Four and other Partnership For Peace countries. We are going to give some direction through section 604.

Mr. Chairman, I urge rejection of the Torricelli amendment.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON], a member of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Torricelli amendment. I believe that the mandated-funding provision and other policies contained in title VI of this bill are severely flawed.

Mandating a funding program for these four countries is a serious mistake. Congress should not attempt to legislate the expansion of NATO—NATO expansion must be handled flexibly, in close consultation with our allies, as circumstances in Europe evolve. In addition, NATO expansion would be at an enormous expense—tens of billions of dollars. This bill mandates an expansion of our commitments overseas, yet it doesn't say how we should pay for them—and all during a period of declining foreign assistance resources.

Specifying countries that are to be fast-tracked into NATO membership is also a mistake. As Secretaries Christopher and Perry recently wrote in the New York Times, "If we arbitrarily

lock in advantages now for some countries, we risk discouraging reformers in countries not named and fostering complacency in countries that are."

In general, this bill micromanages U.S. foreign policy to an unacceptable extent. Any policy of NATO expansion should be closely responsive to the very fluid political landscape in Europe—the President should decide how and when NATO is expanded. Members on both sides know well that this sort of micromanaging simply does not work.

Mr. Chairman, I must also question the wisdom of the underlying policy of NATO expansion as expressed in this bill. At the very least, I believe the Nation needs a broad national debate on NATO expansion, a debate that has hardly begun.

This policy of NATO expansion would draw clear new lines across Europe. It would prejudice, and I believe adversely affect, the outcome of transitions underway in Russia and throughout the region. Moreover, I am not convinced that NATO expansion is viable politically. Do the American people truly understand the legal and financial implications of providing security guarantees to Bratislava and Budapest? Are we ready to sacrifice the lives of our sons and daughters to defend Slovakia and the other countries? Once the public debate begins in earnest, the expansion of NATO by treaty obligation may well be politically impossible.

I strongly support the Torricelli amendment to this bill.

□ 1240

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to respond to a couple of the points that have been made in this debate. I am very familiar with Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, having visited and examined some of their emergence from the former Soviet bloc, and I can tell you that this amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey is a grave mistake at this time.

The point was made here that this is some extension of foreign aid, and that is not correct. There is foreign aid already in all of these countries, United States foreign aid. This amendment says the President shall establish a program to assist in the transition to full NATO membership. He says "may."

Well, the President already may. That is what we are suffering from, is a lack of leadership, a lack of direction. And what this Congress is trying to do is say that we shall assist these emerging nations to reach NATO status. And that is the clear intent.

That is what has been lacking here, and that is what will be lacking if we miss this opportunity. We will make a grave mistake if we pass this amendment and put us back in the situation we are in, because these countries, Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and

Slovakia want this status and want to work toward this status, and this directs from the Congress, providing leadership, to say that we will establish a program and the President will cooperate with us to bring these people into NATO. And that can only be in the long-term interests of the security and peace of not only this Nation, but the entire world.

If we adopt this amendment, we are voting for the status quo, and we are voting to make a great mistake in the history of these emerging nations. I urge its defeat.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, if I were a NATO ally, I would be scratching my head in wonderment and asking has the U.S. Congress gone mad, or is this a joke? Did the Americans hear that the cold war is over, or is this a time warp?

Whatever happened to consultation with our NATO allies? What does the President think about this initiative? Oh, I forgot, we now have 230 Secretaries of State and Defense, and we do not need an executive branch. We now have an imperial Congress with a constitutional authority to run foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bad bill. It is an attempt to dictate the terms of NATO expansion with no criteria for membership. England is against this, France is against this, Germany is against this. Russia is going to think we are indicating aggression. Slovakia is run by an authoritarian leader. Poland is run by a former Communist Party member. Should we not be discussing these issues with others, rather than dictating to NATO and the executive branch?

We are also starting a new military assistance program, an entitlement program. This is going to take money from other strategic allies like Israel, like Turkey, like Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, let us not allow this amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] to go down. It corrects a serious flaw. This bill is not going to become law, but it sends a chilling signal to our allies that the United States is divided, that there is no cohesion between the executive and congressional branches.

Mr. Chairman, let us debate NATO expansion within the Congress, within the American public, but with our allies. Let us pass the Torricelli amendment and correct a very, very chilling signal that is going to arrive in Europe and NATO tomorrow that the United States is divided.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman, I hope

the gentleman is aware there is no entitlement program created by this. The President, of course, is proposing to spend \$100 million for the Warsaw Initiative, part of which could go for the countries which would be eligible. There is no mandatory timeframe, of course.

We have by the action of the framers of H.R. 7 and by action of the Committee on International Relations taken additional criteria that ought to be considered, giving some guidance to these countries on how we ought to proceed. But we certainly are not forcing our allies or the President to take them in.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is an expert on many of these issues, NATO especially. The gentleman knows our allies are seriously concerned about this initiative, and you are going to be taking money from other strategic allies. You are setting forth a military assistance program. The language is very clear.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Torricelli amendment. It calls on NATO membership for four countries in the near future. It mandates an assistance program of all kinds to aid in the transition to NATO membership. It specifically designates four countries. Now, there are a lot of things wrong with that.

First of all, it prejudices and dictates the pace and direction of NATO expansion. What you have got going on in this part of the world is a very elaborate historical process to determine the security regime of Europe in the years ahead, and the Congress of the United States comes in with this provision in H.R. 7 and tries to dictate what that result would be.

Furthermore, this is just gratuitous advice, because NATO expansion cannot be dictated by a statute of the Congress. We short-circuit the partnership for peace initiative, which is supported by all of our allies today. That establishes closer military and political ties between NATO and the nations of central and Eastern Europe. We ought to let that evolve.

Now, there has been a lot of talk in here about this bill providing guidance to the President. This does not provide guidance to the President. This tells the President what to do. It mandates the President shall establish a program. That is not providing guidance. That is mandating. And you are telling the President to assist in the transition, and furthermore, you are not giving him any resources to do what you tell him to do.

That is no way to conduct American foreign policy. You are mandating an

ambitious program of military and economic assistance here. You are picking out winners and losers in this historical process that is going on. You are creating a dangerous gulf between our commitments on the one hand and the resources that we provide on the other hand.

We are extending U.S. security commitments under the plan you put into H.R. 7, and that is an unwise thing to do. I strongly support the Torricelli amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I would ask if the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] would engage in a brief colloquy with my regarding the U.S. policy toward NATO as spelled out in clause 4 of section 603, which is language I worked with the chairman and his committee to develop.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this provision addresses NATO's current lack of an airborne ground surveillance system to provide allied forces with essential, timely, and reliable enemy movement and targeting information.

Mr. GILMAN. If the gentleman would yield, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. In 1991, the United States recommended to NATO that it consider procuring an airborne ground surveillance capability to complement the air surveillance capability of the NATO AWACS fleet. The AWACS system has effectively provided our pilots with a map of the skies, however, it is not designed to observe real-time movement of ground forces on the battlefield at extended ranges. It is, therefore, in the best interests of the United States and the NATO alliance to expedite a program which will provide our ground forces with the same ability to see the battlefield that our pilots currently enjoy with the AWACS fleet.

□ 1250

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, is it not correct that the United States has already developed such a system which is called JSTARS and demonstrated its battle management capabilities during Desert Storm?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman is again correct. In fact, the JSTARS program has been nominated by our Nation as the best candidate to meet the needs of NATO. I am confident that the JSTARS program will provide NATO with a significant operational advantage that will strengthen the capabilities of our allied forces.

Mr. HAYES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, all sides including the administration, envision the eventual expansion of NATO. The problem is that the administration has been unwilling to spell out in clear terms what conditions candidates would have to meet. This ambiguity does not serve any good purpose and, in fact, plays into the hands of the Russians who want to block any expansion.

Let me remind Members and assure Members the bill does not mandate that the countries listed or any others would be invited to even join NATO. There is a separate process for that. The process for expansion is qualified by article 10 of the NATO treaty. There is a specific process for that. We are talking about a program to assist in the transition.

I urge Members to read on page 69 the kinds of things we are talking about that we would like to see happen: shared values and interests, democratic governments, free market economies, civilian control of the military, and so on and so forth.

Let us not just be passive and reactive. I believe we need to be proactive for the sake of security for Europe and for the rest of the world.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me and for his leadership in presenting this amendment, because I think that if it passes, it will vastly improve H.R. 872.

I am very, very concerned about the language contained therein, which would expand NATO membership. We must remember that NATO membership means that our security alliance would be expanded, that we would expand the guarantee of security to many more countries.

And this may be appropriate, as my colleague and friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] said, we all envision a time when that would happen. But right now, 16 governments are involved in any decision to expand NATO. The United States, we do not make this decision alone. The situation in Eastern Europe and in the New Independent States is a delicate one, the balance of which could be very disturbed by this legislation.

The administration's partnership for peace was designed to enhance the security of our allies in this region while providing incentives for reform for the new European democracies. If we move forward with these NATO provisions, we will run the risk of alienating the countries not named and the greater risk of developing a bunker mentality with Russia.

I urge my colleagues to support the Torricelli amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 872, which poses a significant threat to our national security. The bill before

us violates basic tenets of our national defense strategy; it abrogates international treaties; and, it violates the U.S. Constitution. The National Security Revitalization Act is fundamentally flawed. It is also dangerous.

H.R. 872 is dangerous because it would revive the old star wars project, an ineffective, unnecessary, and costly project which was, after significant public and congressional debate under previous administrations, deemed to be not worthy of funding.

The Congressional Budget Office [CBO] has estimated that the system proposed by the Republicans in this bill could cost \$29–\$30 billion over the next 5 years. Others have estimated that the costs could range as high as \$39 billion. In today's budget climate, funding one projects means not funding something else. If star wars goes forward, troop readiness and weapon modernization will be cut.

