

The previous question was ordered.
The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2620, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mrs. MYRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-273) on the resolution (H. Res. 279) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2620) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GERALD B. H. SOLOMON FREEDOM CONSOLIDATION ACT OF 2001

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 277, I call up the bill (H.R. 3167) to endorse the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Pursuant to House Resolution 277, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 3167 is as follows:

H.R. 3167

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress declared that "full and active participants in the Partnership for Peace in a position to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area should be invited to become full NATO members in accordance with Article 10 of such Treaty at an early date . . .".

(2) In the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (title VI of section 101(c) of title I of division A of Public Law 104-208; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress called for the prompt admission of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia to NATO, and declared that "in order to promote economic stability and security in Slovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Moldova, and Ukraine . . . the process of enlarging NATO to include emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe should not be limited to consideration of admitting

Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia as full members of the NATO Alliance".

(3) In the European Security Act of 1998 (title XXVII of division G of Public Law 105-277; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress declared that "Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic should not be the last emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe invited to join NATO" and that "Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria . . . would make an outstanding contribution to furthering the goals of NATO and enhancing stability, freedom, and peace in Europe should they become NATO members [and] upon complete satisfaction of all relevant criteria should be invited to become full NATO members at the earliest possible date".

(4) At the Madrid Summit of the NATO Alliance in July 1997, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic were invited to join the Alliance in the first round of NATO enlargement, and the NATO heads of state and government issued a declaration stating "[t]he Alliance expects to extend further invitations in coming years to nations willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership . . . [n]o European democratic country whose admission would fulfill the objectives of the [North Atlantic] Treaty will be excluded from consideration".

(5) At the Washington Summit of the NATO Alliance in April 1999, the NATO heads of state and government issued a communique declaring "[w]e pledge that NATO will continue to welcome new members in a position to further the principles of the [North Atlantic] Treaty and contribute to peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic area . . . [t]he three new members will not be the last . . . [n]o European democratic country whose admission would fulfill the objectives of the Treaty will be excluded from consideration, regardless of its geographic location . . .".

(6) In late 2002, NATO will hold a summit in Prague, the Czech Republic, at which it will decide which additional emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe to invite to join the Alliance in the next round of NATO enlargement.

(7) In May 2000 in Vilnius, Lithuania, the foreign ministers of Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia issued a statement (later joined by Croatia) declaring that their countries will cooperate in jointly seeking NATO membership in the next round of NATO enlargement, that the realization of NATO membership by one or more of these countries would be a success for all, and that eventual NATO membership for all of these countries would be a success for Europe and NATO.

(8) On June 15, 2001, in a speech in Warsaw, Poland, President George W. Bush stated "[a]ll of Europe's new democracies, from the Baltic to the Black Sea and all that lie between, should have the same chance for security and freedom—and the same chance to join the institutions of Europe—as Europe's old democracies have . . . I believe in NATO membership for all of Europe's democracies that seek it and are ready to share the responsibilities that NATO brings . . . [a]s we plan to enlarge NATO, no nation should be used as a pawn in the agenda of others . . . [w]e will not trade away the fate of free European peoples . . . [n]o more Munichs . . . [n]o more Yaltas . . . [a]s we plan the Prague Summit, we should not calculate how little we can get away with, but how much we can do to advance the cause of freedom".

(9) On October 22, 1996, in a speech in Detroit, Michigan, former President William J. Clinton stated "NATO's doors will not close

behind its first new members . . . NATO should remain open to all of Europe's emerging democracies who are ready to shoulder the responsibilities of membership . . . [n]o nation will be automatically excluded . . . [n]o country outside NATO will have a veto . . . [a] gray zone of insecurity must not re-emerge in Europe".

SEC. 3. DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.

Congress—

(1) reaffirms its previous expressions of support for continued enlargement of the NATO Alliance contained in the NATO Participation Act of 1994, the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996, and the European Security Act of 1998;

(2) supports the commitment to further enlargement of the NATO Alliance expressed by the Alliance in its Madrid Declaration of 1997 and its Washington Summit Communique of 1999; and

(3) endorses the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and urges our NATO allies to work with the United States to realize this vision at the Prague Summit in 2002.

SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF SLOVAKIA TO RECEIVE ASSISTANCE UNDER THE NATO PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1994.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Slovakia is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The designation of Slovakia pursuant to subsection (a) as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994—

(1) is in addition to the designation of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia pursuant to section 606 of the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (title VI of section 101(c) of title I of division A of Public Law 104-208; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) and the designation of Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria pursuant to section 2703(b) of the European Security Act of 1998 (title XXVII of division G of Public Law 105-277; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994; and

(2) shall not preclude the designation by the President of other emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe pursuant to section 203(d)(2) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of such Act.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES DESIGNATED UNDER THE NATO PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1994.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING.—Of the amounts made available for fiscal year 2002 under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763)—

(1) \$6,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Estonia;

(2) \$7,000,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Latvia;

(3) \$7,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Lithuania;

(4) \$8,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Slovakia;

(5) \$4,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Slovenia;

(6) \$10,000,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Bulgaria; and

(7) \$11,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Romania.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 515 of the Security Assistance

Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-280) is amended by striking paragraphs (1), (5), (6), (7), and (8) and redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (9) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment printed in the bill is considered adopted.

The text of H.R. 3167, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3167

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress declared that "full and active participants in the Partnership for Peace in a position to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area should be invited to become full NATO members in accordance with Article 10 of such Treaty at an early date . . .".

(2) In the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (title VI of section 101(c) of title I of division A of Public Law 104-208; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress called for the prompt admission of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia to NATO, and declared that "in order to promote economic stability and security in Slovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Moldova, and Ukraine . . . the process of enlarging NATO to include emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe should not be limited to consideration of admitting Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia as full members of the NATO Alliance".

(3) In the European Security Act of 1998 (title XXVII of division G of Public Law 105-277; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress declared that "Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic should not be the last emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe invited to join NATO" and that "Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria . . . would make an outstanding contribution to furthering the goals of NATO and enhancing stability, freedom, and peace in Europe should they become NATO members [and] upon complete satisfaction of all relevant criteria should be invited to become full NATO members at the earliest possible date".

(4) At the Madrid Summit of the NATO Alliance in July 1997, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic were invited to join the Alliance in the first round of NATO enlargement, and the NATO heads of state and government issued a declaration stating "[t]he Alliance expects to extend further invitations in coming years to nations willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership . . . [n]o European democratic country whose admission would fulfill the objectives of the [North Atlantic] Treaty will be excluded from consideration".

(5) At the Washington Summit of the NATO Alliance in April 1999, the NATO heads of state and government issued a communique declaring "[w]e pledge that NATO will continue to welcome new members in a position to further the principles of the [North Atlantic] Treaty and contribute to peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic area . . . [t]he three new members will not be the last . . . [n]o European democratic country whose admission would fulfill the objectives of the Treaty will be excluded from consideration, regardless of its geographic location . . .".

(6) In late 2002, NATO will hold a summit in Prague, the Czech Republic, at which it will decide which additional emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe to invite to join the Alliance in the next round of NATO enlargement.

(7) In May 2000 in Vilnius, Lithuania, the foreign ministers of Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia issued a statement (later joined by Croatia) declaring that their countries will cooperate in jointly seeking NATO membership in the next round of NATO enlargement, that the realization of NATO membership by one or more of these countries would be a success for all, and that eventual NATO membership for all of these countries would be a success for Europe and NATO.

(8) On June 15, 2001, in a speech in Warsaw, Poland, President George W. Bush stated "[a]ll of Europe's new democracies, from the Baltic to the Black Sea and all that lie between, should have the same chance for security and freedom—and the same chance to join the institutions of Europe—as Europe's old democracies have . . . I believe in NATO membership for all of Europe's democracies that seek it and are ready to share the responsibilities that NATO brings . . . [a]s we plan to enlarge NATO, no nation should be used as a pawn in the agenda of others . . . [w]e will not trade away the fate of free European peoples . . . [n]o more Munichs . . . [n]o more Yaltas . . . [a]s we plan the Prague Summit, we should not calculate how little we can get away with, but how much we can do to advance the cause of freedom".

(9) On October 22, 1996, in a speech in Detroit, Michigan, former President William J. Clinton stated "NATO's doors will not close behind its first new members . . . NATO should remain open to all of Europe's emerging democracies who are ready to shoulder the responsibilities of membership . . . [n]o nation will be automatically excluded . . . [n]o country outside NATO will have a veto . . . [a] gray zone of insecurity must not reemerge in Europe".

SEC. 3. DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.

Congress—

(1) reaffirms its previous expressions of support for continued enlargement of the NATO Alliance contained in the NATO Participation Act of 1994, the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996, and the European Security Act of 1998;

(2) supports the commitment to further enlargement of the NATO Alliance expressed by the Alliance in its Madrid Declaration of 1997 and its Washington Summit Communique of 1999; and

(3) endorses the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and urges our NATO allies to work with the United States to realize this vision at the Prague Summit in 2002.

SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF SLOVAKIA TO RECEIVE ASSISTANCE UNDER THE NATO PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1994.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Slovakia is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The designation of Slovakia pursuant to subsection (a) as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994—

(1) is in addition to the designation of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia pursuant to section 606 of the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (title VI of section 101(c) of title I of division A of Public Law 104-208; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) and the designation of Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria pursuant to section 2703(b) of the European Security Act of 1998 (title XXVII of division G of Public Law 105-277; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994; and

(2) shall not preclude the designation by the President of other emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe pursuant to section 203(d)(2) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of such Act.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES DESIGNATED UNDER THE NATO PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1994.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING.—Of the amounts made available for fiscal year 2002 under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763)—

(1) \$6,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Estonia;

(2) \$7,000,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Latvia;

(3) \$7,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Lithuania;

(4) \$8,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Slovakia;

(5) \$4,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Slovenia;

(6) \$10,000,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Bulgaria; and

(7) \$11,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Romania.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 515 of the Security Assistance Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-280) is amended by striking paragraphs (1), (5), (6), (7), and (8) and redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (9) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the House of Representatives delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, this Member rises in strong support for H.R. 3167, the Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001.

