

Talent	Towns	Weldon (FL)
Tanner	Traficant	Weldon (PA)
Tauscher	Turner	Weller
Tauzin	Upton	Wexler
Taylor (MS)	Velazquez	Weygand
Taylor (NC)	Vento	White
Thomas	Visclosky	Whitfield
Thompson	Walsh	Wicker
Thornberry	Wamp	Wise
Thune	Waters	Wolf
Thurman	Watkins	Woolsey
Tiahrt	Watt (NC)	Wynn
Tierney	Watts (OK)	Yates
Torres	Waxman	Young (FL)

NAYS—7

Ensign	Paul	Smith (MI)
Gibbons	Royce	
Klug	Sensenbrenner	

NOT VOTING—9

Blumenauer	Meek	Schiff
Gonzalez	Miller (CA)	Stark
Martinez	Molinari	Young (AK)

□ 1213

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. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the further consideration of H.R. 2203, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE SUNDRY PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, having cleared this with the minority, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight, July 25, 1997, to file three privileged reports on bills making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1998; the Departments of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for fiscal year 1998; and the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1998.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bills.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1119, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1119) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for military activities of the De-

partment of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DELLUMS moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill H.R. 1119 be instructed to insist upon the provisions contained in section 1207 of the House bill relating to limitation on payments for cost of NATO expansion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During the House's deliberation on the bill, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1119, the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1998 and 1999, the House adopted an amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK]. That amendment now embodies the provisions contained in section 1207 of the bill.

Very briefly, let me describe that amendment and now the provisions of section 1207. It would place a limit on U.S. costs for handling the expansion of NATO to 10 percent of the total cost, or \$2 billion, whichever is lesser, for fiscal years 1998 through 2010.

With respect to background, Mr. Speaker, Congress, the House especially, has for a long time expressed concern regarding the relative shares of meeting the burden of providing European and transatlantic security. It has passed provisions on several occasions to secure increases in European support for U.S. troop nonpersonnel costs, and has a provision, adopted again by overwhelming support on the floor in the House version of the 1998 Defense authorization act, the Frank amendment that I have alluded to earlier.

With NATO expansion looming on the horizon, concern exists regarding the understanding of both the scale of the costs associated with expansion and the distribution of those costs across new and current members of NATO, including the United States.

Let me quickly reiterate, Mr. Speaker, arguments in support of the provisions contained in section 1207, the subject of this motion to recommit conferees.

First, the United States provides disproportionate support for NATO in many capacities, making available naval forces as well as communications, transportation, and logistics capabilities, and strategic nuclear forces. As a result, it pays a substantially larger portion of its GDP on its military account than our European allies.

Second, several of our European allies are wealthy nations and can contribute more to the burdens of the alliance than they currently do.

Third, new members of NATO should be expected to contribute along the terms of existing members, and should not be admitted without the capabilities to contribute across the panorama of dimensions, that would include financial, military, political, and foreign policy, of current members of the alliance.

Fourth, the amounts contained in the amendment do indeed reflect the administration's current estimates of the probable U.S. share. The provisions contained in section 1207 would establish that in law for the period through the year 2010, after which a review can be made of the continuing appropriateness of that level of commitment or restraint.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, legislative initiatives have in the past provided important leverage, as it were, to the U.S. Government in negotiations with NATO partners on burdensharing arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, with those opening and explanatory remarks, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the distinguished ranking member of the committee. This motion expresses support for section 1207 of H.R. 1119, a provision offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] that would ensure that the United States' share of the costs associated with the proposed expansion of NATO does not exceed the administration's projected estimates.

While I believe we want to closely examine the precise wording of this provision, I support its intent, as it addresses a very important aspect of the administration's NATO expansion policy: How much will this policy cost, and who will pick up the cost?

On this point, a recent letter from President Clinton to the committee states that "all NATO members will share in the cost of NATO enlargement, and the distribution of costs will be in accordance with long-standing financial principles."

However, at the recent NATO summit in Madrid, French President Chirac declared, and I quote, "France does not intend to raise its contribution to NATO because of the cost of enlargement." At a minimum, this development raises important questions that deserve continued attention and scrutiny by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of where one might stand on the broader question of NATO expansion, I agree that the question of cost, how much, who pays, and by when, should be of universal concern. Therefore, I join the gentleman from California in supporting this motion, and look forward to working with him and the Members on all sides of the NATO expansion issue as we arrive at a proper statement of congressional policy on questions of cost.