In addition, restarting star wars would actually make the world less safe. The passage of this bill could abrogate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, threaten START II negotiations, and terminate existing Nunn-Lugar agreements to dismantle nuclear warheads with Russia, Ukraine, Byelarus, and Kazakhstan. These actions do not increase our security, they undermine it by threatening the real progress which is being made toward diminishing the threat of nuclear destruction.

H.R. 872 is dangerous because it would tie the hands of the President, any President, in international crisis when he or she determines it is in our national interest to place our troops under the operational control of another country, including NATO allies. My Republican colleagues must know that with this law on the books, President Bush would not have been able to deploy the troops he deemed necessary to carry out Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm against Saddam Hussein; President Clinton would not have been able to respond to Hussein's threats by deploying troops to Kuwait in 1994. For that matter, if constrained by this law, President Truman would not have been able to deploy troops to Korea in 1950.

This provision is unnecessary. Today, our forces always remain under the command of the President of the United States. We already apply the most rigorous standards when we pass even the most limited responsibility to a competent foreign commander—an action which has been done throughout this great Nation's history from the Revolutionary War through the Persian Gulf war. I frankly do not understand why my Republican colleagues, who have steadfastly defended the President's prerogatives for years, would choose to tie his hands in what is a very dangerous way.

H.R. 872 is dangerous because it undermines the very viability of international peacekeeping efforts. Many argue that the United States cannot and should not be the world's policeman. We cannot afford to intervene everywhere; we do not want to put American lives at risk. However, conflicts do not go away and in this post-cold-war world, there seem to be an evergrowing number of global hot spots. If we want to retain our role as the world's only superpower and if we do not want to be the world's policeman, it is critical for us to work to strengthen, not to weaken, multinational institutions.

If this bill passes, we are going in the wrong direction. The U.N. peacekeeping provisions contained in this legislation would cripple mul-

tinational efforts to address international crises. If we reduce our assessed peacekeeping dues dollar-for-dollar by the costs of peacekeeping operations which we conduct voluntarily and in support of U.S. interests, we would force the cancellation of peacekeeping activities, undermine U.N. peacekeeping efforts, and ultimately devastate the United Nations. If the United States changes the way it funds U.N. peacekeeping, other countries will follow suit.

As much as some would like to believe this country can survive in isolation, it cannot. If we pass this bill, we will be forced either to be the world's sole policeman or to ignore conflicts which could threaten our national security. I do not believe this choice is what the American people really want.

H.R. 872 is also dangerous because it unilaterally designates certain candidates for NATO membership. Sixteen governments are involved in any decision to expand NATO; the United States does not make this decision alone. The situation in Eastern Europe and the New Independent States is a delicate one, the balance of which can be disturbed by H.R. 872. The Administration's Partnership for Peace was designed to enhance the security of our allies in the region while providing incentives for reform for the new European democracies. If we move forward with these NATO provisions, we run the real risk of alienating the countries not named by the Republicans for NATO membership and destabilizing an already precarious region. These NATO provisions are imprudent also because it sends the wrong message to Russia. The last thing we need is for Russia to adopt a bunker mentality as the security guarantee is extended to all of their neighbors. Against what country.

H.R. 872 contains a number of other objectionable provisions, some of which are dangerous and some of which are just plain silly. One of the themes of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle has been that government should be downsized, reduced, and eliminated. It is therefore with some perplexity that I note the inclusion in this bill of an unnecessary and duplicative commission to review national security.

Why do people who claim to be opponents of government agencies, bureaucracies, and departments, propose to establish a brand new one, one which would duplicate services which are already being provided by the Secretary of Defense and Members of Congress?

American taxpayers already pay the salaries of people to review U.S. security needs. We have a Department of Defense and defense specialists in other Government agencies and here in Congress. But, this bill would spend an additional \$1.5 million of American workers' hard-earned dollars to copy what people in Government are already doing. This Commission does not make sense.

Mr. Chairman, for all of the above reasons and others, I believe that the National Security Revitalization Act should be defeated. If it passes, U.S. national security will be weakened significantly.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations in a colloquy, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. Chairman, I wondered if the gentleman could succinctly tell us, does he have some estimation of exactly how much we would be spending in new foreign assistance to help these poor countries? Is there a dollar amount he has in mind?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TORRICELLI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the President has to evolve a program and then send the program to us. We are not mandating.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, so in fact, we would be mandating a foreign assistance program without knowing a number?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield—

Mr. TORRICELLI. Reclaiming my time, if the gentleman would then answer, is there a reason, a theory in mind, why when each of these four countries is declining in their defense spending, spending less of their dollars, we would take the American taxpayers' dollars in foreign aid to substitute for their military spending? Is there a rationale there I am missing?

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for his comment. We await the President's program before we can analyze what the costs would be.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, this is evidence that if one lives long enough, they can see anything.

The majority has come to this Congress to establish a mandatory foreign aid program at a time of enormous domestic problems and mounting deficits in this country.

They have done so claiming that our current program to help these same foreign nations is not working, even though it is only 90 days old. We have asked the President for 90 days to begin working militarily for NATO expansion with these countries. Now in our impatience we tell him on a mandatory basis, he must do so, that we do not know what it would cost. We overlook the fact that two of the four countries have former Communists running their governments. One is becoming an authoritative government. But we want to expand foreign aid to help them. Even though the same countries, every one of them, has a declining defense budget. But in our enthusiasm to help them, even when we do not have enough money for our own armed forces, we are going to throw our money upon them.

Mr. Chairman, the simple truth is, this has not been well thought through. We have a program that is working. We tell the President of the United States, you may have a program to help these countries if they are democratic, they are pluralistic, it would help the security interests of the United States, our NATO allies agree.

It is a good program. It is under way, and we should remain with it. Our differences indeed are narrow, whether we apply those criteria to those four countries, do so on a basis of the President's discretion or, in my judgment, have the largest mandatory expansion of the American foreign assistance program that I have ever witnessed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of this institution to vote for my amendment. It is consistent with bipartisan foreign policy, the actions of the 103d Congress, and indeed, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] has pointed out, the Contract With America, which itself talks about a permissive expansion of our foreign assistance program, not a mandatory expansion.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TORRICELLI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. I would just like to remind my colleagues, on page 108 of the contract, it says "the President is given authority to establish this program."

If the Torricelli-Roemer amendment is adopted, we say he "may establish" this program, not as the current language reads, he "shall establish" a program, which is mandatory. The other side even lists the countries that should be in NATO.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indian. I urge a yes vote. I thank Members of the majority party, the new members in the committee who voted for this amendment in committee.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, section 604(a) of H.R. 872 directs the President to establish a program to assist in the transition of full NATO membership of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia and any other country emerging from Communist domination that is designated by the President.

The author of this amendment, Mr. TORRICELLI and the administration opposes the mandatory establishment of this program. That is no surprise to me. This administration, and in fact, any administration, nearly always opposes congressionally mandated initiatives.

I am reminded of the Bush administration's vociferous objections to the establishment of the Nunn-Lugar program. And also to the establishment of the nonproliferation and disarmament fund which was a part of the Freedom bill.

In fact, I am quite confident that each and every Member here can point to examples of congressional initiatives which this and other administrations have opposed. It seems to me that if it is not their idea then it is not a good idea.

Permit me to explain why I think it is so important to direct that this program be established. The answer is quite simple.

It is clear that this administration wants to provide assistance to certain Central European countries. This administration has been trying to find a way for more than a year to make additional countries eligible for excess defense articles.

In fact, the administration recently briefed staff of the International Relations Committee about the President's fiscal year 1996 budget request for \$100 million for military cooperation with Central European states. We want to work with the President to support that assistance.

But I want to make clear that we want that done in a proper framework. The establishment of a program under this provision provides a framework for the Committee on International Relations to carry out its fundamental oversight responsibilities. It will provide us a framework for accounting purposes. It will provide us a framework for hearing purposes. I don't know why any Member would oppose that provision.

One final point and it is a key one, let me be clear that although section 604 directs that the program be established it does not in any way, shape, or form, mandate that the President provide assistance to these countries. Not one penny is earmarked in this legislation. The decision to provide assistance under this program is left entirely up to the administration.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to defeat the Torrecelli amendment.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 232, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

AYES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)

Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio

DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Ensign
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake

Foglietta
Ford
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hayes
Hefner
Hinchey
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Klecza
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Laughlin
Levin
Lincoln
Lofgren
Lowe
Luther
Manton
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy

McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roybal-Allard

Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—232

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis

DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Durbin
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Evans
Everett
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Flanigan
Kim
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson

Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari

| | | |
|------------|---------------|-------------|
| Moorhead | Rogers | Tate |
| Morella | Ros-Lehtinen | Taylor (NC) |
| Myers | Roth | Thomas |
| Myrick | Royce | Thornberry |
| Neal | Salmon | Tiahrt |
| Nethercutt | Saxton | Torkildsen |
| Neumann | Schaefer | Traficant |
| Ney | Schiff | Upton |
| Norwood | Seastrand | Vucanovich |
| Nussle | Sensenbrenner | Waldholtz |
| Oxley | Shadegg | Walker |
| Packard | Shaw | Walsh |
| Pallone | Shays | Wamp |
| Paxon | Shuster | Watts (OK) |
| Petri | Skeen | Weldon (FL) |
| Pombo | Smith (MI) | Weldon (PA) |
| Porter | Smith (NJ) | Weller |
| Portman | Smith (TX) | White |
| Pryce | Smith (WA) | Whitfield |
| Quillen | Solomon | Wicker |
| Quinn | Souder | Young (AK) |
| Radanovich | Spence | Young (FL) |
| Ramstad | Stearns | Zeliff |
| Regula | Stockman | Zimmer |
| Riggs | Stump | |
| Roberts | Talent | |

NOT VOTING—11

| | | |
|---------|---------------|----------|
| Becerra | Hastings (FL) | Stark |
| Clay | Lewis (GA) | Thornton |
| Ewing | McHugh | Wilson |
| Green | Roukema | |

□ 1318

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Lewis of Georgia for, with Mr. McHugh against.

Mr. EVANS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. HARMAN, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. COOLEY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SKELTON: Page 73, line 15, strike the close quotation marks.