Indeed, this legislation enjoys the support of Members from the elected leadership on both sides of the aisle, including the Speaker of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT); the House majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY); the minority whip, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR); and the chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. COX).

Additionally, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE); the ranking minority member of the Committee, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS); and the chairman emeritus of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN); and the chairman of the subcommittee on Europe, the gentleman

from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), are cosponsors of the measure.

Mr. Speaker, this Member is also pleased to note that among the cosponsors are many Members of the House delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, including the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS); the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY); the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER); the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS); the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON); the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Also, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), not a member of the delegation, who has been very active in NATO expansion issue is a cosponsor, as would be the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), if we had had their names in time.

□ 1145

The measure before this body today outlines and reaffirms congressional support for further expansion of NATO. In addition, the legislation endorses the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance as expressed in statements by former President Bill Clinton and by President George W. Bush.

Further, the bill specifically designates Slovakia to receive assistance under the NATO Participation Act of 1994, and the President is authorized to designate, as he deems appropriate, other countries as eligible for the assistance under the same program.

Finally, this legislation authorizes foreign military financing for the following leading NATO alliances aspirants. These are not all of the aspirants, but these are the ones that the administration has requested authorization levels for: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Romania and now Slovakia. These levels that are in the legislation reflect exactly the administration's request.

I think it is important to note that H.R. 3167 does not specifically endorse the candidacies of any countries. It simply endorses expansion, hopefully at the Prague Summit in the year 2002, for those countries which meet the criteria outlined by current NATO members, and they are substantial criteria, not easy to meet. I identified a few of them a few minutes ago in discussing the rule.

On November 1 of this year, the Committee on International Relations considered and passed this legislation, as amended, by voice vote. This Member and the dean of the New York Republican delegation, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), offered the sole amendment to the measure during

the committee markup, which redesignated the title as the Gerald B.H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act. This amendment was approved, of course, by voice vote in Committee and approved unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, this Member can think of few more fitting legislative memorials to our former distinguished colleague who, through his service in this body and as a long-time member of the House NATO Parliamentary Assembly delegation, consistently championed efforts to strengthen and expand NATO. Indeed, Congressman Solomon wrote a book on it.

I would say also that Members should know that he played a very active role in the Assembly. He served as the chairman of one of the five working committees of the Assembly, the Political Committee, the one that dealt with the most controversial and most comprehensive list of subjects. He also served as the vice president of the Assembly for the maximum 2-year term, and he was proud to be a member of a small delegation that President Clinton took to the Madrid Summit when decisions were made about NATO enlargement to include the countries of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland.

Congressman Solomon was unwavering in his belief that the former Warsaw Pact countries, if they meet the NATO criteria, plus others, including some of the new nations springing from the disintegration of Yugoslavia and nations farther to the southeast, should have the opportunity to join the NATO security alliance. He recognized that NATO membership for those countries would be critical in maintaining stability and prosperity for the entire continent and particularly for Eastern Europe. This Member believes that Congressman Solomon would be pleased to know that his vision for an expanded NATO continues to enjoy overwhelming support from this body.

Mr. Speaker, this Member, who once again led a House delegation to the NATO PA spring meeting in Vilnius, Lithuania, this year, was impressed with the grassroots support in Lithuania for NATO membership. In fact, during that trip, this Member asked a street vendor why he displayed a pro-NATO sticker on his cart. The vendor explained that he would never forget how a family member of his had been taken to Siberia by the Soviets and had never returned. Therefore, because of this and very similar incidents affecting thousands of citizens of the three Baltic nations in the early stages of World War II, this vendor said, That is why I am for NATO expansion—so it can never happen again.

He is joined by so many people of the former Warsaw Pact countries who viewed NATO membership, or the prospect for it, as very important to the stability of future freedoms for their citizens.

Without a doubt, NATO has been the most effective collective defense alli-

ance in the history of the world. It has provided collective security to the member nations of Western Europe. Therefore, it is no surprise that many members of the former Warsaw Pact now aspire to such membership. For NATO to continue its expansion is entirely appropriate at this time, as is congressional support for expansion, but of course, expansion only when appropriate criteria are met, when these countries can make a proper contribution to the NATO collective security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 3167.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office on H.R. 3167 for printing in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
November 5, 2001.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has completed the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 3167, the Gerald B.H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001. The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Joseph C. Whitehill, who can be reached at 226-2840.

Sincerely,

DAN L. CRIPPEN,
Director.

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE
H.R. 3167—Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001

H.R. 3167 would reaffirm Congressional support for the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and would increase the amounts of foreign military financing (FMF) earmarked in 2002 for seven Central and Eastern European countries that are potential candidates for NATO membership. The FMF spending is subject to appropriation action. The bill would not increase the total amount authorized for FMF in 2002 under Public Law 106-280, the Security Assistance Act of 2000; therefore, CBO estimates that implementing the bill would not significantly affect discretionary spending. Because the bill would not affect direct spending or receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply.

H.R. 3167 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Joseph C. Whitehill, who can be reached at 226-2840. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me at the outset identify myself with all the comments made by my colleagues concerning our late friend, Jerry Solomon. Jerry Solomon was a most distinguished Member of this body and his leadership on the NATO issue simply cannot be overstated.

Let me also commend my good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BERUTER) whose leadership of the congressional delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly has been extraordinary. He has earned our respect

as the leader of our NATO delegation, and I want to pay public tribute to him.

I also want to acknowledge the contributions to NATO and our participation of the chairman emeritus of our committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), our current chairman.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has consistently led the way in supporting NATO enlargement and for a strong and robust role for NATO in Europe. One of the most memorable moments in my congressional service was to fly with our former Secretary of State Madeline Albright to Independence, Missouri, with the foreign ministers of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic when we moved to include those three former Communist states, having cleansed themselves of their past as full members of NATO.

NATO is the longest surviving alliance of all time, and it has endured because it is an alliance of free and democratic nations. No country was ever forced to join the alliance by a larger and stronger power, in sharp contrast to the Warsaw Pact where every single member was forced into that pact by the power and might of the Soviet Union. There can be no better endorsement of NATO's success and achievements than the desire of the newly emerging countries of Central and Eastern Europe to join this alliance.

Now, the post-September 11 era, Mr. Speaker, has brought us new realities, and one of them is the critical role that NATO can play in the fight against international terrorism. As a matter of fact, although we did not plan it this way, my friend, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, yesterday in an op-ed in the Washington Post states correctly that NATO has found its new mission, and that mission is to lead the way along with the United States in the global war against international terrorism.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and I were managing the legislation, giving our President whatever powers he needs to wage this war. And while we were here in this Chamber, our NATO allies invoked Article 5 of the NATO Treaty stating, in essence, that the attack on one NATO member is an attack on all members of NATO, and they have given us and will continue to give us their support in every conceivable form.

In this context today, I want to acknowledge the Government of Germany for yesterday making the historic decision of committing German troops to the war in Afghanistan, a historic first for that country.

NATO members, Mr. Speaker, have also responded immediately and willingly to the call by President Bush to cut terrorist financing. In this context, let me just mention parenthetically that NATO members stand in sharp contrast to the arrogant governmental action of Lebanon, which is refusing to

give us cooperation in cracking down on the financial capabilities of international terrorist organizations like Hezbollah. Our NATO allies share intelligence with the United States regarding both Osama bin Laden and the entire al-Qaeda network.

Just yesterday, Mr. Speaker, President Bush spoke via satellite to the Warsaw Conference on combatting terrorism, where all of the nations of Eastern and Central Europe who wish to join NATO were represented.

Although the war on terrorism is now our top national priority, we must remain engaged with our allies on a wide spectrum of issues, including NATO enlargement. The next NATO summit in Prague in 2002 will be the first opportunity for the applicant countries to formally present their bids for membership in NATO. Our bill demonstrates our strong belief that this process must not be and will not be sidelined.

The 10 countries which are hoping to become members of NATO, and I will read them in alphabetical order, Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Rumania, Slovakia and Slovenia, are all seeking membership in this great peace-loving alliance.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) indicated, they will have to meet some very tough yardsticks to be judged worthy of joining NATO. They relate not only to having achieved a certain degree of economic success and having made a contribution to their own defense and the collective defense, but they must demonstrate that they are practicing a respect for human rights, religious rights, minority rights and press freedom. They have to demonstrate that they are free and open democratic societies.

I want to underscore, Mr. Speaker, that the upcoming summit in Prague, where we will be looking at the new applicants for membership in NATO, is the first and not the last of such meetings. The Prague Summit is part of a measured and carefully managed process of including more and more of our European friends in NATO. Invitations will be extended to the applicants consistent with their compliance with the NATO membership action plan.

As do all of my colleagues in this Congress, I support a Europe whole and free. And I strongly endorse the statements of the 10 applicant countries that eventual NATO membership for all of them will be a success for the United States, for Europe and for NATO.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word about Russia. Following the events of September 11, Mr. Speaker, clearly a new relationship is evolving between the United States and Russia. Next week we are looking forward to welcoming the Russian President, Mr. Putin, in Washington, who then will go on for a more intimate meeting with the President in Crawford, Texas.

There is a whole new flavor to the Russian/U.S. relationship, and it is apparent in a dozen different ways.

□ 1200

We are modifying our previous position of just a few months ago with respect to the ABM Treaty to missile testing. The Russians are asking that we put an end to Jackson-Vanik, which was historic human rights legislation but which has served its purpose.

I look forward to the day when a democratic Russia will be able to explore the possibility of joining NATO; and I think it is important to underscore, in dealing with the expansion of NATO, that this is in no sense directed at Russia. Russia is no longer our enemy, and we are looking forward to the day when it will be our ally.