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

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the gentleman's remarks, the chairman of our Committee on National Security.

Mr. Speaker, I took part in a NATO summit meeting. We certainly are in support of NATO expansion, but I think burdensharing is an extremely important aspect of all of this. We want to make certain that the Congress and the American people fully understand what the burden of costs will be with regard to NATO expansion.

I am pleased to rise with the gentleman in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for their support of this motion to instruct conferees. It certainly gives this gentleman confidence that we will stand firmly and strongly in the context of the conference to bring this provision back.

I in a moment will yield to one of my distinguished colleagues from Massachusetts, the author of the amendment that is now the subject matter of section 1207, but I would first like to say, Mr. Speaker, that over the years there have been several Members very keenly interested in the issue of burdensharing. One of them who has loomed large in the context of our deliberations here in the Congress on the matter of burdensharing has been the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], who has been unwavering and unrelenting in his concern about burdensharing.

I think it is a tribute to the gentleman that the Congress on more than one occasion has embraced the wisdom of my distinguished colleague, and that his work is now the subject matter of the motion to recommit conferees today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I am deeply grateful, Mr. Speaker, for the

ranking minority member's words of praise, because he is among the most consistently thoughtful and serious Members of this body, and praise from him in this area means a great deal to me.

I am also grateful to the two chairmen who have spoken, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], chairman of the Committee on National Security.

It is appropriate that we be speaking out with virtual unanimity, certainly great consensus. We are not here debating whether or not America ought to join NATO. Indeed, in its specific form, that will not come before us. It will come before the other body as a ratification of a treaty. This House voted on a resolution, a sense of Congress, in favor of the expansion of NATO. That is not at issue. There is a large majority in favor, although some may have questions.

The issue is what is an equitable sharing of the costs. I think it is important to note the history here. Fifty-two years ago, at the close of World War II, this Nation undertook as generous an approach to foreign nations as we have seen in the history of the world. From the Marshall plan through a whole range of other activities, the people of the United States went to the aid in particular of people in Europe who had been devastated by the war, in what is really quite an extraordinary example of national generosity and good sense. It was done in a bipartisan way by President Truman and a Republican Congress that came into power in 1946.

This country not only went to the aid of its former allies, but in what is really an example of the importance of a generosity of spirit and an appreciation of the value of reconciliation, we went to the aid of our former enemies. This country by the late 1940's was a partner in the rebuilding economically and politically of Germany and Japan. Germany and Japan today and for decades have been functioning democracies, and that is something about which we can be proud, our part in having that reaction.

I say that because no one can accuse this country of a lack of appreciation for international responsibilities when we say at this point, dealing with allies that are our equals in wealth, that an element of subsidy from us to them is no longer appropriate. That is what this amendment says.

This amendment says that when it comes to the expansion of NATO, which is, after all, primarily about Europe, although it is obviously going to benefit us as well, the wealthy European nations, and this is not an effort to impose more money on the Czech Republic or the people of Hungary or the people of Poland, but we are talking here about our wealthy European allies.

The chairman of the Committee on National Security correctly noted, I believe, the quotation from President Chirac of France. Remember, the French have two positions. One, more countries ought to be invited into NATO; two, they should not contribute a franc to that.

□ 1230

That is obviously an untenable position. I regard this as strengthening the hands of the administration. The number we have here, \$2 billion, is the upper end of the range that the President has told us this will cost. This is not an effort to force the administration to do with less than they have asked for. The President has said over this 12-year period it will cost \$1.5 to \$2 billion. We say \$2 billion.

We realize he has got to be negotiating with our allies, allies who have refused to bear a common part of the burden, and questions have legitimately been raised. Why is that important? It is important because if they do too much or we get forced to do too much at the expense of other things, we are about to adopt, not with my vote, but it is going to be adopted, a budget agreement. It will very tightly constrain for the next 5 years at least both domestic and international spending, both military and civilian spending, the military spending itself will be tight according to those in charge of it. And it cannot, I think, sustain additional billions for NATO expansion without taking away from important categories that we need to worry about. So this simply takes the President at his word.