Page 73, after line 15, insert the following new paragraphs:

"(5) The number, types, and costs of NATO armed forces that would be required to defend the country and the number, types, and costs of United States Armed Forces that would be required as part of such a NATO force.

"(6) Whether the United States is prepared to provide a nuclear guarantee to the country.

"(7) The likelihood that the country may become involved in disputes or armed conflict with neighboring countries in the region."

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] will be recognized for 1 minute, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 1 minute.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would add a section to 604 requiring the President to assess the number, types, and costs of NATO

armed forces that would be required to defend the country and the number, types, and costs of U.S. Armed Forces; also whether the United States is prepared to provide a nuclear guarantee to the country; and also the likelihood that the country may become involved in disputes or armed conflict in neighboring countries in that region.

I would hope that the majority will accept this amendment. We have discussed it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the majority is prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment to title VI regarding NATO. The information requested from the administration will be useful to the committee and the Congress in determining just how fast and under what circumstances NATO should be expanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

The amendment was agreed to

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House today, it is in order for the consideration of the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

AMENDMENT, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the previous order, I offer an amendment, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL: Page 23, strike line 12 and insert the following:

"(c) ADDITIONAL EXCEPTIONS.—

"(1) EXCEPTION FOR AUTHORIZATION BY LAW.—

Page 23, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) EXCEPTION FOR NATO OPERATIONS.— Subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of a proposed placement of any element of the armed forces in an operation conducted by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Page 31, strike line 8 and insert the following:

"(d) ADDITIONAL EXCEPTIONS.—

"(1) EXCEPTION FOR AUTHORIZATION BY LAW.—

Page 31, after line 14, insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) EXCEPTION FOR NATO OPERATIONS.— Subsection (b) shall not apply in the case of a proposed placement of any element of the armed forces in an operation conducted by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. GILMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1320

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have been troubled by the fact that this bill would prohibit U.S. troops from serving under a military commander from a NATO country. The NATO alliance is

very, very, important and I think that that is really not what ought to be.

This amendment, and I thank the chairman of the committee, goes a step in the direction not quite as far as I would like it to go, but needless to say it goes a step in the right direction in saying that U.S. troops would be able to serve under a military commander of NATO, in a NATO operation.

I think that at a time when we are talking about expanding NATO we ought to respect it.

I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, that the process really is terrible, it is terrible because we have to operate under this majority-imposed ridiculous 10-hour constraint and it is terrible, frankly, because some people on this side of the aisle were unhelpful and less than frank with me in terms of helping me to bring my amendment for a vote. However, in the 10 or so seconds I have left, I want to say that the chairman has tried his best and I appreciate the fact he has worked with me to bring this amendment forward.

If we did not have something like this, we could not have had D-day, fought World War I or II or Desert Storm, and that is why I think the amendment is a step in the right direction.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] for a colloquy.

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. In view of the tremendous progress toward establishing democratic political institutions and market economies made by the Baltic States and their keen interests in NATO memberships, I want to clarify my understanding that this bill in no way compromises their opportunity for future NATO membership.

It is my understanding that today's bill includes language recognizing the transformation toward economic, political, and military reform in Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Hungary. These states have taken the necessary steps toward democratic reforms and I support the recognition of their efforts and continued U.S. assistance.

Mr. GILMAN. The gentlewoman is absolutely correct.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman.

The expansion of NATO will foster continued economic growth and political stability in these regions. Moreover, the declining defense budgets of European and American forces necessitate expansion of the NATO security umbrella and the military cooperation it fosters.

It is also my understanding that this bill authorizes the President to designate "other European countries emerging from communist domination" who might receive assistance. Title VI of H.R. 872 specifically designates the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania

as eligible to be considered for future NATO membership. These countries will be required to continue to develop their democratic political structures, market economies, and military reforms while contributing to the security of the North Atlantic area.

To date, the Baltic States have made significant progress in these areas. Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania all have progressed toward democratic institutions by adopting Western-style constitutions and holding free and fair elections. In addition, these states have moved toward a market economy by following tight fiscal and monetary policies, creating strong currencies, and moving toward privatization of housing, small businesses, and industry.

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania also constitute the Baltic Peacekeeping Battalion. This force is currently receiving assistance from the U.S. Military and should be operational for security and mutual defense by 1996. As members of the Partnership of Peace, these states hope to maintain cooperation in the areas of defense and peacekeeping while adopting NATO military hardware standards.

Further, the Baltic States have been admitted to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE] and the United Nations. Besides being members of the International Monetary Fund [IMF] and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development [EBRD], the Baltic States hope soon to be members of the European Union [EU], with which they have free-trade agreements.

I am pleased with the language of H.R. 872 regarding the expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This provides the United States a historic opportunity to ensure future regional security by taking appropriate actions now. We can no longer adhere to lines drawn during the cold war. NATO expansion and admissions will lend stability to the entire region, promote U.S. interests, and provide security against a possible resurgence of nationalism.

I thank the gentleman from New York for entering into this colloquy with me and am glad that we were able to clarify this important issue.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the majority is prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment to title VI regarding NATO.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The minority leader is recognized for 3 minutes.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in disappointment and sorrow that this bill which I think is terribly ill-advised will be passed by our House of Representatives.

I have served in this House for 18 years and I have witnessed the fiercest debates on both domestic and foreign policy. But I have seen that even though we have differed sometimes on foreign and defense policy, that for all

the time that I have been here and before, this has been a country, this has been a House of Representatives that could find its way to support a bipartisan internationalist foreign and defense policy for our country.

I think back to the 1920's when there were isolationists in both parties, but America finally rejected isolationism and fought World War II, and after World War II came together in the greatest act of compassion in the world, and sensibility, and supported the Marshal Plan. Republicans and Democrats together.

We formed the United Nations, whereas in the early part of the century we decided we did not want the League of Nations and backed out of the world after World War II and in a bipartisan way we created a multilateral action for world peace.

After the Marshal Plan and the United Nations, we fought a cold war for 45 years, and together, Republicans, Democrats, Americans, we stayed involved as the leader of this world and rejected isolationism, rejected pulling back into our borders, rejected the idea that we could be self-sufficient, alone in this world.

The crowning achievement of these years was no matter how much we squabbled about our internal domestic policies, when it came to the shores of the United States we came together, and we decided together with the American people what our policy would be.

I believe that if this bill passes today we put all of that history, all of that partnership, and all of that progress at risk.

When you try to politicize the actions of the United Nations and our relationship with the United Nations, when you strain to reinvent a cold war that no longer exists, when you politicize NATO and who should be in NATO, and who should be out, and who should decide it, when you politicize the decisions in NATO between the Congress and the President, and when you politicize arms control and try to reinvent nostalgically a weapon system that may have been appropriate 10, 15 years ago but is not appropriate to the threats we meet today, then you put at risk all of that progress, all of that achievement which is the crowning achievement of our country.

Theodore Roosevelt once said we have no choice, we the people of the United States, as to whether we shall play a great part in the world. That has been decided for us by fate, by the march of events. All that we can decide is whether we play it well, or ill.

□ 1330

My friends in the House, I think if this bill passes, we will play it ill and not well.

This bill is not about campaigns and about pollsters and what may achieve some more votes or some more popularity among some in the country or in the world. It is about our conscience. It is about our achievement together of a

foreign and defense policy that has made the American people secure. It is not about campaigns. It is about our conscience, and if we allow that conscience to be dictated by opinion polls, if we allow it to be bought and sold for votes, then God help this Congress and God help this United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, yes, this has been an important bill. It has been an important debate.

It has not been the most important bill, nor the most important debate on this Nation's role in protecting the peace and freedom and dignity of nations as well as ourselves across the globe. In the 10 years I have been here, I have seen more exciting debate. I have seen more fitful differences of opinion. I have seen more important and more immediate and more pressing issues with extraordinarily more sharply divided and heartfelt differences of opinion. The debate we had for so many years over Nicaragua, for example, comes to mind.

It has been a strange debate. People have been lining up in positions that we have not been accustomed to seeing them in over these past few years.

There is no need to hyperbolize this. This is not this Congress' last word. This is not the last word on defense of this session of Congress. There will be a defense authorization bill later.

What is this bill about today within this contract period? It's a course correction. It is a statement by this Congress that, yes, we, too, have heard the voices of the American people. These voices have said it is necessary to this Nation and to this world for this Nation to have a strong, independent, and able defense—first and foremost of its own national interest and then also, and importantly, the interest of peace and freedom across the globe. It is important that this Nation's strong defense be deployed when necessary in support of our NATO allies—and even to the U.N. peacekeeping efforts—but they must be deployed in a balanced, thoughtful way, and never, never when the interests of this Nation, nor the safety and security of this Nation's troops, are made subservient to some other cause.

It is a mid-course correction that recognizes that this Nation is and must be the world's champion for democracy, the world's guardian against tyrants, in concert with alliance with the United Nations at times, NATO at times, and other nations in the world and other theaters in the world.

It is a bill that says this Nation has a duty even in the post-cold-war era to recognize new and different kinds of threats and to be ready and able to change deployment schemes.

This is a good bill. It is a bill that has enjoyed the jurisdiction of three of

our most important committees. It has had thoughtful debate. It has had thoughtful markup. It does deserve our thoughtful consideration, and it does deserve our vote.

I am saddened to see even the intimidation by anybody in the debate that this is a political effort. This is a serious effort and an effort that has commanded the serious attention of the people on those committees that have taken their most serious professional commitment to the task. Their work product needs to be respected. Their motives need to be understood to be decent and honorable motives. The product is important to reaffirm Congress' standing with the American people, for us to say to America at this time, "Yes, we agree, and we understand what you have told us." The Nation has gone too far in the direction of globalism and has lost sight of its essential footing, and we intend to correct that before we go on to the larger task of this year's defense authorizations and appropriations bills.