I, for one, welcome President Putin's new attitude towards NATO enlargement and his statement that he would not rule out NATO membership for Russia. Let me say we also do not rule out that possibility. This represents an important change, a historic change in Russian perceptions of the NATO alliance, a sentiment that we should continue to encourage strongly. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I want to just compliment the gentleman from California on his articulate statement, and I appreciate his kind remarks regarding this Member. His comments about President Putin, I think, are certainly appropriate.

We have seen very moderate and positive statements on NATO expansion, on missile defense, coming from President Putin since the tragic events of September 11th. And I think it is very interesting, as I conclude these comments, to note that NATO assets, AWACS planes, are sent from Europe to the United States today to help our fighter aircraft patrol our cities since American AWACS aircraft are deployed for operations related to Northern Watch over Iraq, in the Persian Gulf regions, and in operations related to Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the dean of the delegation and the person who helped me offer the amendment to name this Gerald B.H. Solomon legislation.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to commend our former vice chairman of our Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), for introducing this bill, which I am pleased to cosponsor with him, and for his strong consistent support for NATO enlargement. He has been a true leader in NATO for our Congress.

I thank our committee's ranking minority member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for his support not only for this bill but for NATO's enlargement throughout the years.

Under the aegis of NATO, the past decade has shown a remarkable expansion of freedom in Europe without firing a single shot. It is ironic that our NATO allies have invoked the, and I quote, "attack on one is an attack on all" clause of NATO's treaty in the recent terrorist attacks on our own Nation from abroad. We have special reasons, therefore, to value the contributions that NATO has made in our own defense.

Accordingly, it is in our own national interests that we need to bring as many democratic, stable and capable European nations as possible into NATO alliance. This bill makes it clear that the door to NATO membership remains open to other nations; and it is fitting, therefore, for Congress to ask the President to sign this measure into law, a NATO expansion policy declaration. It was in our interest in the opening of the East, which laid the groundwork for the eventual accession of the Czech Republic, of Hungary, and Poland into NATO in the last decade, which, with many of my colleagues, I strongly supported.

I was pleased to join my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), in making one change to this bill, naming it after our close friend and former colleague on our Committee on International Relations, and former chairman of the House Committee on Rules, the late gentleman from New York, Mr. Solomon. Mr. Solomon was an outstanding, dedicated public servant, a Congressman who deeply carried about our national security and how we came to depend on NATO alliance. Accordingly, it is altogether fitting that we name this NATO expansion legislation the Gerald B.H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act.

It was in 1998 that Jerry Solomon authored a book entitled "The NATO Enlargement Debate: 1990-1997: The blessings of Liberty." In that book he concluded, and I quote from the final paragraph of his book: "In the final analysis, a wider alliance is but a means to the end of building confidence and security toward which all of NATO's directions are aimed. In an era of profound transformation in transatlantic and European security, there can be no guarantees that the values and strategic outlook of the alliance can form the foundation for all of Europe. Nevertheless, we do know that the NATO experience has much to offer as we return to the original broad ambition of NATO and embrace a wider community of free peoples."

The distinguished chairman of the full Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), has enthusiastically supported this bill in our committee; and I very much appreciate the expeditious consideration of the bill in committee and

the efforts to obtain early floor consideration. I thank House leadership for making certain that this bill was considered in an appropriate and timely manner. It is an appropriate tribute to a great patriot, Mr. Jerry Solomon.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a valued and thoughtful member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his courtesy in letting me to speak on this measure.

I have some real concerns about the legislation before us today. It certainly is not a lack of respect for the spokespeople on both sides of the aisle, two of the most respected Members of Congress in this arena, for whom I am deeply gratified for being able to learn about international affairs; and it certainly is not any reservations about NATO itself. As has been pointed out, NATO, for 52 years, has performed an invaluable service for providing peace and stability on the European continent. It has been especially critical for the first 42 of those 52 years.

But I think the real question is whether it is time for us to take a step back and look at some of the underlying assumptions, much like my friend from California mentioned a moment ago, in terms of framing the question about how we are going to deal with Russia. I think that is one of the most critical points that we need to focus on.

I think it fascinating that the first call from a head of state that our President received after the disaster, the terrorist attacks on September 11, was from President Putin. It signaled, I think, a part of this new era that we are seeing. And before we deal with an expansion of NATO or something else, I think it is critical that we take a step back, as the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has said, and take a look at the role of NATO.

In early October, Secretary General Lord George Robertson met with President Putin; and neither seemed to see any reason why Russia, at some point, should not be a member of NATO. Indeed, as we look at the list of countries that we are bringing forward as potential members, certainly Russia would appear to be at least as well qualified as these would-be member states in terms of its effort to develop its economy and its democracy.

In this context, I think we should ask ourselves why we are moving ahead with our expansion plans that could look to those elements in the Soviet Union that it is not necessarily consistent with this emerging new agenda. It looks certainly like a continuation of Cold War encirclement, as we are expanding a military alliance that does, for the time being, exclude them, but will extend almost to their eastern border. Is there not a more constructive and effective way to show our support

for democratization in Central and Eastern Europe than continuing to build an alliance that looks as though it is arrayed against them?

I must also point out that the continued expansion of NATO is an exceedingly expensive endeavor. The weak economies of the new members and what appears to me to be lukewarm support for implementing and financing the expansion of the alliance by some of our European members is going to force the United States to assume more of the funding burden.

A CBO study found that the cost of expansion simply to Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia would be in the neighborhood of \$60 billion to \$125 billion over a 15-year period ending in 2010. The United States' portion of this tab was expected to run between \$5 billion and \$19 billion. A study conducted concurrently by the RAND Corporation found that the total cost of this expansion could be in a similar range, up to \$110 billion.

These estimates, I fear, are misleading because they assume that both new member states and other NATO members will be willing and able to pay for their costs of expansion. I think at a time when we are facing severe economic crisis at home, it is highly improbable that they are going to assume their share of the burden, and we are going to have to make some very real trade-offs in terms of our domestic economy and other higher priorities that we have in this war against terrorism.

Finally, I think we need to be asking ourselves whether the continued expansion of NATO is the most effective way to encourage the development of free markets and democracy in Eastern Europe. It is a military alliance that was critical for its time, it still plays an important role; but I am wondering if it needs to be supplemented.

I strongly urge that this body deal with some of the questions that my colleague from California, the ranking member of the committee, dealt with, and that we not continue with more legislation dealing with the expansion of NATO until we come back and deal with the hard realities of the role of Russia and the costs that are associated to it. I think the American public deserves that.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, who followed European and NATO issues long before he became chairman.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, this bill calls upon the NATO alliance to agree to a robust second round of enlargement at its summit meeting in Prague late next year. The bill does not call for the admission of any specific country to NATO, but is broadly supportive

of all seven leading contenders for admission in the next round: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania.

I will not dwell on the qualifications of the individual countries, other than to say each has made great progress in the difficult transition from the prison house of communism to the promise of democracy in the free market. Forcibly separated from the West for decades, each is now reclaiming its rightful place in the Western community of nations. It would be shameful, as well as stupid, for us to ignore their pleas to become members of the Atlantic alliance.

For over half a century, NATO has been the foundation upon which the security of the West has rested. NATO's continuing importance to the United States was most recently demonstrated in this unified response to the terrorist attacks of September 11 when article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which states that an attack on one member of NATO shall be considered an attack upon them all, was invoked for the first time in the alliance's history.

It is my hope that this next phase of NATO's enlargement will see an end to Russia's opposition to NATO, an opposition needlessly inherited from the Soviet Union and inconsistent with Russia's own desire to become a part of the West. For this reason, I commend President Putin for his recent remarks indicating his government will not object to further enlargement of NATO.

A robust second round of NATO enlargement will not end our task. Many vocal aspirants will still remain outside of the alliance's pacifying embrace. And in a speech earlier this year in Warsaw, President Bush spoke of a future in which all of the states between the Baltic and Black Seas would be welcomed into the Western community of nations. I certainly share that vision.

Thus, even as we admit additional countries to NATO, we must remember this is but the latest step toward our goal of creating a Europe whole and free, and of bringing lasting peace to that ancient and long-suffering continent.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), in the spirit of collegiality and bipartisanship, knowing full well he will be taking the side which is opposed to my position.

□ 1215

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am shortly going to display a couple of visuals here. The first will be in Russian, and I wanted to present it in Russian because I did not want Members to think that I was telling the Russians something they did not know about our vulnerability.

The first of these will show a page from a Russian journal which shows an

EMP attack on our country. What Members will see is Russian language, and they will see something which looks like the sun with some rays coming from it, and then Members will see what it does.

What it does is disrupt our communication system and disrupt our power system. See the one on the right is in Russian. What it does is melt all of our microelectronics, including our computers. If we think about our power grid and communications grid, if we melt down the computers, we do not have a power and communications grid. This is our translation of it here.

All that needs to be done is to detonate a nuclear weapon high above the atmosphere, and what is produced is something equivalent to a simultaneous lightning strike everywhere in the country, or enormous static electricity. We see a miniature of this every time there is a solar storm. This is many, many times as powerful as the pulses we get from that solar storm.

If the chart would be put out that shows Yamantau Mountain, and these two are connected, Members will see these are two closed cities of 60,000 people. What is a closed city? A closed city is so remote it does not have tourists. Nobody visits. They have a single mission; 60,000 people live there and they have a single mission, and that mission is working on Yamantau Mountain.

If the Russians are going to do an EMP attack on us, they had better have Yamantau Mountain because we are going to respond.

I showed this in Russia. I am not giving them any ideas. They knew this before we did. We knew it from the Starfish explosion in 1962. The Russians had done more testing and explosions, and they knew it before we did. They know more about it than we know about it.

If they are anticipating an EMP attack on us, and it would be almost certainly the first way they would use a weapon because there is no way they could do as much harm to our economy and infrastructure with ground level explosions as they could do with an explosion above the atmosphere, producing electromagnetic pulse.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it makes sense to feed Russia's paranoia. I have been told that the reason they spent \$6 billion on Yamantau Mountain is because they are paranoid, because they do not think that we are their friends, when we are enlarging NATO right up to their border. And they do not think NATO is friendly because for years it was the counter of the Warsaw Pact, and they cannot get it out of their head that this is their enemy.