I would also point out two things: The chairman of the committee said quite correctly that he, and I appreciated this, agreed in concept but we would work on the wording. Of course, an instruction motion does not tie the hands of our conferees. It does not require them to vote ad infinitum for every word. It, I hope, will send them into negotiation with the other body with a powerful statement that some concern about cost has to be written in.

Second, what we are talking about people will say, suppose something unforeseen comes up there 4 or 5 years from now. The answer under the American Constitution is not that the President should have a blank check to deal with that but where we are talking about the spending power, the President should be required to return to the Congress of the United States and say, this has happened. There is this emergency. This threat has turned out to be worse than we thought. This expense is greater than we thought. There has been a collapse in one of our allies and we understand that they cannot bear the strain of that cost.

This House and the other body will certainly listen to that. This is not an absolute forever limitation. It is saying to the administration, this is what you say you need now and this is what we

are going to give you. If circumstances arise which should require more, then under our Constitution you come back and ask because what we fear, many of us, is that our allies will cheer us on, urge us to expand to even more countries and continue the pattern of refusing to cooperate.

I include for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, an article which was published in yesterday's Washington Post by two distinguished Republican Members of the other body:

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1997]

THE MISSING NATO DEBATE

(By John Warner and Kay Bailey Hutchison)

Going into the NATO summit in Madrid, conventional wisdom had it that expanding the Alliance would be easy. We believe this perception is changing with the realization of what expansion will entail.

The plan—which would have Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary come under the American security umbrella in just two years—seems to contradict the reality of declining defense budgets and general post-Cold War retrenchment that is taking place in all of the Western democracies. French President Jacques Chirac admitted as much at the recent NATO summit in Madrid, when he flatly declared that “France does not intend to raise its contribution to NATO because of the cost of enlargement.”

One indication of this intensified scrutiny is the recent letter from 20 senators to the president outlining those areas that will be debated prior to NATO expansion. Signatories include senators from every region of the country and from across the political spectrum, from Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) to Paul Wellstone (D-Minn.).

These members have differing views of NATO expansion, from support to skepticism to outright opposition. But they share one concern: The decision to enter into a mutual defense treaty with three additional countries deserves more debate and inspection than it has thus far received.

Under Article 5 of the NATO Charter, the members make a commitment to treat an attack on one member as an attack on all. Are the American people willing to make that same commitment to the three countries in Central Europe being identified for NATO membership, and possibly more in the future? And at what price?

The cost of adding at least three members to NATO will entail increased training for the new members, enhanced command and control capabilities, communications and intelligence-gathering improvements, upgrading of facilities and the purchase of weapons that will bring the new members up to NATO standards.

The wide variations in the estimates for these improvements are of concern. The independent and respected Rand Corp. in 1995 fixed the cost of NATO expansion at \$1 billion to \$5 billion a year over 10 years, soaring as high as \$10 billion or more should a strong threat to NATO reemerge.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has estimated that expanding the alliance (to the three plus Slovakia) would lead to U.S. costs ranging from \$5 billion to \$19 billion over 15 years. The CBO estimates the total cost of expansion at as much as \$125 billion. The cost to the United States assumes, questionably, that the new members of the alliance would increase their own defense spending by 60 percent over the same period.

In stark contrast to these staggering cost assessments are the Clinton administration's rather modest estimates for adding three to

five unnamed members to the alliance. In a February 1997 report to Congress, the administration concluded that the cost to the United States over 12 years would be just \$150 million to \$200 million a year, at best only one-fifth of the next highest estimate from an independent source. The same administration estimated the costs of the current U.S. operation in Bosnia at less than \$2 billion. The actual cost will be \$6.5 billion through June 1998, with that withdrawal date now in question.

The administration's February report is further troubling because of its assumptions about burden-sharing, or how much of the total cost of NATO enlargement will be borne by our European allies. According to the administration, the United States will pay just 15 percent or so of the direct enlargement costs. Other members will pay 50 percent, and the new members 35 percent.

The recent statement by President Chirac would seem to call this assumption into question. His statement is consistent with the trends of the last several years. Despite cuts in U.S. defense spending since the end of the Cold War, we still spend nearly 4 percent of our total wealth (gross domestic product) on defense. By comparison, France spends just 2.5 percent, Germany 1.5 percent and Poland 2.4 percent. It seems unlikely that these current and future allies will pay proportionately two or three times more than the United States for the costs of NATO expansion when they spend just half of what we do on general defense.