I want to give my best regards to and appreciation for all three of the committees of jurisdiction. I want to thank everybody who has participated in the debate. I want to appreciate everybody for their different point of view at times, and ask my colleagues, vote for this product, reaffirm our standing with the American people.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in the words of our former President, here we go again. Believe it or not, after spending billions of dollars on a defense system with questionable results, the Republicans are now asking that we immediately build up a new arsenal to fend off who? Darth Vader? The star wars missile defense system made a modicum of sense when we were worried that the Soviet Union would launch missiles against us. But now, with the Soviet Union disintegrated and no other significant long-range ballistic missile threat existing, I cannot fathom why we should direct millions of Federal dollars toward this far-out defense system.

Thousands of families in my congressional district desperately need improved schools, housing, job training, and so forth. Over half of the public school buildings in Chicago were built before World War II and 15 percent were built before the turn of the century. And yet there is no funding for our children, our future? Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot accept the whimsy explanations offered by the other side of the aisle for promoting this over-the-top star wars system.

Even worse, Mr. Chairman, is that this bill calls for the reestablishment of the budget firewalls between defense and domestic spending. This means that should we one day realize that our priorities are completely distorted, our hands will be tied. Should we one day regret that we are spending billions of dollars to fight off fictional foes that never materialize, we will be hamstrung. When we finally take a look around and realize that teenagers are being shot in the streets, families are working full time and still aren't able to climb out of poverty and young children are attending pitifully under-funded schools with almost no chance to afford a college education, it will simply be too bad. We will not be able to redi-

rect our billion dollar star wars budget to here at home where it is needed the most.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill is heading directly for a Presidential veto because it completely destroys our current military operation system which allows the President to respond quickly to threatening situations. I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this ill-prepared bill and voting against H.R. 7.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, passage of the Durbin, Lipinski, Gilman, Knollenberg amendment will encourage stability in Central Europe. As written, H.R. 7 mentions only the visegrad nations. We need to make it clear that other European countries emerging from communist domination should receive assistance and be welcomed into NATO when they meet appropriate standards.

Expressing an interest in having these countries join NATO one day will create stability and provide for the growth of democracy and economic prosperity. We will be encouraging these countries to expedite the promotion of democratic principles within their respective governments. It follows that a less volatile political environment will provide fertile ground for foreign investors.

With the end of the cold war, the United States is the largest single investor in this part of the world. Our investment creates employment and encourages stability and the strengthening of democracy.

By assisting our friends in Central Europe, we will bring continued stability and prosperity in Western Europe, and thus secure United States interests in all of Europe.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman: Yesterday the House of Representatives reversed course on resurrecting the star wars anti-missile defense system, demonstrating clearly how out of step the Republican contract is with the views of the American public. This misguided effort to further bankrupt our defense coffers with wasteful spending simply reflects failed policies of the past rather than a fresh vision for the future.

Little acknowledgement is given in this measure for the changing world view we face and the types of regional conflicts likely to arise. With the end of the cold war we need to reevaluate the role of the United States as a world leader and the types of alliances that will support our efforts abroad. This bill chooses to relinquish our involvement with strategically important allies that in the past have fostered political and economic as well as military cooperation. An unfounded fear of United Nations control of American forces belies the fact that since World War I the President has only on occasion allowed purely operational control—not military command—of U.S. troops by a foreign commander.

Now more than ever the United States has an obligation and an opportunity to promote peace and democracy world-wide. This effort to hamstring and second guess the President's authority as Commander in Chief is not only short-sighted but dangerous. Asking the President to jump through hoops in order to execute vital military actions diminishes the U.S. stature as a world power and jeopardizes the effectiveness of our foreign policy.

Times have changed and a return to isolationism and a star-based missile defense system is a return to foreign policy based on fear rather than readiness. Let us take advantage of the fall of the Soviet Union to make the kind of changes which prepare us against the rede-

fined threats that realistically may occur. Allowing Congress to undermine the President's position as world leader subjects us to the kind of divisiveness that makes effective foreign policy decision-making impossible. While not every foreign policy decision may be universally supported, the current checks and balances serve adequately to preserve our ability to act responsibly when needed.

Now that we have shown the foresight not to once again take the path to frivolous defense spending with the reinvention of the star wars missile defense system, let us also reject a return to isolationist policy centered on imaginary fears and insecurity. Our true national security interest lies in our ability to assert our leadership and to focus our defense dollars on combat readiness. To be successful in dealing with the end of the cold war, we need to look to the future—not to the past.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong support for the provisions of the pending legislation which squarely addresses the issue of NATO expansion. At the outset let me dispel the notion that this section would somehow hamstring the administration's foreign policy—assuming it has one. Nothing in the National Security Revitalization Act mandates NATO membership for any country or group of countries. Changes in the membership of NATO are determined on the basis of consensus among the Alliance's member states as stipulated under article X of the North Atlantic Treaty, a point reaffirmed in the pending legislation and known to Members on both sides of the aisle.

The crux of the matter is how best to consolidate and build upon the fundamental political changes which have occurred in many of the countries of central Europe, the Baltics, and some of the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union. On the security front, a veritable no-man's-land has emerged between Germany and Russia following the demise of the Warsaw Pact, and the ensuing moves toward democracy and market economy by many in the region.

The Clinton administration, like the one before it, has been slow to move to fill this vacuum. Mr. Chairman, this has been a source of great consternation to the emerging democracies of the region, who rightly view it as a source of potential instability. I think my colleagues would agree that the Partnership for Peace initiative, launched by the administration a year ago, has failed to fill this void.

The National Security Revitalization Act provides a reasonable framework for addressing these concerns consistent with U.S. interests in ensuring stability in Europe. It lists a variety of criteria, such as respect for democratic principles and human rights enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act, against which to evaluate the suitability of prospective candidates for NATO membership. In addition, it establishes a program to provide the emerging democracies with the necessary tools to facilitate their transition to full NATO membership, which, as I pointed out earlier, will ultimately be up to the current members to decide.

Given the broad range of our political, economic, and security interests in Europe, strengthening new free markets and democracies in that region benefits the United States. Two of the most prominent members of the foreign policy establishment, Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski, are ardent supporters of the timely expansion of NATO.

Kissinger sees the existing vacuum as a threat not only NATO cohesion but the very existence of NATO as a meaningful institution. "NATO expansion," he observed, "represents a balancing of two conflicting considerations: the fear of alienating Russia against the danger of creating a vacuum in central Europe * * *." "A wise policy," he counsels, "would proceed with membership for the Visegrad countries [Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia] and reject a Russian veto." Dr. Kissinger concluded, "NATO cannot long survive if the borders it protects are not threatened while it refuses to protect the borders of adjoining countries that do feel threatened."

Brzezinski recently urged NATO to formally declare its "criteria for expansion and indicate which countries appear to meet them. This would end the counterproductive debates with Russia over whether NATO should expand. The longer this step is delayed, the more vociferous Moscow's objections are likely to be."

Mr. Chairman, this is precisely the purpose of title VI of the National Security Revitalization Act.

Rather than dodging the issue of NATO expansion, as it has largely done to date, the Clinton administration, should move on the membership issue before more time is lost. But that requires leadership. We must seize upon today's opportunities which could be gone tomorrow. A steady and deliberate course of action is one thing, obfuscation, which has characterized the Clinton administration's approach to date is another.

Russia, perhaps sensing a certain timidity within the administration, has sought to block NATO expansion. It is instructive to recall that the Soviet Union vehemently opposed German membership in NATO in 1955 and attempted to deny unified Germany's continued participation in the Alliance. A democratic Russia has nothing to fear from a defensive alliance founded on democratic principles. It would be foolhardy and dangerous, as Henry Kissinger rightly pointed out, to give Russia a veto over NATO expansion. And, as Dr. Brzezinski observed, failure to act now will only make matters worse.

Our approach to NATO expansion is steady and deliberate, not the sketchy and indecisive path proposed by some.

Some are critical of the fact that four countries—Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia—are mentioned as leading candidates for NATO membership at some point in the near future. This reference is a testament to the great strides which these countries have, in fact, made since the fall of communism. It neither ensures their membership nor precludes others from joining. It does not, as some claim, arbitrarily lock in advantages from some countries. Instead of fostering complacency in these countries as some warn, the reference should serve as an incentive for continued progress as those named should be subjected to more, not less, scrutiny as they move toward membership in NATO. The reference is simply an acknowledgement of the fact that reform in the region is uneven. Rather than serving as a discouragement, this should spur others to redouble their efforts if they are seriously interested in pursuing NATO membership.

Mr. Chairman, my endorsement of an expanded NATO should not be read as a failure to understand that each of the countries considered here has residual problems with its

transition to democracy. On the contrary, I believe that NATO membership, and the integration and cooperation with Western countries it entails, increases the opportunities for addressing outstanding concerns. There are, in fact, specific areas where I believe the United States should weight in to seek further reform. As Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I am very much aware of need for further progress in these and other countries in the region. I believe the Czech citizenship law, for example, is deeply flawed and should be amended; the newest Slovak government has signaled in word its commitment to continuing reform, but has yet to follow through in many specific areas where reform has been slow or altogether lacking thus far, and the Hungarian government would do well to lead by example in improving its relations with many of its neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, nothing in the pending legislation diminished the fact that each candidate will be individually judged on its own merits on a case-by-case basis.

It is also instructive to recall that this is not the first expansion of NATO. In 1952 Greece and Turkey acceded to the North Atlantic Treaty joining the 12 NATO countries in common security system. The Federal Republic of Germany joined the Alliance in 1955 and in 1982, Spain also became a member of NATO. Besides its contribution to collective security in Europe, NATO has served as an important vehicle for bolstering democracy among its members as these cases demonstrate.

Finally, critics assert that the course we have proposed could lead to instability in Europe. Mr. Chairman, one thing is clear: continued ambiguity and foot-dragging will not enhance European security but will, as Kissinger and Brzezinski point out, be counterproductive. The National Security Revitalization Act, provides a much needed action plan for seizing new opportunities as NATO and its members face new challenges.