I have no idea why we think it is productive in terms of our national security to enlarge NATO right up to their borders. I am all for a European friendship society. I just do not want one that slaps Russia in the face.

We are making great strides. Putin was the first foreign leader to call our President after the terrorist attacks on

September 11. Why would we want to do this to the Russian people? For the first time in many years, and I went to Russia recently and I saw the mountains of flowers at our embassy, it was a very moving experience, here are people moving in our direction. Why would we want to move them in the other direction?

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to enlarge NATO, let us have Russia as a member. If we do not have Russia as a member, let us not enlarge it. It is threatening to our national security and it is not in our long-term national security interest.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), a member of the Committee on Armed Services and the vice chairman of the Defense Security Committee of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services and as vice chairman of the Defense and Security Committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Assembly, I stand in strong support of this Gerald Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001.

I think it is appropriate that we would name this after Jerry Solomon. It has been said before, and I will not belabor it, but Jerry believed so strongly that when democratic free societies worked together in a security alliance, the world is a safer place to be. He promoted this idea. Not that he wanted to enlarge NATO just to be enlarging NATO, just to have more numbers, but that every NATO member must bring something to the table, something not only for their own security, but for the security of the NATO alliance.

It is difficult to depart from the memories of September 11. Almost everything we do in this Chamber now is viewed through the scope of terrorism. Just like the threat of communism, the catalyst for NATO, current threat reaffirmed the need of a strong transatlantic alliance for the protection of free societies all around the world. By endorsing expansion, we are sending a message to those who decry democracy and freedom.

As the response to September 11 has shown, an attack on one is an attack on all. It is very relevant in our redefined geopolitical world. We could easily conclude in this body that NATO has more of a purpose against terrorism than it did against communism. With a time-tested formula and victories under our belt, we would be foolish to turn our backs on those who aspire to join the greatest alliance history has ever known.

A little more than a month ago in Ottawa, Canada, I had the privilege of speaking to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly's Defense Committee, and in my remarks I spoke about how we, being NATO, must look forward and come together as a family of nations.

The worst of times, as we have seen, separate the civilized world from the uncivilized. As nations that respect and honor freedom, democracy and decency, we must join together and form an unbreakable bond against terrorism.

Terrorism has been a plague on our world for far too long. Every nation in the alliance has been on the receiving end of terrorist attacks, ranging from the brutal to the barbaric. We have watched airplane hijackers negotiate with guns, we have seen truck bombs explode on embassy grounds, we have seen extremists raid an Olympic village, plane wreckage in Lockerbie, Scotland, car bombs on the streets of London and Belfast, and a gaping hole in the hull of an American warship.

When I finished my speech, there was overwhelming support from not only the NATO nations represented there but from the observers as well; from the French who oftentimes do not agree with us on things, and the second one to speak after I had spoken was a Russian observer who pledged strong support to this effort.

We need NATO now maybe more than ever. I think we need to support the further enlargement of the NATO Alliance. I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), who in this last year has joined the delegation to the Parliamentary Assembly, and has done an outstanding job and has had a personal outreach program to Lithuania and to the Baltic states for some period of time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3167, the Gerald Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001. I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation which memorializes congressional support for further NATO expansion that is set to take place at the 2002 Prague Summit.

This is in line with the President's intent stated on his trip to Warsaw, Poland, and I quote, "I believe in NATO membership for all of Europe's democracies that seek it and are ready to share the responsibility that NATO brings. As we plan the next NATO Summit in 2002, we should not calculate how little we can get away with, but how much we can do to advance the cause of freedom."

He also stated that he envisioned a NATO that extends from the Baltic to the Black Sea, a NATO whole, free and secure.

As chairman of the Baltic Caucus and a member of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I am a strong supporter of the NATO enlargement, especially for the Baltic states. In the wake of September 11, I believe that enlisting the talents of the Baltics and others who are eager to make contributions to NATO will be instrumental to defeating terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, let me share a few photos. This is a photo of the border when I served in West Germany, the border between West Germany and

Czechoslovakia. This is the old world. As many of my colleagues have said, in the spring of this year, we attended the NATO Parliamentary Assembly in Lithuania. This is a new vision of Europe, and these are photos of citizens with signs saying NATO, Lithuania, okay, good; The victims of the gulags are calling for justice; The pact of Molotov-Ribentrop is our past. NATO is our future. And the youth were present in these signs of public display in support of NATO.

Another thing that we learned on our trips is that the countries who are recently now members, countries like Poland, have a better relationship with Russia now since they are under the NATO Alliance. And they have better relations and better trade, and it has helped the stability of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), and the Committee on International Relations for their leadership on this issue. I would also like to commend the committee for naming this act after our recently passed colleague, Jerry Solomon. This is fitting since Congressman Solomon was one of the first in Congress to recognize that NATO membership for former Warsaw Pact countries was essential for maintaining stability in Eastern Europe.

On our Statue of Liberty it says, "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free." With NATO expansion, the countries that are yearning to breathe free can do this under the NATO Alliance. I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 3167.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), who has been very much interested in NATO membership for a number of countries of Eastern and Central Europe, and has played a special role in outreach to Slovakia.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3167. I am especially pleased that this legislation includes a provision to recommend Slovakia for full NATO membership.

As the grandson of Slovak-American immigrants, I have carefully followed the Slovak Republic's difficult transition from the former Soviet bloc to a free and independent nation. The dramatic changes from a socialistic government and a managed economy to an open democracy and free market enterprise system have been a challenge for this new nation.

Since January of 1993, the Slovaks have made great progress in joining the European and Western family of nations. Slovakia has been recognized for its economic and political progress by admission last September to the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development.

The Slovak Republic is also a leading contender today for future membership in the European Union. While international economic integration is vital to Slovakia's future, it is critical that

this strategically located Central European nation be a part of NATO.

While in the past I have urged leaders of the new Slovak Republic to primarily focus on issues and admissions to organizations related to international economic cooperation, I did so coming from a nation and background that always felt secure from the standpoint of national security. At times in the past I could not understand the preoccupation with membership in NATO by Slovak leaders.

As I learned more over the years of the history of the Slovak people and their domination and suppression, I realized why they were so concerned and so dedicated to a security relationship with NATO.

□ 1230

Slovakia had lost its freedom and independence and security in the past. They did not want to risk that possibility in the future. The events of September 11 made me recognize why Slovakia and its people were so right. Nothing is more vital than national security. The other countries under this bill also, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Slovenia, Romania and Bulgaria, also seek entry into NATO for exactly the same reason. In the interest of our United States national security, in the interest of those who have lost and regained their independence and also regained their national identity, and in the interest of world security, I urge the passage of this legislation.

I again commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), and also honor the memory of our departed colleague, Jerry Solomon.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding time. I, unfortunately, am going to say some words about this legislation that are not quite consistent with the views that have been heard on the floor.

I am in opposition to this bill. I certainly want to honor the memory of our departed colleague, Congressman Solomon; but I am opposed to the expansion of NATO. I was opposed under President Clinton, and I continue to oppose expansion under President Bush. The countries named in this bill for NATO candidacy have made incredible progress since the fall of the Soviet Union toward Western ideals and economics, but it should not make them automatically superior candidates for NATO.

First of all, NATO is founded on the premise of collective defense. These countries are still undergoing major political and economic changes, and I do not think we should be promising to go to war on behalf of countries when we do not know what kind of conflicts we may be drawn into.

Second, NATO was created to defend against the Soviet Union, a threat that

obviously no longer exists. If at this critical time the U.S. is seeking cooperation from Russia, it is counterproductive in my opinion to take actions that Russia would perceive to be aggressive. In this legislation that is before us today, we are talking about admitting into NATO countries that would bring NATO right next to the border with Russia.

Thirdly, the expansion would put the strategic advantage of the alliance at risk. NATO was created for rapid Allied response to a threat. Its tactical strength will be compromised when the inclusion countries with inexperienced militaries make it more difficult to mobilize. The high cost of NATO expansion would also divert U.S. defense investment to militaries of foreign countries at a time when we should be focusing on our own. And there are other institutions that are more valuable to the Eastern European countries than NATO, the European Union, the World Trade Organization, and other international institutions that will help promote their economic and democratic development. NATO expansion will drain their treasuries toward massive military expenditures to come up to NATO's standards.

The bottom line is that NATO expansion is more of a liability than an opportunity for the United States and for the countries this bill seeks to add to the alliance. For that reason, I will oppose the legislation.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely appreciate the fact that I have brought together bipartisanship here and got time from both sides. I deeply appreciate that, especially since I am taking the opposition to this bill. I do rise in opposition to expanding NATO. I do not think it is in the best interests of the United States. The one thing that I would concede, though, is that everyone in this Chamber, I believe, every Member agrees that our country should be strong; that we should have a strong national defense; and that we should do everything conceivable to make our country safe and secure. I certainly endorse those views. It just happens that I believe that membership in organizations like NATO tends to do the opposite, tends to weaken us and also makes us more vulnerable. But that is a matter of opinion, and we have to debate the merits of the issue and find out what is best for our country.

I think the bill is motivated for two reasons. One is to increase the sphere of influence into Eastern Europe, who will be the greatest influence on the

commercial aspects of Eastern Europe, and so there is a commercial interest there, as well as in this bill there is \$55 million of foreign aid which I think a lot of Americans would challenge under these circumstances whether or not we should be sending another \$55 million overseas.

We have this debate now mainly because we have had the demise of the Soviet system, and there is a question on what the role of NATO should be and what the role of NATO really is. It seems that NATO is out in search of a dragon to slay. It appeared that way during the Kosovo and Serbian crisis, where it was decided that NATO would go in and start the bombing in order to help the Kosovars and to undermine the Government of Serbia. But our own rules under NATO say that we should never attack a country that has not attacked a member nation. So this was sort of stretching it by a long shot in order to get us involved. I think that does have unintended consequences, because it turns out that we supported Muslims, the KLA, in Kosovo who were actually allies of Osama bin Laden. These things in some ways come back to haunt us, and I see this as an unintended consequence that we should be very much aware of.