NATO expansion may well be a good idea, but the plan to bring it about must be based on hard realities, not feel-good perceptions. A heavy burden falls upon elected leaders to make a convincing argument to the American people that changes we make to the alliance are in our national interest and will strengthen the organization.

I cite this because it is, I will tell the Parliamentarian, directly relevant to the legislation under consideration. Under our rules we cannot just idly comment on the other body, but we can talk about things that are relevant. Two Members of the Senate, the Senator from Virginia, who is a senior member of their Committee on Armed Services, and the junior Senator from Texas have an interesting article about this problem. They talk about, for instance, when they list what the President of the United States has said this will cost us, the recent statement by President Chirac of France would seem to call this assumption into question.

His statement is consistent with the trends of the last several years. Despite cuts in U.S. defense spending since the end of the cold war, we still spend nearly 4 percent of our total wealth on defense. By comparison France spends just 2.5 percent; Germany, 1.5 percent. It seems unlikely that these current and future allies will pay two or three times more than the United States for the cost of NATO expansion when they spend just half of what we do on general defense.

There is one thing we can do about that. We can have this Congress say, yes, the great majority here in this House voted to support the concept of NATO expansion but not in a context in which the U.S. taxpayer has to reduce our contribution. Remember, the European nations have imposed on themselves, the leading NATO Euro-

pean nations are also the leading nations in the European Union. They have impressed on themselves the requirement that they get their budget deficits down to 3 percent of gross domestic product, far higher than ours. They are under pressure to make cuts and their military budgets are going to be cut.

Great Britain, another very important NATO member not in the EU currency union, just announced, under the new government, that they would be cutting defense. It is important for us to have a large vote for this so that our administration understands and is strengthened in negotiations with our allies and in insisting that the American taxpayer not be given an open-ended budgetary problem with the expansion of NATO.

Therefore, I am very grateful to my friend from California, my friend from South Carolina, the gentleman from New York and the others who I think are strengthening the hand of the U.S. Government in this negotiation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Frank motion. Let me stipulate, I am an internationalist. I for 10 years chaired the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations. In that capacity, I worked with many Members in this institution in initiating and then expanding American assistance to eastern Europe after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union. I was deeply involved in ensuring that we had major debt relief for Poland without which Poland would not, in my view, have been able to make the transition from a captive Communist country to a now economically thriving incipient democracy.

I believe deeply in engagement with countries around the world, including those in Central Europe. But I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is absolutely correct. Uncle Sam cannot be Uncle Sucker. I think frankly, while the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] said this debate is not about the expansion of NATO, I wish it were because frankly we have never really had a debate in this country about expansion of NATO. We have had a very lightly once over discussion in this House last year encouraging the administration to pursue the possibilities of expansion, something which no reasonable Member could oppose; but I do not believe that the expansion of NATO has occurred in the right way. I think that what the West has done and the way it has done it in expanding NATO has been one of the most culturally and politically, internationally politically arrogant acts that the West has undertaken.

I am concerned it will lead to some long-term problems because, first of all, I do not like the fact that, if you expand NATO selectively, we then

leave the Baltic States exposed in a no-man's land. I think if we add three or four countries to NATO, we increase the vulnerability to the countries closest to Russia, Ukraine, Balkans, countries like that.

Second, we had in this country our own debate about who lost China more than a generation ago. It was not a healthy debate. I am concerned that the way in which we approach the expansion of NATO will add fuel to the fire and add to the capacity of the most hard-line rejectionist elements within Russia to some year down the road, when the economy starts to slide again, encourage them in their own who-lost-Eastern-Europe debate. I think that would operate to the disadvantage of democratic forces in Russia.

Last, and I think most importantly, as stewards of the taxpayers money, it is our obligation both to know and to be frank with the American people about the cost that will be associated with NATO expansion. I do not think that we have had that frankness and that openness. I doubt very much that, if the country knew that we are going to commit ourselves to the concept that an attack on, say, Budapest would be treated as an attack upon Washington, DC, I think the country would want a whole lot more debate about that than it has had to this point. And certainly it would want to know what that could cost us in this era of competing forces and scarce budgets.