Given the implications for our own national security, the future of NATO demands our immediate attention.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

This bill does not actually authorize any specific missile defense system. But this amendment seeks to tie our hands despite whatever technologies may develop. If there is a problem with a particular missile defense system, the normal authorization and appropriation process is the proper forum for this type of program restriction.

I am personally opposed to committing, at the present time, to a space-based antiballistic missile defense system because we are not at a point technologically where such a system makes sense. But it does make sense to continue doing the research necessary to develop this important defense option. I am committed to making the necessary funding investment to determine the feasibility of such a program.

This amendment is too restrictive and raises concerns about whether this option could be even explored. Congress needs to be very careful that we do not act in a precipitous way which would preclude this research option.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject the Spratt amendment.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support to Congress

reaffirming its commitment to a strong national defense.

The world is a changing place, Mr. Chairman. If you had told me 15 years ago that the Soviet Union would be dissolved and the Berlin Wall would vanish by the 1990's, I certainly would have had trouble accepting your claims. However, as time passed on during the eighties, our late nemesis, the Soviet Union, eventually splintered and the Berlin Wall was reduced to dust. Since the Soviet Union has been disintegrated, we have discovered other situations and crises in the realm of foreign affairs. Within the last 4 years, there have been crises with nations such as Kuwait, Bosnia, Somalia, Haiti, Korea, and Rwanda which have required the aid, in one form or another, of the United States.

This example alone should serve as a reminder to my colleagues that our planet is in a constant state of evolution and flux. Events happen which cause the world to be sometimes turbulent and volatile and it is up to our Nation to take the lead. With this in mind, it is important that our country stay in its position of strength and leadership within the world community while protecting our own national interests.

Mr. Chairman, I believe H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act, is a measure which our body should adopt to achieve these purposes.

The National Security Revitalization Act has been written to refocus the priorities of our military so it may keep in step with a world that is constantly changing.

H.R. 7 would direct the leaders of our Nation to address questions and situations which should have been dealt with during the past several years. For example, H.R. 7 would direct that the Department of Defense establish a comprehensive review of American defense needs by commissioning a bipartisan panel of independent defense experts to assess our Nation's military readiness, process and status of modernization, force structure, and strategic vision. Mr. Chairman, this commission will play a most essential role in maintaining our security needs which are so vital to our Nation's well-being.

This bill would also reassert our Nation's commitment to an effective national missile system to having the Department of Defense cultivate and create mature ballistic missile defense systems in the future. American intelligence officers such as Lt. Gen. James Clapper of the Defense Intelligence Agency and Adm. William Stuedeman, the Acting Director of the Central Intelligence Agency have alerted Congress to the possibility of a rogue regime possessing the capability of attacking the United States with ballistic missiles toward the end of this decade. With effective antimissile defenses, I believe we can ensure basic protection for the citizens of America. Mr. Chairman, there may be chronic opponents of defense spending who will complain that we are trying to create star wars II by implementing this part of H.R. 7. This is not true. What we are trying to do is build upon the technology we have now and the vision of Clinton Defense Secretary Perry who claims we can create a ground-based missile system by the end of the decade at a reasonable price over 5 years. I believe the Department of Defense should pursue this objective and I would support the Department's efforts.

H.R. 7 also addresses new guidelines for restrictions in regard to U.N. operations. In the past, the American Ambassador to the United Nations would make commitments to United Nations without either the House or Senate being consulted. Mr. Chairman, with H.R. 7, we state that before we send our troops under the command of the United Nations, the President must make it clear to both Houses that the U.N. operation is vital to our own interests, that the commander of the American forces be allowed to report to our own Nation's military authorities and decline to partake in actions which he may deem to be illegal, imprudent or beyond what the U.N. mission is supposed to do. Also, this bill also dictates that American forces will remain under American administrative command. Mr. Chairman, our troops have been trained by American commanders in the ways of American military procedure with the best American military equipment available. I feel that it is in the interests of our Nation, our soldiers, and even the U.N. operation to enact the certain amount of autonomy and the certain amount of legislative and executive responsibility as dictated by this bill.

I also want to point out that H.R. 7 would state that it should be the policy of the United States to include the former Soviet bloc nations Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia as full members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO]. Mr. Chairman, by allowing these countries to join NATO, we will be able to help them to continue their maturing into full-fledged democracies.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7 is not the ultimate panacea in regard to our foreign affairs and defense matters, as we will have to continue debate and consideration of these matters in our authorization and appropriation bills. Rather, I feel that it is a responsible first step toward a sounder foreign policy and a sturdier defense policy in a constantly changing world. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7 and oppose any amendments which can be deemed as weakening the bill.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, over the last several years, the world has changed dramatically, and with it, the role of the United States, as well as the activities required of the U.S. military to carry out that role. Since the breakup of the Soviet Union and the end of the cold war, United States defense policy has shifted its primary, concentrated focus to a widely dispersed number of potential threats. At the same time, peacekeeping operations have greatly increased. Since 1988, the United States has entered into 21 new peacekeeping missions compared to only 13 missions in the previous 40 years. In light of these dramatic changes, it is necessary to redefine U.S. defense and foreign policy.

In my view, H.R. 7 takes a sound and balanced approach to clarifying the new U.S. position in the world. It calls for a commission to evaluate U.S. defense needs and assess force structure, readiness, strategic vision, modernization, and personnel policies, requires the President to identify our national security interests before deploying United States troops, wisely restricts the ability of the Commander in Chief to place troops under foreign control or command, promotes the expansion of NATO to include fledgling democracies in Central and Eastern Europe, and encourages the deployment of a workable national missile defense system.

I would like to draw attention to the provision that prohibits U.S. troops from being under U.N. or foreign command. The measure is vital to our goal of maintaining the integrity of our military force. As Speaker Gingrich noted: "We invest a lot of money in the best command and control, the best communications and the best training in the world * * *. When you take a unit from that level of speed and effectiveness and you reduce it by putting them under the command of somebody who has never practiced the tempo and complexity of American operations, you are raising the risk of young Americans getting killed * * *."

The missile defense provisions in the bill have precipitated a significant amount of debate, and, I'm afraid, a fair amount of misunderstanding. The original language in the bill states that "it shall be U.S. policy to deploy at the earliest practical date an anti-ballistic missile system" to ensure the security of the United States. Last night, the House properly rejected an amendment offered by Representative EDWARDS that would have prohibited the Department of Defense from deploying a missile defense system that included space-based interceptors. It is bad policy for Congress to tie the hands of DOD before giving the agency the time to make recommendations to Congress on how best to protect the American people. By rejecting this amendment, Congress has allowed for the opportunity for an analysis of the effectiveness and costs of both ground- and space-based systems before mandating which one should be deployed.

I opposed another amendment, offered by Representative SPRATT, for largely the same reasons. The amendment requires that operational readiness and modernization of existing forces take fiscal priority over developing and deploying an effective theater missile defense. Modernization of defenses is absolutely necessary to maintain a reasonable level of readiness in the face of ever-improving offensive systems in regions of potential conflict, such as North Korea and Iraq. The Spratt amendment will tie the hands of our military in ensuring such readiness. Unfortunately, the Spratt amendment passed by a narrow margin of 218-212.

I should note that two important amendments were passed en bloc Wednesday night that I believe removed a flaw in an otherwise sound approach to national security. These amendments removed from H.R. 7 language that prohibits the use of defense funds to pay the cost of participating in the U.N. peacekeeping missions unless such action is specifically authorized by Congress. I believe this provision imposes unfair and counterproductive restrictions on the President as Commander in Chief, violating his constitutionally granted powers. In certain situations, I believe it has been in our interests to move from unilateral occupation to a U.N. operation. For example, at the end of this month it is my understanding that in Haiti the United States command will become a U.N. peacekeeping operation. We do not want to continue to occupy Haiti. The shift to the United Nation is in our national interest and gives us a way out. The Bereuter amendments remove language in the original bill that would have given the administration an incentive to maintain the unilateral U.S. mission instead of moving to a more sensible, cooperative effort with the United Nation. I am pleased that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle were able to come to

agreement on this issue and eliminate this inadvertent but realistic effect of this bill.

In the end, I believe H.R. 7 successfully enhances the national security of the United States in a balanced and appropriate manner. It affirms our commitment to a strong, modern defense force and properly limits our role in United Nations operations. I commend Chairman SPENCE and Chairman GILMAN for their good work on this legislation.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member would take this opportunity to explain the two Bereuter amendments to title V of H.R. 872, the National Security Restoration Act, that were accepted under unanimous consent during yesterday's debate.

The first of these amendments addresses concerns raised about section 508 of the bill. This amendment deletes language that would prohibit the President from spending Department of Defense funds on any operation that was authorized by the U.N. Security Council unless Congress specifically authorizes the use of funds for that purpose.

This body should know that section 508, as drafted, would be an extraordinary limitation on the President as Commander in Chief. This limitation has its origins in what many on our side of the aisle view as legitimate concerns about the judgment of the current Commander in Chief, but that does not, ipso facto, mean that this body should limit the prerogatives of the Commander in Chief. If enacted, this statute would limit the actions of any future administration—Republican and Democrat alike.

There is a need to separate our understandable frustration about some policy decisions made by this administration from the act of legislating restrictions.

Constitutional questions have been raised. Can the legislative branch limit the actions of the President as Commander in Chief by withholding funds until a specific authorization has been approved? for decades, Members on both sides of the aisle have complained about constitutional infringements through the War Powers Act and the Boland amendments. This body should be very careful about placing further limitations, however well intended.

This body needs to be aware that crises do occasionally occur when Congress is not in session. The President still must have the flexibility to act as Commander in Chief after this body has recessed.

Lastly, section 508 reflects a genuine and bipartisan indignation regarding the manner in which this administration went to the U.N. Security Council for approval of nonemergency peacekeeping operations in Haiti without coming to Congress for prior approval; nor did the Clinton administration come to Congress when they escalated the humanitarian operation in Somalia into a peace-enforcement operation. But we should remember that this provision is not central to the Contract With America.