But overall I oppose this because I support a position of a foreign policy of noninterventionism, foreign noninterventionism out of interest of the United States. I know the other side of the argument, that United States interests are best protected by foreign intervention and many, many entangling alliances. I disagree with that because I think what eventually happens is that a country like ours gets spread too thin and finally we get too poor. I think we are starting to see signs of this. We have 250,000 troops around the world in 241 different countries. When the crisis hit with the New York disaster, it turned out that our planes were so spread out around the world that it was necessary for our allies to come in and help us. This is used by those who disagree with me as a positive, to say, "See, it works. NATO is wonderful. They'll even come and help us out." I see it as sad and tragic that we spent last year, I think it was over \$325 billion for national defense, and we did not even have an AWACS plane to protect us.

During that time when we had our tragedy in New York, we probably had cities that we paid to protect better than our own cities. If planes went awry or astray in Korea or Haiti or wherever, I think that they probably would have been shot down. I see this as a tragedy.

I hope we will all give some consideration for noninterventionism.

Mr. Speaker, more than a decade ago one of history's great ideological and military conflicts abruptly ended. To the great surprise of many, including more than a few in own government, the communist world and its chief military arm, the Warsaw Pact, imploded. The Cold War, which claimed thousands of lives

and uncountable treasure, was over and the Western Alliance had prevailed.

With this victory, however, NATO's *raison d'être* was destroyed. The alliance was created to defend against a Soviet system that as of 1991 had entirely ceased to exist. Rather than disbanding, though, NATO bureaucrats and the governments behind them reinvented the alliance and protected its existence by creating new dragons to slay. No longer was NATO to be an entirely defensive alliance. Rather, this "new" NATO began to occupy itself with a myriad of non-defense related issues like economic development and human rights. This was all codified at the Washington Summit of 1999, where the organization declared that it would concern itself with "economic, social and political difficulties . . . ethnic and religious rivalries, territorial disputes, inadequate or failed efforts at reform, the abuse of human rights, and the dissolution of states." The new name of the NATO game was "interventionism"; defense was now *passé*.

Nowhere was this "new NATO" more starkly in evidence than in Yugoslavia. There, in 1999, NATO became an aggressive military force, acting explicitly in violation of its own charter. By bombing Yugoslavia, a country that neither attacked nor threatened a NATO member state, NATO both turned its back on its stated purpose and relinquished the moral high ground it had for so long enjoyed. NATO intervention in the Balkan civil wars has not even produced the promised result: UN troops will be forced to remain in the Balkans indefinitely in an ultimately futile attempt to build nations against the will of those who will live in them.

Mr. Speaker, we are now called on to endorse the further expansion of a purposeless alliance and to grant \$55.5 million dollars to former Soviet Bloc countries that have expressed an interest in joining it. While expanding NATO membership may be profitable for those companies that will be charged with upgrading the militaries of prospective members, this taxpayer subsidy of foreign governments and big business is not in the interest of the American people. It is past time for the Europeans to take responsibility for their own affairs, including their military affairs.

According to the Department of Defense's latest available figures, there are more than 250,000 U.S. military personnel deployed overseas on six continents in 141 nations. It is little wonder, then, that when a crisis hit our own shores—the treacherous attacks of September 11—we were forced to call on foreign countries to defend American airspace! Our military is spread so thin meddling in every corner of the globe, that defense of our own homeland is being carried out by foreigners.

Rather than offer our blessings and open our pocketbooks for the further expansion of NATO, the United States should get out of this outdated and interventionist organization. American foreign policy has been most successful when it focuses on the simple principles of friendship and trade with all countries and entangling alliances with none.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to take this opportunity to express a couple of concerns that I have

about this measure that is before us this afternoon. It has been said a number of times on the floor here today that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been the most successful military alliance in history. I think that that is indisputable. It was created in the aftermath of the Second World War to deal with a set of geopolitical circumstances that presented themselves to the world at that time. Over the course of the succeeding 55 years, NATO has served Europe, the United States, Canada and indeed the world very, very well. It prevented a third world war. And ultimately it was NATO and other factors that resulted in a very definitive change within the Soviet Union.

But now we are faced with a different set of circumstances. The geopolitical world in which we live today is in no way similar to that which confronted the West and other nations at the close of the Second World War. We ought not to be thinking about expanding an entity that was created for a different need and a different purpose at a different time. We ought to be thinking more about the circumstances in which we find ourselves today. And while one might argue that expanding NATO in the way that we have done recently and may do again in the context of this suggestion here, this proposal, might not do any harm, the fact of the matter is that at the very least it diminishes our likelihood to think of the world in different ways, and that is really what we ought to do.

NATO served us. We ought to now begin to put it behind us and begin to think about the world we live in in ways in which are necessary to confront the circumstances that we have to deal with today. We ought not to be doing things, for example, that are insulting or might be taken as an insult by Russia, because they are now in a different relationship with the United States.

So I am concerned about this for those reasons, but primarily because it will prevent us from thinking about the world in ways in which we ought to be thinking of it in order to address the different circumstances that confront us at this moment.

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

This debate is really why we need NATO. The reason for creating NATO is to preserve free and open societies. The reason to have NATO is so that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and others who spoke against NATO expansion should have the opportunity to speak freely and openly, not just in the United States but throughout Europe, throughout an expanding and open and democratic Europe. We are creating NATO so people in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Slovakia and elsewhere should have the same opportunities we have here. There has never been more need for a military alliance dedicated to preserving and ex-

panding democratic free and open societies which was more palpable than today.

We have heard a great deal about building a coalition against international terrorism. The majority of those so-called coalition members are police states and dictatorships. They will not fight for free and open and democratic societies. They may oppose Osama bin Laden, they may oppose specific terrorist acts; but they are not in favor of what we are in favor of, a free and open and democratic society. And the top guarantee of that is the expansion of NATO.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman on his comments in closing debate on his side of the aisle today. I would say that the gentleman from Texas who made remarks in the well certainly makes his comments from a very principled point of view. His philosophy is exemplified entirely by his comments here. I respect his point of view on this issue although I disagree with it. To the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the concerns he raises I think are legitimate concerns, but I would say in response to them, as the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and this gentleman have both said in the past, the criteria for NATO membership, set out by the 19 existing members, are very tough. They insist on economic progress, on substantial movements towards democracy, on transparency in defense budgets, on civilian control of the military, and on interoperability.

Some of these countries, even some of the seven listed for authorization for assistance, are, frankly, some distance away, undoubtedly, from meeting all of the initial criteria. But the prospect for membership in the EU, the prospect for membership in the NATO alliance itself have been important incentives that are held out there for membership to bring about change in these societies.

□ 1245

I think the House should be proud of its leadership in suggesting expansion at the previous round of decisions on NATO expansion made in Madrid. The House of Representatives was really the first entity in the world to suggest it was appropriate to consider expansion of NATO. And as we looked at the Visegrad Four, we found and encouraged very specifically membership for the countries of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, that had made the necessary commitments and that met the criteria set forth. It was only a disappointment to both the other body and this House that Slovenia, a newly independent country, was not also included in the first round, because we felt that they as well had met the criteria for membership.

Mr. Speaker, I would think as we look for the next year to come before the summit in Prague, we may well consider giving our view as a Congress on which additional countries seem to have met most adequately the criteria for NATO expansion at that summit.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the legislation before us today makes a major contribution. Its authorization levels are consistent with those the administration has requested.

Finally I would just close my remarks by citing two quotations from President William Clinton and President George W. Bush that are actually cited in the legislation itself.

President Clinton said in a speech in Detroit in 1996, "NATO's doors will not close behind its first new members. NATO should remain open to all of Europe's emerging democracies who are ready to shoulder the responsibilities of membership. No Nation will be automatically excluded. No country outside NATO will have a veto. A gray zone of insecurity must not reemerge in Europe."

Then, in June of this year, President George W. Bush at Warsaw said, "All of Europe's new democracies, from the Baltic to the Black Sea and all that lie between, should have the same chance for security and freedom and the same chance to join the institutions of Europe as Europe's old democracies have. I believe in NATO membership for all of Europe's democracies that seek it and are ready to share the responsibilities that NATO brings. As we plan to enlarge NATO, no nation should be used as a pawn in the agenda of others. We will not trade away the fate of free European peoples. No more Munichs, no more Yaltas. As we plan the Prague Summit, we should not calculate how little we can get away with, but how much we can do to advance the cause of freedom."

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for not being down here during the entire debate. I am the Chair of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics of the Committee on Science. We have a big discussion on the Space Station, which is another international effort.

Let me say, I certainly support cooperative efforts like the International Space Station, and I supported NATO when it was necessary. NATO served its purpose. It protected us against the Soviet invasion of Western Europe. Now the Cold War is over. The best thing we can do now is to try to promote democracy in Russia, and expanding NATO goes in exactly the opposite direction. It slaps the Russians in the face.

I believe the Europeans can now defend themselves. We no longer should be subsidizing their defense. Expanding NATO just puts us more into the position of subsidizing people's defense far

away who can manage their own defense. It also takes away from our ability to cope with the real challenge to world freedom and peace today, which we will find in Asia in the form of an expansionary and belligerent Communist China.

Lastly, let us note that we are engaged in a war right now, a war against terrorism and a war in Central Asia. Being part of NATO has not really helped us. In fact, the billions of dollars we spend in NATO can be used by our own troops in that battle, and only a limited amount of support has come from our NATO allies, the British and Italians, who would be giving it to us anyway. They would be with us anyway, without us having to spend tens of billions of dollars a year on NATO.