So I wish we had a more full debate on that subject, but given the fact that we have not, at least I believe that we certainly ought to do what the Frank amendment does, which is to take at their word what they say the cost to us of NATO expansion will be and to see to it that it does not rise above that ceiling because I believe that will at least force a stronger debate on the issue. If we are going to make this decision, it ought to be made with everybody's eyes open, after a full debate. That is the only way to strengthen rather than weaken the commitment of our society to involvement in international affairs. That is the only way that we can discourage rather than encourage isolationism.

That is why I think that the Frank amendment, while it does not come soon enough to generate a full-blown debate on what is happening in NATO, at least gives us an opportunity to be more frank about what it is we are doing, not meaning a pun there. I congratulate the gentleman and support his motion.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

At the outset let me just sing the praises of the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], ranking member and their

staffs for the great job that they do on the most important committee in the entire Congress, even more important than our Committee on Rules. That takes a little bit for me to say that.

Let me also just point out that I rise in support of the concept of this amendment, if not the specifics. I am a little concerned about placing a percentage or a dollar figure in an amendment like this. But if we look at the Constitution of the United States, the primary purpose for forming this Republic of States into the United States of America was to provide for a common defense. And in providing for a common defense, that means in being able to have the capability of defending America's interests anywhere in the world in order to prevent an eventual attack on our sovereignty and our way of life and our democracy.

In doing that, we have responsibilities as leaders of the world. We have to look at the fact that twice we have been called into battle in the European continent. It has cost millions and millions and millions of dollars and a million American lives during those two world wars. Then the cold war erupted when the Soviet Union became an entity and tried to force their atheistic philosophy down the throats of the entire world, and it became necessary to engage in that cold war at great financial expense to the American taxpayer. But it was money well spent because today instead of communism breaking out all over the world we now have democracy, the kind that we enjoy so much breaking out all over this world.

But that is a very, very fragile peace that we have today. The NATO alliance was the greatest defense alliance in the history of this world because, all during that cold war, it kept the peace. It kept this country and others from being annihilated from nuclear attack. And the way to keep that peace for the future is to expand NATO. We have an obligation in America to do that because we are the leader of the free world. We are the beacon of hope for all people throughout this world. We cannot just sit back and say, Europe, that is your responsibility because down the road it then could reflect back on us as a nation.

Therefore, we have to say to the rest of the world, and let me heap praise on the President of the United States of America, Bill Clinton, because before he went to Helsinki he met with me for an hour and discussed his philosophy and our Republican philosophy to make sure they were on line, that we were speaking the same philosophy; and that was that there would be an open door to all of those people who had been deprived of this thing we love so much, our sovereignty, and Bill Clinton lived up to his word.

I went to Madrid with the President and with others and we sat down. And over the objections of Jacques Chirac and even Helmut Kohl and many others, President Clinton stuck to his

guns, and he said we will have an open door policy.

□ 1245

And, yes, we will bring in Poland and the Czech Republic and Hungary. And then tomorrow it will be Slovenia and Romania. And the next day or the next year or the year after it will be the Baltic States. And we wrote that into the communique. I actually had the opportunity to write it in, which included the Baltic States.

That means that all countries, regardless of size, regardless of geographic location, regardless of political problems that might affect Russia, that that door will be kept open. And that is why we must be a part of NATO.

And, yes, over the years the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. FLOYD SPENCE and myself, and the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. DOUG BEREUTER, representatives to NATO, to the North Atlantic Assembly, along with Pat Schroeder, a former colleague of ours on the other side of the aisle, fought for burden sharing to make sure the other countries paid their fair share.

And, yes, we must do that today, but let us not be foolhardy in thinking that when we bring in a country like Slovenia, that has suffered so much, or Romania or the Baltics, who do not have the wherewithal, we must remember we have to help them in order to prepare for this, for an irreversible democracy.

These are the criteria for bringing these countries in: They must have moved to an irreversible democracy; they must believe in the free market system; they must believe in human rights for their own people within their boundaries and those without their boundaries as well; and then they must be able to participate militarily.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska, who has been so active in this over the years, and I am sorry to take so much time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and commend him for his remarks.

The gentleman, of course, is currently serving as one of the vice presidents of the North Atlantic Assembly. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and myself, we have all been involved, with others, for quite some period of time.