Members on this side of the aisle should recall that section 508 is not a part of the contract document that many House Republicans signed. The important peacekeeping provisions of Contract With America deal with: maintaining U.S. command of U.S. troops; making sure the United States is no longer to be grossly exploited through exorbitant assessments; and ensuring that the United States reimbursed for all of incremental costs in our peacekeeping expenditures.

We should not permit the very good peacekeeping provisions in this legislation to be obscured by raising this an unnecessary constitutional question. Failing to address this issue would leave the administration with a legitimate excuse for challenging the constitutionality of this legislation and thereby justifying a Presidential veto.

The second amendment that was approved under unanimous consent addresses this Member's concern regarding the level of reimbursements that nations should receive for peacekeeping activities.

This Member raised the issue in committee, seeking at that time to set U.S. policy on this matter. While both majority and minority generally expressed sympathy for my concern, this Member was persuaded by the argument that it was not yet time to establish a new U.S. Government policy on reimbursement matters.

But the problem remains. It is only proper that Congress understand the full extent of the problem. Hence, the reporting requirement.

We know how much the United Nations pays nations who supply peacekeepers—slightly over \$980 per month for enlisted, and around \$1,300 for officers. It is also clear that some of the lesser developed nations that provide a higher proportion of the peacekeeping troops in many U.N. operations are paying their troops far less than this amount—sometimes less than 10 percent of the U.N. personnel payments—in other words a 1,000 percent mark up.

The personnel payments, of course, don't go to the individual soldiers—but, yes, you guessed it, to the treasury of the country sending that underpaid soldier.

It might be one thing if these nations were plowing their reimbursements back into their military to augment training. But this does not appear to be the case. Rather, it would seem that this is a case of take the money and run. This is a poor reason to be involved in peacekeeping operations.

We also have indications that the civilian managers and general-purpose police officers, international cops on the beat, attached to peacekeeping operations from some accounts are making obscene amounts of money—over \$100,000 per year.

The International Relations Committee has heard tales, which I have reason to believe are accurate, of mid-level civilian employees making six figure salaries, with an extraordinary package of perks that would make even the most jaded individuals blush.

Regrettably, I have concluded that it is premature, in H.R. 7, to set U.S. policy on these issues until this body has the facts, but it is entirely appropriate to expect to receive the facts so that we can strenuously demand reforms. This amendment requires the Secretary of State to present these facts.

The United Nations probably may object to supplying some of this information. After all, some at the United Nations and certainly some member nation may find it to be in their interest to keep us in the dark as to how our peacekeeping dollars are being spent.

But the United States—indeed any nation—should be able to get such information from the United Nations.

Again, this amendment is a vehicle to require this information and to ask our Government to recommend the kind of reforms it will push in the United Nations or which we in the Congress can demand next year.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will vote against this bill because it infringes on the constitutional authority of the President to use the military command and control structure that is essential to our Nation's strategic interests.

The bill's provision prohibiting the President from deploying U.S. troops in peacekeeping operations without an explicit authorization by Congress for such purpose is unacceptable and quite possibly unconstitutional. Under such a provision, President Bush would not have been able to deploy troops and equipment to Operation Desert Storm, President Clinton would have been blocked from deploying troops to Kuwait in 1994 to stop an Iraqi threat, and even President Truman would have been prevented from sending troops to Korea in 1950. Such prohibitions would not have been in our strategic interest.

By dictating how the President should conduct foreign policy, the bill both micromanages U.S. actions and denies the President the flexibility needed in times of crisis.

In the post-cold-war world, it remains essential that the President retains his authority to establish command arrangements best suited to meet the needs of future operations. U.S. troops will always and ultimately be under U.S. command as per the Constitution. No Presidential action can change this fact. This bill undermines the power of the President as Commander in Chief, and I cannot support it.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7 is bad legislation and should be defeated. In the stated opinion of DOD, H.R. 7 is "dangerous, wasteful, and unconstitutional." It is a Republican tactic to provide "defense welfare" for military contractors who seek lucrative Government contracts.

H.R. 7 is dangerous because it sacrifices American military readiness for star wars. It is a wasteful Republican effort to spend \$30 to \$40 billion on star wars at the price of military readiness. These billions of dollars should be spent to make life better for American families and for decreasing the deficit. H.R. 7 is a Republican boondoggle.

H.R. 7 is unconstitutional because it limits the ability of the President of the United States to fulfill his constitutional role as Commander in Chief of our military forces. It restricts his ability to utilize troops in a most effective manner by limiting the amount the United States can spend on operations with the United Nations. H.R. 7 cripples U.N. peacekeeping and destroys the idea of collective security. If H.R. 7 had been law during Desert Storm, America would have been prevented from successfully deploying necessary troops.

If America insists on spending countless billions on star wars at the expense of our troops, if America retreats from global economic and military cooperation, if America refuses to feed, educate, and house her own troops and citizens at risk—the children, the sick, and the elderly—a bankrupt America will fall into economic and social ruin.

For years, respected Members of Congress, such as former Congressman Charles Bennett who represented Jacksonville, have opposed funding for star wars. These Members believed that troop readiness was a top priority. Their efforts were focused on conventional warfare requirements and on providing all that was necessary for our troops to perform their duties with excellence.

Today it is shameful that many U.S. troops live in substandard housing and use food stamps because they cannot stretch their pay to cover even the most basic needs for their families. This does not contribute to military readiness.

We in Congress should demonstrate our interest in funding military programs that benefit our troops and our military families. We want our military dollars spent to keep our troops ready in every way.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act of 1995. While I am aware of the current fashion in the Congress to increase defense spending at the expense of our domestic programs, I am also mindful of my duty as a Member of Congress to act in the best interest of the people I represent and in the best interest of the U.S. Constitution I have sworn to uphold. This shortsighted and rushed legislation will not only try to resurrect cold war programs long not needed, but will endanger the delicate balance of domestic and defense spending.

The National Security Revitalization Act of 1995 that we are considering here today is completely out of balance. H.R. 7 seeks to isolate the United States by restricting America's role in peace keeping operations, and misguidedly redirects billions of dollars to a star wars missile defense system whose time passed with the end of the cold war. It would be an abdication of congressional responsibility if we support this legislation at the expense of our most important efforts to improve the quality of life for all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that our military is by far among the world's best. This was demonstrated by our leadership of international forces during the war in the Gulf. Over the past 20 years, our military has undergone a massive undertaking to build a defense infrastructure which has allowed us to effectively provide an international show of strength.

While I believe that we must maintain a strong military presence in an era of low intensity global conflicts, I am an avid believer that a healthy balance must be reached between domestic and defense spending. The importance of striking this balance is especially true in light of recent world events such as the end of the cold war. Because of these changes in world politics, the United States is faced with an unprecedented opportunity to redirect funds to relieve problems here at home.

Contrary to the arguments that have been made by the supporters of H.R. 7, President Clinton has proposed a budget that reasonably addresses the defense needs of this Nation. President Clinton's fiscal year 1996 defense budget, which is strongly supported by the Pentagon, has two key initiatives: Enhancement of military readiness, and improvement of quality of life for our men and women in uniform and their families. The ironic truth about H.R. 7 is that it will actually weaken our national defense. The bill directs massive amounts of defense dollars to a star wars missile defense system that will certainly undermine the more legitimate funding goals outlined in the President's budget.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been in favor of a balanced approach to our domestic and foreign affairs interests, and the Constitution's separation of powers. H.R. 7 requires that U.S. Forces may not be placed under control

of any foreign commander. Such actions would effectively end U.S. involvement in multilateral peacekeeping operations. This is contrary to the principle of separation of powers and the clear language of the Constitution. The Constitution permits the President as Commander in Chief of the U.S. Armed Forces the power to place U.S. Forces under the operational control of other nations' military leaders for United Nations operations.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for me to point out that under the current congressional leadership, U.S. policy has taken a direction that will adversely affect the essence of each and every one of our lives. The majority party's plan ignores quality of human life questions, and in order to finance additional military spending, we have been expected time and time again to sacrifice already substantially depleted health, housing, education, and employment budgets.

As opposed to spending billions of dollars to immunize American children, revitalize our urban centers, provide jobs to the jobless or homes for the homeless, this bill seeks to divert funds from these essential services to fund star wars and other unworkable initiatives. H.R. 7 is an essential part of the Republican strategy to force through a series of bills that will gut the chances for many Americans to live the American dream.

A review of the Contract With America's plan to slash domestic discretionary programs reveals that many programs serving the most needy will be cut. Legislation such as H.R. 7, would result in defense spending on Reagan era star wars gimmicks. This misdirection of funds would greatly harm the American people, the strength of our Nation's defense and the future of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to say that while the pursuit of peace is a noble and necessary objective, it is no easy task—especially when certain Members of Congress are determined to promote antiquated notions left over from the cold war. This legislation clearly reflects the new majority's desire to sacrifice the domestic interests of the American people in pursuit of isolationism and star wars.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act. I think this legislation is an important step toward restoring America's reputation as a superpower. In addition, this legislation preserves our ability and reaffirms our intent to defend America's national security interests around the globe.

Mr. Chairman, I am especially glad that H.R. 7 includes language restricting the placement of U.S. troops under the control of foreign nationals acting on behalf of the United Nations. The language included in H.R. 7 is almost identical to a bill I introduced last year (H.R. 3334), and reintroduced again this year (H.R. 631).

I strongly believe this legislation is necessary in order to counter the Clinton administration's proposed policy directives that would allow U.S. military forces to be placed under foreign command, on a regular basis, for U.N. peacekeeping operations.

Mr. Chairman, the people in my district, especially the war veterans, demand that when we send our young men and women overseas to battle that they will do so under the American flag, not the blue helmet of the United Nations.

Some argue that this legislation will hamstring the President's ability to act as Commander in Chief. This is simply not true. My proposal, included in H.R. 7, requires the President to certify to Congress that such foreign operational control is necessary to protect vital national security interests of the United States. The President must provide Congress with a report setting forth the following: a description of the interest that requires placing U.S. troops under foreign operational control; the mission and objectives of the U.S. Armed Forces, and an estimate of the duration they will serve under such foreign operational control; the expected size and composition our forces involved; the cost of U.S. participation in the proposed operation; the precise command and control relationship between the U.S. forces and the United Nations; and the extent to which the U.S. forces will rely on non-U.S. military forces for security and self-defense and an assessment of the ability of those forces to provide adequate security to the U.S. forces involved.