While I respect my colleagues, especially Jerry Solomon and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), I would suggest that expanding NATO is not a good idea.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today we debated H.R. 3167 on the House floor, legislation to encourage further expansion of the Northern Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to include Eastern European countries such as Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria. I want to share with my colleagues an opinion piece that ran recently in the Washington Post which raises what I feel are some of the critical issues regarding continued expansion of the NATO alliance. Written by Jonathan Newhouse, a senior advisor at the Center for Defense Information, this article emphasizes that the key issue is not the future of NATO, but the importance of including Russia in future collective security arrangements in Europe. I found his thoughts helpful and I encourage my colleagues to review this.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 3, 2001]
A NEW ALLIANCE COULD NUDGE ASIDE THE
OLD

(By John Newhouse)

The terrorist threat laid bare on Sept. 11 is transforming global security arrangements. Already, it is pushing Washington and other major capitals toward a historic makeover of the security system the United States and its European allies have relied upon for half a century. And much of the energy for that push is coming from an improbable source: Russia—or, more precisely, its president, Vladimir Putin.

Putin's broad purpose—to link his ailing, self-absorbed country to the United States while moving it into the European mainstream—has been gathering force for some time. Even before Sept. 11, he was taking a more accommodating line on President Bush's foremost priorities—missile defense, modification of the ABM Treaty, and further enlargement of NATO, the Western security alliance. Since the attacks, the Russian's tone has become even more acquiescent, enough to raise concerns in Western capitals that he has maneuvered himself far in front of his national security apparatus and political base. When he meets with Bush in Washington and Crawford, Tex., later this month, the two men can be expected to start a process aimed at moving their countries into a shifting strategic environment. And that move could edge NATO, the centerpiece of America's security relationship with Europe, to the sidelines.

Well, before Sept. 11, NATO was the object of some tough questions: Did it still have a

purpose? Was there a role in it for Russia, and if so, how central a role? A few Western leaders, starting with Britain's Tony Blair, had in one degree or another concluded that Western and Russian strategic interests had converged, and that collective security arrangements that lacked Russian participation no longer made sense. But if anyone was shuffling the new deck after Sept. 11, it was Putin. He was the first to call Bush after the attacks. He agreed not to oppose the use of bases in Uzbekistan and elsewhere in Central Asia for strikes against the Taliban. He visited German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder and wowed the Bundestag with a speech delivered in fluent German, studded with quotations from Goethe and Schiller, that portrayed Russia as rooted in European values.

On Oct. 3 Putin had a long private meeting in Brussels with NATO Secretary General Lord George Robertson, with whom he enjoys discussing security issues. Soon thereafter, I was shown an official account of what the two men said. The conversation pointed up Putin's resolve to anchor Russia to the West, and the intensity of his hatred of the Taliban and radical Islam.

In the meeting, Putin cited nuclear proliferation as the main threat confronting the world. He said there was a plot afoot to kill Pakistan's president, Gen. Pervez Musharraf. If that happened, he wondered, who would control Pakistan's nuclear weapons? And he answered his own question in stark, if peculiar, terms: Osama bin Laden, he said, calling the terrorist leader "the defense minister." As for the Taliban, he said it would be a great mistake to remove the leaders but leave the Taliban in power. The Taliban is Afghanistan, he declared, and proposed a conference to bring together all the anti-Taliban forces in Afghanistan.

But Topic A was the Russian link to NATO. Neither man saw any reason Russia shouldn't be a member. Noting that Robertson was the first to understand that Russia poses no threat to the alliance, Putin said his country should be a primary NATO ally. But he said that Russia would have to be consulted on common security issues, or it would be isolated on the periphery of security, which would be in no one's interest. He wasn't asking for membership as such, but rather a central political involvement.

Putin declared that Russia would not stand in the queue to be admitted into the alliance, like countries on whose membership nothing depends. Robertson replied that he understood this, but he was no reason Moscow shouldn't apply. Both sides, he said, needed to stop the diplomatic sword dance over Russian membership. Putin restated his reluctance to wait in line, but said he did want a full-fledged, mature relationship with NATO. He wondered if Robertson and Russian experts could work jointly on the question.

The Russian president tried to highlight the opportunity he was offering the West by telling Robertson that he expected to be in office only four years at most. All his values, he said, were Western. But he warned that his successors may have a different view of European security—thereby underlining up the developing gap between him and other key players in Moscow.

Robertson noted that the two sides could focus on a few specific areas of cooperation—terrorism, air-sea rescue, Kosovo and Bosnia. He also raised the idea of a conference on military responses to terrorism jointly sponsored by NATO and Russia, an idea Putin liked. The conversation ended with Putin, perhaps revealingly, asking Robertson to pass on his regards to Bush, whose name had not arisen.

We should hear loud echoes of this meeting in Texas. There, Putin can safely agree to enlarging NATO yet again. Before Sept. 11, he deplored this idea, especially the prospect of admitting the Baltic nations, because he and his advisers saw it as bringing NATO into space that Russians are accustomed to influencing, if not controlling. But this concern becomes moot as he moves to acquire a serious role in revised Western security arrangements and to segue into Europe on his own.

Moreover, a bloated alliance operating by consensus will not be close to the center of political action. More and more, the center will lie wherever the key players, notably the United States and Russia, locate it. Today's security threats are not military, and NATO is not equipped to help much in the struggle against terrorism and weapons proliferation. Counterterrorism, for example, is much more of an intelligence and police function than a military one, and Washington will be increasingly reluctant to rely on NATO for other than peacekeeping tasks. NATO itself could become absorbed in solving problems between its members.

Although Putin won't be deflected, he will have to show critics at home some return on his bold move toward the West. Embedding Russia in the world economy is probably his first priority. But accomplishing this will require Russian membership in the World Trade Organization, even though well-positioned Russians see the organization as a conspiracy of multinational companies to exploit Russian assets. Putin also wants and probably needs a trade agreement with the European Union. Members are sympathetic, but unlikely to grant one unless and until Putin has maneuvered WTO membership. They need to see Russia establishing itself as a serious player and fully capable of living up to commitments.

The meeting with Bush could help anchor Russia to the West, politically and probably economically. Putin may expect Washington to advance his WTO prospects by asking EU governments to join in pushing to relax the standards for Russian membership.

Putin may not object—at least not strongly—to the Bush plan for a national missile defense if he convinces himself that the project may eventually fall of its own weight. Agreeing to kill the ABM Treaty, as distinct from amending it, would be very tough for him. While the treaty is about arms control, it is also seen in Moscow as an agreement between great powers and, as such, of great political value. If he and Bush were to produce a new and verifiable bilateral agreement dealing with steep reductions of strategic weapons, it would play very well in Moscow. Prospects for an agreement of that kind are good, although just how binding it might be is unclear, and the importance Russians attach to locking the United States into a formal agreement cannot be overstated.

The shell of the egg won't be filled overnight. Putin's romancing of major Western capitals will have to be accompanied by internal reforms, including democratic ones. And he will have to hold up the Russian end of any bargain, especially by helping to discourage the proliferation of truly frightful weapons and playing a full part in interconnected programs aimed at curbing organized crime, drug trafficking and money laundering, etc. Also, in most Western capitals, including London, there are senior bureaucrats who resist major change, especially change that benefits Russia and appears to weaken NATO. France, for one, may have mixed feelings about NATO, but it will see stronger Russian involvement as accelerating movement of the center of political gravity eastward, a shift that has been underway since German unification.

Change is nonetheless underway, as Secretary of State Colin Powell made clear in Shanghai last month, when he ventured the lapidary phrase: "Not only is the Cold War over, the post-Cold War period is also over." (John Newhouse is a senior fellow at the Center for Defense Information.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support today of the Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001, a bill appropriately named after my good friend Jerry Solomon, who passed away last month. Jerry was a fine man who truly cared about NATO and the leading contenders for NATO admission. I support this bill, because I support the further enlargement of NATO alliance, as well as the inclusion of those seven countries that are candidates for NATO admission. If these democracies are willing to meet their responsibility of membership, I see no reason why they should not be able to enter this defensive alliance, and join their fellow members in preserving peace, freedom and democracy. These seven worthy nations are our friends, and I look forward to the day we can welcome them as members. I would now like to introduce a speech I made in March to the Lithuanian Parliament, in which I made the case for Lithuania's inclusion into NATO.

SPEAKER J. DENNIS HASTERT ADDRESSES
LITHUANIAN PARLIAMENT, MARCH 2001

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Seimas, distinguished guests:

I am deeply honored to be here today.

Two years ago, just a few months after I became the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, you were kind enough to invite me to address this Parliament. The opportunity to speak to you was one of the first honors given to me by another government. What made it even more special was the fact that it was an invitation from you, the representatives of the People of Lithuania, a people, like my own countrymen, who love freedom and know its heavy price.

Last month I was traveling in the State of Virginia—a part of my country that was the home of some of America's most famous "Founding Fathers." One was a man named Patrick Henry. The school children in the United States are taught a famous line from one of Patrick Henry's fiery speeches which he gave during our War of Independence. In just six simple but passionate words he summed up the resolve of a people struggling to be free when he said: "Give me liberty, or give me death!" Patrick Henry's Comrades in Arms, went on to sign a Declaration of Independence where they pledged to each other, "our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor."

Most of us who serve in the Congress of the United States, and many of you who serve here, have never had to risk our lives to preserve our liberty. But many men and women, on whose shoulders we stand, have done so, on battlefields around the world and even in the streets of our own capitals.

Once again today, while entering this Parliament Building, I passed the spot where some of you literally manned the barricades and stood your ground to defend the right of the Lithuanian people to govern themselves.

As Speaker, I often ask my members to make difficult decisions and cast difficult votes. But I have never had to ask them to risk their very lives as some of you have done. To those of you were served in this body during those dark and difficult days, let me thank you on behalf of freedom loving men and women everywhere, for your courage and your example.

Some things have changed since I was last here. Your "new" President is now a success-

ful veteran and you have held Parliamentary elections. The political landscape in the United States, too, has changed. We now have a "new" President and a new Congress.

But one thing has not changed. The bond of friendship between the people of Lithuania and the people of the United States remains strong. Our admiration of Lithuania's struggle for freedom and democracy remains constant. You can count on America's lasting friendship.

As our new President develops his legislative agenda and as the new Congress works to implement it, there are significant differences between the political parties, differences we debate peacefully, but with great passion.