I recall my earliest involvement in this particular issue was back in 1982 or 1984, and it seems to me we have been pushing for burden sharing arrangements since that time, both on infrastructure and every other way. So before it became popular, we had been pushing for that, just as I continue to push for reasonable burden sharing on the United Nations.

But I do think we need to keep in mind, regardless of our support for the Frank amendment, that the overriding

consideration for us being in NATO is because it is in our national interest. And the overriding reason for us encouraging and participating and actually providing the leadership for expansion of NATO into the Czech Republic and Hungary and Poland, and thereafter, as the gentleman said, to other countries, including Slovenia, Romania, and the Baltic States, is because of our national interest. And that ought to be the overriding factor.

We will push hard for burden sharing in every way. We expect the Europeans and Canada to bear their share of the cost, and especially the new countries, but I also think we need to be careful that we do not fall for the exaggerated cost. It is no longer reasonable for us to consider the full infrastructure we have in the front line states in NATO today, like we have in Germany, and these new states.

So inheriting the infrastructure in places like Hungary, some of which I have seen in good shape, we can have a dramatic improvement and a protected environment for the citizens of these three countries without extraordinary costs.

The defense industry, the opponents of NATO expansion, they put out some extraordinary costs that are not reasonable. But I do think that we need to take this step to try to push the Europeans to pay their share along with the Canadians, but I want to commend the gentleman for his statement and the chairman and the senior Democrat on the Committee on National Security for their comments here today, as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to stress a couple of points of agreement between us.

First, I very much have in mind trying to get France and Germany and England and Belgium and Denmark and Norway, quite wealthy countries, to contribute. I agree with the gentleman that we should not be trying to get more out of Hungary and Poland and the Czech Republic.

Indeed, I think it is essential for these newer democracies, newer recently, not to put themselves at risk with their own people in terms of excessive demands here. So I am not trying to get more money out of the new members. I believe the problem is with the existing NATO members who have been doing so very well for so long. And that is the key point.

The second thing I would say, in agreement with the gentleman from Nebraska, I hope that those figures we have seen are exaggerated. That is why what this says is we will take the administration's figures at its word. And we always have the constitutional right as Congress, if it turns out there is some unforeseen problems, the way this works is we come back here and nobody doubts they would get very rapid consideration.

So I am not in dispute with the gentleman's views on the costs. Indeed, it is precisely those more moderate costs he described that are the fundamental premise of this amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlemen, and let me thank also the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], who is a former vice president of the North Atlantic Assembly and has done such a great job representing us in that body over these many, many years. He has summed up my debate, so I will not have to go further other than to tell my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], he is absolutely on line and we are all in agreement.

As a matter of fact, we should be telling certain people like Jacques Chirac of France, who have done all they can to disrupt NATO over the years, they should either participate or get out. And having said that, I thank the gentleman, and I will be supporting his amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to say to my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the committee, that I plan to make just a very few brief remarks. This will be the concluding comments on this side of the aisle, and then I will be more than happy then to yield back the balance of my time. I would also indicate that we will be asking for a rollcall vote.

Just in summary, let me conclude and underscore for emphasis a comment that the gentleman from Massachusetts made. First, what we are about here today is a motion to instruct conferees. That motion to instruct conferees simply says they should work as diligently as they can to preserve the integrity of section 1207, which places a limitation on the resources to be made available for the purposes of expansion of NATO to \$2 billion or 10 percent, whichever is the lesser amount, between the fiscal year 1998 to the year 2010.

My distinguished colleague from New York clearly recognizes that if we are confronted with extraordinary extenuating circumstances, the Congress of the United States, in this Congress next year or new Congresses down the road, new administrations can revisit this matter. We can act. But what we are saying is at this particular moment this is the most prudent thing to do.

Finally, I would like to say when we listen to the comments offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. FRANK, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY, the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. BEREUTER, and the gentlemen from New York, Mr. GILMAN and Mr. SOLOMON, it points out that this ought to be a beginning point for a debate that has not occurred in this country, a discussion that has not occurred in this country, and that is the efficacy and the appropriateness and the direction of NATO expansion.