In addition to being unconstitutional, Mr. Speaker, putting U.S. troops under U.N. control can be very dangerous as the Clinton administration learned in Somalia.

Last, I would include a letter I received from the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. Allen F. "Gunner" Kent. His outstanding organization supports inclusion of my proposal in H.R. 7, as do millions of people across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, February 2, 1995.

Hon. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DOOLITTLE: On behalf of the 2.1 million members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S., I want to endorse your proposed legislation, H.R. 631 which would limit the placing of U.S. military forces under command of foreign officers acting for the United Nations.

At our 95th National Convention last August, this issue was considered and the delegates overwhelmingly approved VFW Resolution 437 opposing U.S. forces under foreign command. I have enclosed a copy of this resolution for your information and use.

Also I would urge you and the Congress to examine Presidential Decision Directive 25 to determine if Constitutional authority has been misused and if so, to find an appropriate remedy.

If the VFW can be of any assistance or support in moving H.R. 631 to passage, please feel free to contact our Washington Office Executive Director Bob Currie at the earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,
ALLEN F. "GUNNER" KENT,
Commander in Chief.

Enclosure.

RESOLUTION NO. 437—OPPOSE U.S. FORCES
UNDER FOREIGN COMMAND

Whereas, Presidential Decision Directive 25 states as follows: "The President retains and will never relinquish command authority over U.S. forces. On a case by case basis, the President will consider placing appropriate U.S. forces under the operational control of a competent U.N. Commander for specific U.N. operations authorized by the Security Council;

Whereas, if U.S. military forces were to be placed under foreign command (as they now are in Macedonia) they could be removed

from their primary missions of defending the United States, its citizens and its territory;

Whereas, by permitting U.S. military forces to operate under the orders of any international organization, these forces could find themselves executing military operations which are not in the national interest of the United States; and

Whereas, we believe the American people will not support the deployment of American soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines and Coast Guardsmen in dangerous, life-threatening missions that do affect the security of the United States, its citizens or its territory; Now, therefore, be it:

Be it resolved, by the 95th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that we oppose any play or directive placing U.S. military forces under the command of foreign military officers including those who are operating exclusively under orders from the United Nations; and

Be it further resolved, that Congress be urged to examine Presidential Decision Directive 25 to determine if any constitutional authority has been misused, and if so, to find an appropriate remedy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, recent events in Somalia and elsewhere have raised serious questions about when, if ever, members of the United States Armed Forces should be commanded not by fellow Americans but by officials of the United Nations. The surrender of command and control may set a precedent for further diminution of American sovereignty, at a time when most Americans believe that too many decisions affecting their lives are already made by unaccountable institutions in faraway places.

I share these concerns. They are reflected and addressed in sections 401 and 402 of the National Security Revitalization Act, relating to command and control of U.S. forces.

Let us make some crucial distinctions.

First, this legislation would not interfere with U.S. participation in multinational military efforts. Such efforts have a long and honorable history in U.S. foreign policy. For instance, in World War I some 2 million Americans served under the ultimate direction of a great French general, Marshall Ferdinand Foch. In World War II, American units worked under British commanders in Italy, in Normandy, and in the China-Burma-India theatre of operations. In the post-war era several multilateral peacekeeping operations, including some under United Nations auspices, have included U.S. Armed Forces under the temporary and limited operational control of foreign officers. It is a dramatically different matter however, to take the step that has been the subject of recent discussion: that the United States should contribute its soldiers to a standing U.N. army whose commanders, whatever their own national origins, are part of the command structure of the United Nations itself.

It is important to note that sections 401 and 402 allow the President substantial flexibility to act in the national interest. They do not absolutely prohibit the President from placing U.S. forces under the command or control of foreign commanders in U.N. operations, or even under the command and control of the United Nations itself. Rather, they simply require the President to explain the necessity of such arrangements, and to assure the Congress that United States officers involved in the operation will retain sufficient authority to protect their forces and to prevent them from being used illegally or inconsistently with the terms of the

U.S. mandate. The requirement of advance certification by the President may be waived in an emergency. Finally, the requirements of sections 401 and 402 did not apply at all to specifically authorized by law. So, in effect, Congress can waive the reporting requirements of sections 401 and 402 whenever it discerns an emergency that makes this prudent.

The role of U.S. troops in U.N. operations is steadily expanding. A year ago we had 15 troops in the post-Desert Storm U.N. peacekeeping operation in Iraq, 29 in the Western Sahara, 647 in former Yugoslavia, 33 in Cambodia, and almost 2,000 in Somalia. Some of these operations have prevented bloodshed. The Somalia operation, which began as a genuine peacekeeping effort, was somehow allowed to become a war. It then claimed the lives of 26 Americans.

Sections 401 and 402 achieve a balance between the need to protect U.S. sovereignty and the need to give the President the necessary flexibility for handling international crises. Section (a) creates a presumption against the legality of placing any elements of our Armed Forces under the command or control of a foreign national acting on behalf of the United Nations. But this presumption is overcome if the President invokes the certification process that is announced in section (b), and for which section (d) gives the substantive requirements. The President is given 15 days before the start of the operation in question to certify to Congress that the operation is necessary to protect our national security interests, and that the arrangements of the operation are such that U.S. sovereignty will be protected. Furthermore, as I noted a moment ago, even this reasonable requirement does not apply when the operation in question is already authorized by law, or when the President certifies that he is acting in response to an emergency that precludes compliance with the 15-day rule just mentioned. In an emergency situation, the certification requirement detailed in section (d) is postponed until 48 hours after U.S. participation in the U.N. operations begins.

Section 402 amends the United Nations Participation Act so that U.S. participation in Security Council "special agreements," as set forth in chapters VI and VII of the U.N. Charter, is subject to the same certification requirements as in section 401.

There must be clear rules governing the exposure of U.S. service personnel to mortal danger. Such exposure should be related to U.S. interests, and the extent and urgency of those interests should be determined by officials who are accountable to the people of the United States. This is not just the principle of sovereignty; it is also the principle of democracy. Sections 401 and 402 are designed to uphold these principles. They would prohibit commitments of U.S. troops only in cases where the President of the United States cannot or will not articulate to the Congress the justifications and the limitations of such commitments.

At U.N. headquarters in New York City, the flags of all the member nations fly proudly over First Avenue. No national flag is higher than any other, signifying that despite diversities of power, wealth, and territory, the principle of sovereignty means that every nation may deal equally with every other under international law.

One flag in front of the U.N. building does fly higher than the national flags: the flag of the United Nations itself. This signifies that in joining together to form the United Nations, the sovereign member states have recognized that the ideals of human rights, peace, and cooperation for which the United Nations stands may in some circumstances transcend national sovereignty itself.

Even a limited surrender of sovereignty, however, is fraught with risks. One of those risks is that this great international body whose flag flies higher than the others may someday cease to be the instrument of its member nations and become instead master of their policies—and increasingly of their destinies.

American participation in multinational military operations is, has been, and will remain a sound policy option for particular cases. But American participation in the standing armies of another power—especially a power that claims to supersede that of the United States—is an abdication of our sovereignty and a threat to the democratic values that our sovereignty ultimately protects.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7), to revitalize the national security of the United States, pursuant to House Resolution 83, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit with instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SKELTON. Absolutely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SKELTON moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 7, to the Committee on National Security with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike out the last section of title II (relating to the ballistic missile defense as a com-

ponent of military readiness) and insert the following:

Section 204. Readiness Certification.

Of the total amount of funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996, the amount obligated for national missile defense programs may not exceed the amount made available for national missile defense programs for fiscal year 1995 until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the Congress that the armed forces are properly sized, equipped, housed, and structured and are ready to carry out the assigned missions as required by the national military strategy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise with this motion to recommit with instructions with a heavy heart. I do so with the background, Mr. Speaker, of having stood with my friends on the other side of the aisle, lo, those many times in the cause of national defense. I stood with those on the other side of the aisle concerning the Nicaragua crisis. I stood with those on the other side of the aisle in the gulf war issue that was so important to our then President George Bush and to the American people and to freedom throughout this globe.

I find, though, there are parts of this bill I would individually vote for; the part concerning the command and control of American troops is to be commended, but the weight of this bill overall, Mr. Speaker, causes me to offer this motion to recommit.

□ 1340

This motion to recommit is in favor of the troops. This morning we had the sad news of 4 soldiers giving their lives in training in Eglin Air Force Base in the Ranger course. The job that we call those in uniform to do is a dangerous job. This is a motion to stand by those young men and those young women from whom we ask so much and who should be given the very best of our efforts.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Montgomery/Skelton language that states that the Secretary of Defense must certify to us, to us the Congress of the United States, that the Armed Forces are properly sized, equipped, housed, structured, and filled with readiness to do the job that the Commander in Chief and our national interest requires of them. This is putting the troops first. This is saying to those young men and women in uniform, "We care for you. We want to stand by you."

This does not cut off national missile defense programs, it allows for the year 1996 to have a \$400 million program, where we make sure that those troops are ready and able to do their job.

My case was made by my friends on the other side of the aisle when they said that we are not ready. My friend from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] spoke eloquently of the need for readiness. That was my speech. That was my point. That is what we need to do

to stay ready. We never know how much. It was Winston Churchill who once said that war comes very suddenly. This past year we came within an eyelash of having armed conflict three times, once involving North Korea, once involving Haiti, and one with Saddam Hussein. These young men and young women we send in harm's way should be fully ready and every penny should go toward their training, readiness, their quality of life. We should not, as we have seen, have young men and young women on the rifle range, who do not have enough bullets to fire, cancel training so that they are not able to fulfill their duties.