For example, my party, the Republicans, believe in a smaller federal government, leaving more power to the States and local Governments and most importantly to the people themselves. We support a tax policy that leaves more money in the pockets of the people who earned it so they can spend it as they see fit, rather than government collecting it and then spending it. Our worthy opponents, the Democratic Party, have a somewhat different view. We respect our differences because the struggle of ideas is the heart of a true democracy.

But one place where we do not disagree—where our Congress is united—is on the subject of NATO expansion. Democrats and Republicans alike believe in the "open door" policy of NATO enlargement and both strongly endorsed the process begun at the 50th NATO Summit held in Washington. Candidate Bush, now President Bush, supports the idea that another round of invitations for membership be issued at the Prague Summit in 2002. He made that clear in a letter to President Adamkus last May.

No democracy in Europe that is prepared to meet the responsibilities of membership should be denied full participation in NATO. And no nation should fear the expansion of a defensive alliance which has done so much to encourage freedom and democracy and preserve the peace on this continent.

That is why it is worth remembering that the Helsinki Act of 1975—a document heralded as a cornerstone for European security and cooperation—declares that "the participating states . . . have the right . . . to be or not to be a party to bilateral or multi-lateral treaties, including the right to be or not to be a party to treaties of alliance." Our friends in Russia, who are signatories to the Helsinki Act, should not fear Lithuania's membership in a defensive alliance like those sanctioned by the accord.

I pledge to you that if Lithuania invests the resources necessary to meet the requirements of NATO membership, I will do all in my power to bring Lithuania into the alliance in 2002.

I intend to work side-by-side with President Bush, Vice President Cheney, and Secretaries Powell and Rumsfeld to make this a reality.

Lithuania has further to go to achieve NATO membership, but we must not forget how far Lithuania has come in 10 short years. This nation has already taken essential steps on the road to full NATO participation. Lithuania continues to be a reliable member in the Partnership for Peace, an important testing ground for compatibility with NATO forces; Lithuania has employed the NATO Membership Action Plan to focus defense resources and establish military priorities; And Lithuania played a pivotal role in making the "Vilnius-9" process one of cooperation, rather than competition.

In addition, you are to be commended on your commitment to national defense spending. Your Prime Minister's reaffirmation of the government's plan to dedicate 2 percent

of Gross Domestic Product on defense by 2002 is a critical benchmark.

Now, the members of this body must make the difficult choices to ensure your national budget reflects this priority. And while budget choices are never easy, the longterm benefits of today's national security expenditures will certainly pay off for years to come.

On regional security questions, too, Lithuania has shown a high level of commitment.

Your efforts to seek common ground with Russia regarding Kaliningrad and your relationship with Belarus continues to be handled with great finesse. You and Poland have built a strong partnership. And Lithuania's continued good relations with Baltic and Nordic nations are vital.

Some are too quick to forget the tortured years Lithuania endured as a captive nation. For five decades, the shackles of totalitarianism bound Lithuania. But you never gave up.

And for those 50 years, America steadfastly refused to acknowledge this illegal and immoral Soviet action. It would be equally wrong now, for NATO to fail to embrace the wishes of freedom loving Lithuanians.

During my last visit to Lithuania, I had the opportunity to visit your KGB museum. I must tell you it was a very moving experience to see firsthand the brutal methods employed by the Soviet secret police and the sinister tactics designed to strip this nation of its unique identity and proud history.

We all pray that this terrible period in European history has been relegated to museums and history books along with the fall of Soviet communism.

But, sadly, as we witnessed in the Balkans, Europe was not rid entirely of the cancer of aggression. Today in the southern Balkans, as ethnic tensions simmer, Lithuanian troops stand shoulder-to-shoulder with US forces, keeping the peace. Clearly this is another example that Lithuania already is supporting the collective security of all Europe.

But the American-Lithuanian relationship is not—and should not be—based solely on the traditional definition of mutual security. Our growing economic bond is critical to our continued good relations.

And with Lithuania's economic reorientation toward the West—helping to slash inflation from 1,163 percent in 1992 to less than one percent in 1999—there is no doubt that more U.S. investment will follow. Lithuania rightly looks toward America and Europe, while not disregarding Russia, for its increased economic integration.

Further, Lithuania's entry in the World Trade Organization and progress toward European Union membership—which I support—are critical steps in your efforts to broaden trade relations. I read recently that the joint Wall Street Journal-Heritage Foundation Index for Economic Freedom called the Lithuanian economy "the most improved economy in the history of the index". With a record like that, I have no doubt that Lithuania can achieve every economic goal she sets for herself.

The people of Lithuania and the people of the United States are bound by a love of freedom, by a desire to defend democracy, and by a faith in the free-market system.

We are also bound together by the one million Lithuanians who now call America home. Many of the Lithuanian-Americans live in my home state of Illinois, in the great city of Chicago. In fact, it was in Chicago where I first met many of your political leaders, including your President, Val Adamkus.

Earlier today, I was honored by President Adamkus as he awarded me the Order of the Grand Duke Gediminas (pronounced GET-A-ME-NAS).

Later today, I will be presented the title of Honorary Citizen of Vilnius. One of America's most beloved Presidents, Ronald

Reagan, a fellow native of Illinois, was the first recipient of this title. In 1984 President Reagan said, and it is still true today, "We live in a time of challenges to peace, but also of opportunities to peace. Through times of difficulty and frustration, America's highest aspiration has never wavered. We have and we will continue to struggle for a lasting peace that enhances dignity for men and women everywhere."

Both of these honors I accept on behalf of the many Lithuanian-Americans who have contributed so much to my country, and who keep the great nation of Lithuania in their hearts and in their prayers.

Our sixth American President, John Adams said: "whenever the standard of freedom and independence has been unfurled, there will be America's heart, her benedictions and her prayers." Lithuania has unfurled the standard of freedom. May God bless you and all the people of Lithuania as He has blessed the United States of America.

Thank you.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3167 and in strong support of the goal of NATO expansion.

I thank the Chairman of the International Relations Committee for expediting consideration of the bill and I would like to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I have served as an active Member of the U.S. House delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly—the legislative arm of this vital organization—for nearly a decade. Over those years, we have engaged in active discussions of matters relating to trade, financial services, labor policy and engaged our European partners in important discussions regarding the role of NATO in such regional conflicts as that in the Balkans.

These vigorous discussions, led for years by our late Colleague Jerry Solomon, and now by our distinguished colleague—the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. BEREUTER—have enhanced communication among our governments and thereby strengthened our national security. I must make specific and sincere recognition of Jerry Solomon. He was an international leader and it is most appropriate that he be identified in this legislation.

In the last dozen years, various administrations—Democrat and Republican alike—and Congresses—Democratic-controlled and Republican-controlled—have supported expanding the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to include newly democratic states in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

In the NATO Participation Act of 1994, Congress declared that full and active participants in the Partnership for Peace program (which provides U.S. military assistance to former Warsaw Pact nations) should be invited to become full NATO members.

In the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996, Congress called for the prompt admission of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovenia to NATO. It also declared that "in order to promote economic stability and security in Slovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Moldova, and Ukraine. And Congress signaled that we should not just be considering the emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe. But we also should consider the candidacies of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia.

These sentiments were reaffirmed by Congress in the European Security Act of 1998.

Late next year, NATO will hold a summit in Prague, at which it will decide which additional

emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe it will invite to join during the next round of NATO enlargement.

A few weeks ago, Russian President Putin declared that Moscow is prepared to reconsider its opposition to NATO expansion into states of the former Soviet Union as part of its changing security relationship with the West since the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11.

Mr. Speaker, a word about our current NATO allies is in order today as we approach the two-month anniversary of the murderous attacks on America on September 11.

Americans were enormously grateful and reassured by the decision of our NATO allies, in unprecedented action, to invoke Article 5 of the NATO Charter. At the time, this was a most important signal that the international community will stand beside the United States in our fight against terrorism.

Today, NATO nations are cooperating with our war against terrorism on many different levels and through many different activities. This should go a long way toward silencing the critics who claim that the U.S.—NATO relationship is a one-way street. Here is a concrete example of NATO providing important support to America in America's time of need.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for H.R. 3167.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 277, the previous question is ordered.

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this vote will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to House Resolution 262 and on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 372, nays 46, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