In the context of this Republic, there ought to be an informed and enlight-

ened discussion in America. There ought to be an informed and enlightened debate in the context of the Congress. And the comments that the gentlemen have made, to take the opportunity on this motion to instruct to discuss the merit or the lack thereof of the need for expansion, simply underscores the comments that many of us have made, that there ought to be a significant discussion and debate in America on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and will only add to this that the gentleman from California and myself, as chairman and ranking member of the Committee on National Security, wrote to our President raising some of these concerns that have been talked about here today and had a full, lengthy letter back from him explaining these different positions. We also had a hearing in our committee and we discussed these same matters today.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been one of the strongest supporters in this House of the concept of NATO enlargement. I believe that it is only as a result of our efforts in the Congress that the Clinton administration and our NATO Allies came to the momentous decision earlier this month in Madrid to invite Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to join NATO. And our efforts—most recently in the form of the European Security Act, passed by this House last month—helped make certain that NATO would keep the door open to other countries such as Slovenia, Romania, the Baltic States, and Bulgaria, that will want to join NATO in the future.

The amendment offered by Mr. FRANK, which now appears as section 1207 of the bill, was not offered in an effort to block NATO enlargement. Rather, it was offered in an effort to signal our continued concern about the issue of burdensharing within NATO. For this reason, I do not oppose the motion by Mr. FRANK to instruct our conferees on section 1207.

I am pleased to join Chairman SPENCE, however, in pointing out that there are very serious problems with section 1207 the way it is currently drafted. It would be most unwise to impose an inflexible, binding cap on the amount that the United States will pay for NATO enlargement. At this point, no one knows for certain just how much NATO enlargement will cost. But one thing is absolutely clear: We must make certain that the NATO security guarantee that we are about to extend to Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic is not any hollow guarantee. It must be a serious guarantee, one that we and our NATO Allies can back up in a crisis. Therefore it cannot be subject to any arbitrary cost ceiling.

I would also point out the limitation contained in section 1207 is not consistent with the administration's cost estimates for NATO enlargement. The administration's February 1997 cost study projected that our share of enlargement costs would be approximately 15 percent of the total, not 10 percent as provided in section 1207.

I am assured that the Committee of Conference will correct these defects in section

1207. With that understanding, I join Chairman SPENCE in urging my colleague to support the motion.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

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

Mr. DELLUMS. 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 414, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]
YEAS—414

Abercrombie Chabot
Ackerman Chambliss
Aderholt Chenoweth
Allen Christensen
Andrews Clay
Archer Clayton
Army Clement
Bachus Clyburn
Baesler Coble
Baldacci Coburn
Ballenger Collins
Barcia Combest
Barr Condit
Barrett (NE) Conyers
Barrett (WI) Cook
Bartlett Cooksey
Barton Costello
Bass Cox
Bateman Coyne
Becerra Cramer
Bentsen Crane
Bereuter Crapo
Berman Cubin
Berry Cummings
Bilbray Cunningham
Bilirakis Danner
Bishop Davis (FL)
Blagojevich Davis (IL)
Bliley Deal
Blunt DeFazio
Boehlert DeGette
Boehner Delahunt
Bonilla DeLauro
Bonior DeLay
Bono Dellums
Borski Deutsch
Boswell Diaz-Balart
Boucher Dickey
Boyd Dicks
Brady Dingell
Brown (CA) Dixon
Brown (FL) Dooley
Brown (OH) Doolittle
Bryant Doyle
Bunning Dreier
Burr Duncan
Burton Dunn
Callahan Edwards
Calvert Ehlers
Camp Ehrlich
Campbell Emerson
Canady Engel
Cannon English
Capps Ensign
Cardin Eshoo
Carson Etheridge
Castle Evans

Hoekstra
Holden
Hoolley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre

NOT VOTING—20
Baker
Blumenauer
Buyer
Davis (VA)
Doggett
Gonzalez
Lipinski
Martinez
Meek
Miller (CA)
Molinari
Pelosi
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen

Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin

Schiff
Snowbarger
Stark
Torres
Watkins
Young (AK)

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that due to unforeseen circumstances I was unable to vote on H.R. 1119, Rollcall No. 330, and H.R. 1119, Rollcall call No. 331. If I had been present I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on National Security, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. SPENCE, STUMP, HUNTER, KASICH, BATEMAN, HANSEN, WELDON of Pennsylvania, HEFLEY, SAXTON, BUYER, Mrs. FOWLER, and Messrs. MCHUGH, TALENT, EVERETT, BARTLETT of Maryland, LEWIS of Kentucky, WATTS of Oklahoma, CHAMBLISS, RILEY, DELLUMS, SKELTON, SISISKY, SPRATT, ORTIZ, PICKETT, EVANS, TAYLOR of Mississippi, ABERCROMBIE, MEEHAN, Ms. HARMAN, and Messrs. MCHALE, KENNEDY of Rhode Island, BLAGOJEVICH, SNYDER, and RODRIQUEZ.