In Europe we learned just a few weeks ago that the Army had taken from its training account in Europe \$300 million to put in the maintenance account. That is a lack of readiness. We need to pay attention to that and not offer these dollars up to something in excess of what we can fairly spend.

I ask everyone here, Mr. Speaker, to vote for this motion to recommit. It will send the message to the young men and young women we are so proud to call Americans, those in uniform that "we want you to get the best training, the best possible advantage should you have to walk onto that battle field." And if there is a lack of training, if there is someone that is injured or sadly loses his or her life because of lack of readiness, let it not be a reflection of today, let us stand with them, let us work with them, let us vote to recommit this with the instructions on the Montgomery-Skelton language. It is the least we can do for those fine young Americans.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from South Carolina opposed to the motion?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this motion and vote "yes" on final passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, last evening we voted twice on this particular amendment. It was defeated on both occasions. We need not say anything more about that.

I want, just for a minute, Mr. Speaker, to tell this body that in referring to this legislation we are responding, as I have said earlier, to the concerns of the American people. In putting together this contract, we listened to the American people and the concerns they have concerning a number of issues, and then we proceeded to put those things down in the form of a contract.

The American people, for instance, are concerned about the state of our defenses. They think we have cut too much from our defense, readiness is suffering, modernization needs to be fixed, a number of things. We are responding to those concerns because we entitled this legislation the revitalization or the restoration of national security.

The people of this country are outraged when they find that we have no defense against ballistic missiles, protecting them and their families from certain death. They want to know who is responsible for leaving them unprotected. But most of all they want it fixed, and we are trying to fix that for them in this contract, this legislation.

Again, I repeat, we are responding to the concerns of the American people. The American people are concerned about the fact that this administration had a threat assessment conducted after the fact, called a Bottom-Up Review, which is not sufficient. And even if it were, it is underfunded. And so they want to have a new threat assessment of the threats we are facing in this world.

So we are proposing a bipartisan commission advise us as to the course of action to take. Again, we are responding to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit and I urge my colleagues to defend this motion and to support this vitally important legislation which we have fully debated in the International Relations Committee and on the House floor over the past 2 days.

Our committee held numerous briefings and hearings on the issues we have debated today.

Contrary to some of the assertions made in this debate, this bill does not end our support for the United Nations and it most certainly does not end our support for the United Nations and it most certainly does not signal a retreat from our security commitments and our international obligations around the world.

The provisions in this bill simply reaffirm that our foreign policy and our role at the United Nations and in all U.N. peacekeeping operations must serve our national interests.

The bill for example, ensures that we receive credit for our ongoing and extensive support for the U.N. peacekeeping operations around the world.

Presently, we are spending several billions a year on direct and indirect costs in support of these peacekeeping operations. To the extent that the Department of Defense is spending a disproportionate share of its declining resources on U.N. peacekeeping we should be recouping some of those costs against our U.N. peacekeeping assessments.

This bill does set strict limits on any U.S. troops serving in U.N. operations and promotes the expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Our provisions on NATO will ensure that all countries in Europe deemed eligible to be included in an expanded

NATO will be given the political support and the military assistance they need to join this transatlantic security alliance. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this bill which provides a strong national defense and a clear foreign policy road map for our Nation.

□ 1350

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BUNNING). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. VOLKMER. 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 pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 225, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—197

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | Flake | McKinney |
| Ackerman | Foglietta | McNulty |
| Andrews | Ford | Meehan |
| Baesler | Frank (MA) | Meek |
| Baldacci | Frost | Menendez |
| Barcia | Furse | Mfume |
| Barrett (WI) | Gejdenson | Miller (CA) |
| Beilenson | Gephardt | Mineta |
| Bentson | Geren | Minge |
| Berman | Gibbons | Mink |
| Bishop | Gonzalez | Moakley |
| Bonior | Gordon | Mollohan |
| Borski | Gutierrez | Montgomery |
| Boucher | Hall (OH) | Moran |
| Brewster | Hamilton | Morella |
| Brown (CA) | Harman | Murtha |
| Brown (FL) | Hayes | Nadler |
| Brown (OH) | Hefner | Neal |
| Bryant (TX) | Hilliard | Oberstar |
| Cardin | Hinchey | Obey |
| Chapman | Holden | Olver |
| Clayton | Hoyer | Ortiz |
| Clement | Jackson-Lee | Orton |
| Clyburn | Jacobs | Owens |
| Coble | Jefferson | Pallone |
| Coleman | Johnson (SD) | Parker |
| Collins (IL) | Johnson, E. B. | Pastor |
| Collins (MI) | Johnston | Payne (NJ) |
| Condit | Kanjorski | Payne (VA) |
| Conyers | Kaptur | Pelosi |
| Costello | Kennedy (MA) | Peterson (FL) |
| Coyne | Kennedy (RI) | Peterson (MN) |
| Danner | Kennelly | Petri |
| de la Garza | Kildee | Pickett |
| Deal | Kleczka | Pomeroy |
| DeFazio | Klink | Porter |
| DeLauro | LaFalce | Poshard |
| Dellums | Lantos | Rahall |
| Deutsch | Laughlin | Rangel |
| Dicks | Leach | Reed |
| Dingell | Levin | Reynolds |
| Dixon | Lincoln | Richardson |
| Doggett | Lipinski | Rivers |
| Dooley | Lofgren | Roemer |
| Doyle | Lowey | Rose |
| Durbin | Luther | Roybal-Allard |
| Edwards | Maloney | Rush |
| Engel | Manton | Sabo |
| Eshoo | Markey | Sanders |
| Evans | Martinez | Sawyer |
| Farr | Mascara | Schroeder |
| Fattah | Matsui | Scott |
| Fazio | McCarthy | Serrano |
| Fields (LA) | McDermott | Sisisky |
| Filner | McHale | Skaggs |

Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tausin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda

NAYS—225

Allard
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combust
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox

NOT VOTING—12

Becerra
Chenoweth
Clay
Green

□ 1408

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)

Schumer
Stokes
Thornton
Wilson

On this vote:
Mr. Lewis of Georgia for, with Mrs. Chenoweth against.
Mr. Stokes for, with Mr. McHugh against.
Mr. JACOBS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."
So the motion to recommit was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1410

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING). The question is on the passage of the bill.
The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 181, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

AYES—241

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combust
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn

Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim

Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder

Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tausin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich

NOES—181

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra
Chenoweth
Clay
Green
Hastings (FL)

Johnston
Lewis (GA)
McHugh
Petri
Schumer

□ 1425

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mrs. Chenoweth for, with Mr. Johnston of Florida against.
Mr. McHugh for, with Mr. Stokes against.
Mr. Petri for, with Mr. Lewis of Georgia against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 7, NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 7, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, and to make such other technical, clerical, grammatical, and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill, H.R. 7.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 10

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEJEDA] be removed as cosponsors from the bill, H.R. 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 450, THE REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight have until midnight tonight, February 16, to file a report on H.R. 450, the Regulatory Transition Act of 1995.

It is my understanding that this request has been approved by the minority leadership.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 831, PERMANENT EXTENSION OF THE HEALTH INSURANCE DEDUCTION FOR THE SELF-EMPLOYED

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-38) on the resolution (H. Res. 88) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 831) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals, to repeal the provision permitting nonrecognition of gain and sales and exchanges effectuating policies of the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROCEDURES AND DEADLINE FOR PRINTING OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 450, THE REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee plans to meet the week of February 20 to consider a rule for H.R. 450, the Regulatory Transition Act of 1995.

The Rules Committee anticipates reporting an open or modified open rule for the bill. The rule will likely accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, though this would be optional and not mandatory.

If Members wish to avail themselves of this preprinting option, amendments should be titled, "Submitted for printing under clause 6 of rule XXIII," signed by the Member, and submitted at the Speaker's table. Amendments must still be consistent with House rules since neither the rule nor printing in the RECORD will afford any special protection against points of order for such amendments.

It will not be necessary for Members to submit their amendments to the Committee on Rules or to testify on them.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my request is to inquire about the schedule for next week.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

With respect to next week, Mr. Speaker, the House will not be in session on Monday, February 20.

The House will be in session on Tuesday, February 21. Subject to unanimous-consent request, the House will

meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. At 5 p.m., we will take up the rule for H.R. 831, the Permanent Extension of the 25 Percent Health Insurance Deduction for Self-Employed Individuals. We will then move into general debate and complete consideration of the bill. This is important, Mr. Speaker: We expect no votes until 5 p.m. on Tuesday. However, we will complete consideration of H.R. 831 on Tuesday. Members should be advised that the House may work late on Tuesday night.

On Wednesday, February 22, the House will meet at 11 a.m. for the legislative business. We will take up the rule for the Department of Defense supplemental and the rescission package which accompanies it, and then move into general debate. We will complete consideration of the two bills and then possibly take up H.R. 830, the Paperwork Reduction Act, subject to the House's approval of a rule. Members should be advised that the House may work late on Wednesday night.

On Thursday, February 23, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business, and pending the outcome of the previous day's action on H.R. 830, we will take up the rule for H.R. 450, the Regulatory Transition Act of 1995, and then move into general debate on the measure.

On Friday, February 24, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. At that time we will complete consideration of H.R. 450. It is our hope to complete legislation by 3 that afternoon.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, perhaps I could ask a few questions.

First on staying late. The gentleman said perhaps on Tuesday and on Wednesday. By "late," can you give Members a sense of about what time?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, these things are always problematic. But I think I generally hope when I say "late," that I mean around 9 p.m.

What we try to do is measure the rate at which we are getting the work done, juxtapose that against what must need be done the next day, and then set a mark as early as we can that will assure us to be able to complete the next day's work. But by "late," I hope that I can always have some confidence that that means 9. As the gentleman knows, that has not always worked out that way.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Can the gentleman say that he expects to start amendments on H.R. 450 on Thursday? Do you intend to get to the amendments on that bill on Thursday?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, the answer is yes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. The other question really involves the rules and maybe the distinguished gentleman from the Committee on Rules could be involved in this discussion.

We last week met with the requirement to deal with an open rule but in