YEAS—372

Abercrombie	Biggart	Camp	Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Pomeroy
Ackerman	Bilirakis	Cantor	Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Portman
Aderholt	Bishop	Capito	Cunningham	Kanjorski	Price (NC)
Allen	Blagojevich	Capps	Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Pryce (OH)
Andrews	Blunt	Capuano	Davis (FL)	Keller	Putnam
Armey	Boehler	Cardin	Davis (IL)	Kelly	Quinn
Baca	Boehner	Carson (IN)	Davis, Tom	Kennedy (MN)	Radanovich
Bachus	Bonilla	Castle	DeGette	Kennedy (RI)	Rahall
Baird	Bonior	Chabot	DeLauro	Kildee	Ramstad
Baker	Bono	Chambliss	DeMint	Kind (WI)	Rangel
Baldacci	Borski	Clay	Deutsch	King (NY)	Regula
Baldwin	Boswell	Clayton	Diaz-Balart	Kingston	Rehberg
Ballenger	Boucher	Clement	Dicks	Kirk	Reyes
Barcia	Boyd	Clyburn	Dingell	Kleczka	Reynolds
Barrett	Brady (PA)	Combest	Dooley	Knollenberg	Riley
Barton	Brady (TX)	Cooksey	Doolittle	Kolbe	Rivers
Bass	Brown (FL)	Costello	Doyle	Kucinich	Rodriguez
Becerra	Brown (OH)	Cox	Dreier	LaFalce	Roemer
Bentsen	Brown (SC)	Coyne	Dunn	LaHood	Rogers (KY)
Bereuter	Bryant	Cramer	Edwards	Lampson	Rogers (MI)
Berkley	Burr	Crane	Ehlers	Langevin	Ros-Lehtinen
Berman	Callahan	Crenshaw	Ehrlich	Lantos	Ross
Berry	Calvert	Crowley	Emerson	Largent	Rothman
			Engel	Larsen (WA)	Roukema
			English	Latham	Roybal-Allard
			Eshoo	LaTourrette	Royce
			Etheridge	Leach	Rush
			Evans	Levin	Ryan (WI)
			Farr	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (KS)
			Fattah	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
			Ferguson	Lewis (KY)	Sanchez
			Filner	Linder	Sandlin
			Fletcher	Lipinski	Sawyer
			Foley	LoBiondo	Saxton
			Forbes	Lowey	Schaffer
			Ford	Lucas (KY)	Schiff
			Fossella	Lucas (OK)	Schrock
			Frelinghuysen	Luther	Scott
			Frost	Lynch	Serrano
			Gallegly	Maloney (CT)	Sessions
			Gekas	Maloney (NY)	Shadegg
			Gephardt	Manzullo	Shaw
			Gibbons	Markey	Shays
			Gilchrest	Mascara	Sherwood
			Gillmor	Matheson	Shimkus
			Gilman	Matsui	Shows
			Gonzalez	McCarthy (MO)	Shuster
			Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Simmons
			Gordon	McCollum	Simpson
			Goss	McCrery	Skeen
			Graham	McDermott	Skelton
			Granger	McGovern	Smith (MI)
			Graves	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
			Green (TX)	McInnis	Smith (TX)
			Green (WI)	McIntyre	Smith (WA)
			Greenwood	McKeon	Solis
			Grucci	McNulty	Souder
			Gutierrez	Meehan	Spratt
			Gutknecht	Meek (FL)	Stenholm
			Hall (OH)	Menendez	Strickland
			Hall (TX)	Mica	Stupak
			Hansen	Millender	Sununu
			Hart	McDonald	Tanner
			Hastings (FL)	Miller, Dan	Tauscher
			Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary	Tauzin
			Hayes	Miller, Jeff	Taylor (MS)
			Hayworth	Mink	Taylor (NC)
			Hefley	Mollohan	Terry
			Heger	Moore	Thomas
			Hill	Moran (KS)	Thompson (CA)
			Hilleary	Moran (VA)	Thompson (MS)
			Hilliard	Morella	Thornberry
			Hinojosa	Murtha	Thune
			Hobson	Myrick	Thurman
			Hoeffel	Napolitano	Tiahrt
			Hoekstra	Neal	Tiberi
			Holden	Nethercutt	Toomey
			Honda	Ney	Towns
			Hooley	Northup	Trafficant
			Horn	Norwood	Turner
			Hostettler	Nussle	Udall (CO)
			Houghton	Oberstar	Udall (NM)
			Hoyer	Olver	Upton
			Hulshof	Ortiz	Velazquez
			Hunter	Osborne	Vislosky
			Hyde	Ose	Vitter
			Inslee	Owens	Walden
			Isakson	Oxley	Walsh
			Israel	Pallone	Wamp
			Issa	Pascrell	Waters
			Istook	Pastor	Watkins (OK)
			Jackson (IL)	Pelosi	Watson (CA)
			Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)	Watts (OK)
				Peterson (PA)	Weiner
					Weldon (FL)
					Weldon (PA)
					Weller
					Wexler
					Whitfield

Wicker Woolsey Young (AK)
Wilson Wu Young (FL)
Wolf Wynn

NAYS—46

Akin Frank Pence
Barr Goode Pombo
Bartlett Harman Rohrabacher
Blumenauer Hinchey Sanders
Cannon Holt Sensenbrenner
Carson (OK) Johnson, Sam Sherman
Coble Jones (NC) Slaughter
Collins Kerns Snyder
Condit Lee Stark
Davis, Jo Ann McKinney Stump
Deal Miller, George Tancredo
DeFazio Nadler Tierney
Doggett Obey Watt (NC)
Duncan Otter Waxman
Everett Paul
Flake Payne

NOT VOTING—14

Burton Ganske Meeks (NY)
Buyer Jones (OH) Schakowsky
Conyers Kilpatrick Stearns
Cubin Larson (CT) Sweeney
DeLay Lofgren

□ 1314

Messrs. STUMP, JONES of North Carolina, CARSON of Oklahoma, PENCE, KERNS, AKIN and OTTER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SESSIONS and Mrs. CLAYTON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 431, I was detained on legislative business. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 431, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

□ 1315

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING WTO ROUND OF NEGOTIATIONS IN DOHA, QATAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 262.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 262, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 4, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie Andrews Baker
Ackerman Army Baldacci
Aderholt Baca Baldwin
Akin Bachus Ballenger
Allen Baird Barcia

Barr Ferguson Leach
Barrett Filner Lee
Bartlett Fletcher Levin
Barton Poley Lewis (CA)
Bass Forbes Lewis (GA)
Becerra Ford Lewis (KY)
Bentsen Possella Linder
Bereuter Frank Lipinski
Berkley Frelinghuysen LoBiondo
Berman Lowey
Berry Gallegly Lucas (KY)
Biggert Gekas Lucas (OK)
Bilirakis Gephardt Luther
Bishop Gibbons Lynch
Blagojevich Gillmor Maloney (CT)
Blumenauer Gilman Maloney (NY)
Blunt Gonzalez Manzullo
Boehlert Goode Markey
Boehner Goodlatte Mascara
Bonilla Gordon Matheson
Bonior Goss Matsui
Bono Graham McCarthy (MO)
Borski Granger McCarthy (NY)
Boswell Graves McCollum
Boucher Green (TX) McCreery
Boyd Green (WI) McDermott
Brady (PA) Greenwood McGovern
Brady (TX) Grucci McHugh
Brown (FL) Gutierrez McInnis
Brown (OH) Gutknecht McIntyre
Brown (SC) Hall (OH) McKeon
Bryant Hall (TX) McKinney
Burr Hansen McNulty
Callahan Harman Meehan
Calvert Hart Meek (FL)
Camp Hastings (FL) Menendez
Cannon Hastings (WA) Mica
Cantor Hayes Millender-
Capito Hayworth McDonald
Capps Hefley Miller, Dan
Capuano Herger Miller, Gary
Cardin Hill Miller, George
Carson (IN) Hilleary Miller, Jeff
Carson (OK) Hilliard Mink
Castle Hinchey Mollohan
Chabot Hinojosa Moore
Chambliss Hobson Moran (KS)
Clay Hoeffel Moran (VA)
Clayton Hoekstra Morella
Clement Holden Murtha
Clyburn Holt Myrick
Coble Honda Nadler
Collins Hooley Napolitano
Combest Horn Neal
Condit Hostettler Nethercutt
Cooksey Houghton Ney
Costello Hoyer Northup
Cox Hulshof Norwood
Coyne Hyde Nussle
Cramer Inslee Oberstar
Crane Isakson Obey
Crenshaw Israel Olver
Crowley Issa Osborne
Culberson Istook Osbourne
Cummings Jackson (IL) Ose
Cunningham Jackson-Lee Otter
Davis (CA) (TX) Owens
Davis (FL) Jefferson Oxley
Davis (IL) Jenkins Pallone
Davis, Jo Ann John Pascrell
Davis, Tom Johnson (CT) Pastor
Deal Johnson (IL) Paul
DeFazio Johnson, E. B. Payne
DeGette Johnson, Sam Pelosi
Delahunt Jones (NC) Pence
DeLauro Kanjorski Peterson (PA)
DeMint Kaptur Petri
Deutsch Keller Phelps
Diaz-Balart Kelly Pickering
Dicks Kennedy (MN) Pitts
Dingell Kennedy (RI) Platts
Doggett Kerns Pombo
Dooley Kildee Pomeroy
Doolittle Kind (WI) Portman
Doyle King (NY) Price (NC)
Duncan Kingston Pryce (OH)
Dunn Kirk Putnam
Edwards Kleczka Radanovich
Ehlers Knollenberg Rahall
Ehrlich Kucinich Ramstad
Emerson LaHood Rangel
Engel Lampson Regula
English Langevin Rehberg
Eshoo Lantos Reyes
Etheridge Largent Reynolds
Evans Larsen (WA) Riley
Everett Larson (CT) Rivers
Farr Latham Rodriguez
Fattah LaTourette Roemer

Rogers (KY) Simpson Toomey
Rogers (MI) Skeen Towns
Rohrabacher Skelton Traficant
Ros-Lehtinen Slaughter Turner
Ross Smith (MI) Udall (CO)
Rothman Smith (NJ) Udall (NM)
Roukema Smith (TX) Upton
Roybal-Allard Smith (WA) Velazquez
Royce Snyder Vislosky
Rush Solis Vitter
Ryan (WI) Souder Walden
Ryun (KS) Spratt Walsh
Sabo Stark Wamp
Sanchez Stearns Watkins (OK)
Sanders Stenholm Watson (CA)
Sandlin Strickland Watt (NC)
Sawyer Stupak Watts (OK)
Saxton Sununu Waxman
Schaffer Tancredo Weiner
Schiff Tanner Weldon (FL)
Schrock Tauscher Weldon (PA)
Scott Tauzin Weller
Sensenbrenner Taylor (MS) Wexler
Serrano Taylor (NC) Whitfield
Sessions Terry Wicker
Shadegg Thomas Wilson
Shaw Thompson (CA) Wolf
Shays Thompson (MS) Woolsey
Sherman Thornberry Wu
Sherwood Thune Wynn
Shimkus Thurman Young (AK)
Shows Tiahrt Young (FL)
Shuster Tiberi
Simmons Tierney

NAYS—4

Dreier Kolbe
Flake Waters

NOT VOTING—18

Burton Gilchrest Meeks (NY)
Buyer Hunter Peterson (MN)
Conyers Jones (OH) Quinn
Cubin Kilpatrick Schakowsky
DeLay LaFalce Stump
Ganske Lofgren Sweeney

□ 1324

Mrs. BIGGERT changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal of the last day’s proceedings.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2149

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2149.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2180

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name from cosponsorship of H.R. 2180.

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