As additional conferees from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of matters within the jurisdiction of that committee under clause 2 of rule XLVII:

Messrs. GOSS, LEWIS of California, and DICKS.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Commerce, for consideration of sections 344, 601, 654, 735, 1021, 3143, 3144, 3201, 3202, 3402, and 3404 of the House bill, and sections 338, 601, 663, 706, 1064, 2823, 3136, 3140, 3151, 3160, 3201, and 3402 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. BLILEY, DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado, and DINGELL.

Provided that Mr. OXLEY is appointed in lieu of Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado for consideration of sections 344 and 1021 of the House bill and section 2823 of the Senate amendment.

Provided that Mr. BILIRAKIS is appointed in lieu of Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado for consideration of sections 601, 654, and 735 of the House bill, and sections 338, 601, 663, and 706 of the Senate amendment.

Provided that Mr. TAUZIN is appointed in lieu of Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado for consideration of section 1064 of the Senate amendment.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 374, 658, and 3143 of the House bill, and section 664 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FAWELL, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

Provided that Mr. RIGGS is appointed in lieu of Mr. FAWELL for consideration of section 658 of the House bill and section 664 of the Senate amendment.

□ 1312

Mr. HEFLEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for consideration of sections 322 and 3527 of the House bill, and sections 1068, 1107, 2811, and 3527 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. BURTON of Indiana, HORN, and WAXMAN.

As additional conferees from the Committee on House Oversight, for consideration of section 543 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. THOMAS, NEY, and GEJDENSON.

As additional conferees from the Committee on International Relations, for consideration of sections 1101-1111, 1202, 1204, 1205, 1207, 1210, and 1231-1234 of the House bill, and sections 1009, 1013, 1021, 1022, 1056, 1057, 1082, and 1085 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. GILMAN, BEREUTER, and HAMILTON.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 374, 1057, 3521, 3522, and 3541 of the House bill and sections 831, 1073, 1075, 1106, and 1201-1216 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. HYDE, SMITH of Texas, and CONYERS.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Resources, for consideration of sections 214, 601, 653, 1021, 2835, 2901-2914 and 3404 of the House bill, and sections 234, 381-392, 601, 706, 2819, and 3158 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. YOUNG of Alaska, TAUZIN, and MILLER of California.

Provided that Mr. HEFLEY is appointed in lieu of Mr. SAXTON for consideration of section 3404 of the House bill.

Provided that Mr. DELAHUNT is appointed in lieu of Mr. MILLER of California for consideration of sections 2901-2914 of the House bill, and sections 381-392 of the Senate amendment.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Science, for consideration of sections 214 and 3148 of the House bill, and sections 234 and 1064 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, CALVERT, and BROWN of California.

Provided that Mr. ROHRBACHER is appointed in lieu of Mr. CALVERT for consideration of section 1064 of the Senate amendment.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of sections 345, 563, 601, 1021, 2861, and 3606 of the House bill, and section 601 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. SHUSTER, GILCHREST, and BORSKI.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for consideration of sections 751, 752 and

759 of the House bill, and sections 220, 542, 751, 752, 758, 1069, 1074, and 1076 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. SMITH of New Jersey, BILIRAKIS, and KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 1119, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998, WHEN CLASSIFIED NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION IS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XXVIII, clause 6(a), I move that the conference committee meetings on the bill (H.R. 1119) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information is under consideration, provided, however, that any sitting Member of Congress shall have the right to attend any closed or open meeting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Pursuant to clause 6(a) of rule XXVIII, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 409, nays 1, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armed
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehert
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning

Burr
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums

Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren

Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCreery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalfe
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher

Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaefer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Vislosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

DeFazio