pay their fair share to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program [NSIP]. My legislation will reduce the amount the United States contributes to NSIP to $140 million in each of the next 3 fiscal years. This bill will save taxpayers $177 million

NSIP is a program designed to improve the transportation and infrastructure of NATO member nations. Under the fiscal year 1998 military construction appropriation bill signed by the President on September 30, 1997, the U.S. contributes $153 million to NSIP. This amount was appropriately reduced from the fiscal year 1996, $161 million and fiscal year 1997, $172 million contributions. The United States still pays a disproportionate amount into this account, however, while receiving minimal benefit to our own infrastructure.

The NSIP supports projects and activities listed by NATO as capability packages, standalone projects, urgent requirements, and minor works. The projects are then placed in the following categories: authorized works, intra-theater, and trans-Atlantic force mobility; surveillance, reconnaissance, and intelligence systems; logistics support and re-supply; lines of communications control, training support, and exercise facilities; nuclear capabilities; and political-military consultation. These programs are important and I strongly advocate a prepared military. But why do we continue to spend money to expand logistic support and re-supply in Europe when we continue to downsize military depots in this country? Depots are necessary to provide the logistic support and re-supply efforts essential to defend our Nation from a military attack.

Why do we continue to spend money on transportation infrastructure to enhance force mobility in Europe while we continue to cut funding to our own Nation's transportation infrastructure? The Interstate Highway System was conceived so the U.S. military would be able to move forces and equipment from coast to coast. Highway capital investment per 1,000 vehicle mile of travel in the United States decreased by 17 percent from 1985–95, while travel increased by 37 percent. The United States needs an additional $15 billion annually to maintain current conditions on our roads and bridges and another $33 billion annually to improve conditions and performance. We must find alternate sources of income to improve our roads in this country.

I am an advocate of a strong national defense and have fought to increase money in the Defense budget and to fund the weapons programs essential to our military readiness. However, at a time when we are closing military bases and putting American soldiers out of work, it is wrong for American taxpayers to continue paying billions of dollars annually to benefit wealthy nations such as England, Germany, and France while these same countries use their capital to compete with us in international markets. Our country has for too long assumed the lion's share of the cost of defending our allies. These countries do not have war-torn, war-tattered economies. These countries are tough, shrewd international competitors. They have strong economies that give them the capability to pay for their own defense.

I believe NATO is one of the organizations that precipitated our victory in the cold war. As we prepare to expand NATO to include the emerging democracies of Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary, we must realize that expanding NATO will not be easy and will in fact be a rather expensive operation. I advocate expanding NATO and do not believe we should make these countries, which are feeling the growing pains of the change from a Communist economic system to a capitalist system, pay any more than they can afford. However, we must ask our wealthy European allies to pay an appropriate portion of the cost of expanding the infrastructure that is needed to defend these nations.

When I first came to Congress, I pledged to work to enact legislation ensuring Texas receives an equitable share of transportation funds. This goal has yet to be achieved. However, while we continue to work toward that goal domestically, we can also work to see that U.S. taxpayers receive some benefit from every dollar they spend that is earmarked for infrastructure. This bill aims to do just that by decreasing the amount of money the United States contributes to the NSIP. For every dollar that Texas contributes to the national highway trust fund, it receives approximately $.77 cents in return. Massachusetts, on the other hand, receives $2.13 for each dollar it invests. Connecticut has a nearly 187 percent return on its dollar. Clearly, Texans already contribute transportation funds to other States. Why should we be asked to contribute transportation funds to other countries as well? My constituents do not receive adequate funds to repair our own roads, but they are asked to pay for the roads of people abroad.

America's infrastructure needs are great. With the heavy increase in the volume of traffic due to the implementation of NAFTA, we in Texas are more aware of that fact than most. The increase in the number of trucks on our highways has left many of our roads with potholes that have rendered them almost impassable. However, while the potholes remain along highways in east Texas, the taxpayers see their hard earned income going not to improve the Federal highways they use, but to build roads and highways in Germany, France, and England.

We have seen a tremendous amount of support for burden sharing in recent years. This support was evident when the House agreed to the conference report this year on H.R. 1119, the National Defense Authorization Act. That bill authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 1998 and 1999 military activities of the Department of Defense and prescribes military personnel strengths for those fiscal years. The bill contains important provisions on burden sharing. Section 1221 instructs the President to step up efforts to increase burden sharing from nations with whom we have military relations by having them take one or more of the following actions: increase their annual budgetary outlays for national defense as a percentage of its gross domestic product by 10 percent or at least to a level commensurate to that of the United States by September 30, 1998; increase the amount of military assets they contribute to multinational military activities; increase the amount of annual budgetary outlays of foreign assistance; and in nations with U.S. military bases, increase their financial contributions to the payment of the U.S. military non-personnel costs.

The Defense authorization bill also includes a sense-of-Congress resolution dealing with the costs of enlarging NATO. Section 1223 contains a section that states: ''It is the sense of Congress that the analysis of the North Atlantic Alliance of the military requirements relating to NATO enlargement and of the financial costs tothe Alliance of NATO enlargement will be one of the major factors in the consideration by the Senate of the ratification of instruments to approve the admission of new member nations to the Alliance and by Congress for the authorization and appropriation of the funding for the costs associated with such enlargement.''

The burdensharing proposals that have been passed in recent years have proved to be an effective way of encouraging wealthy foreign countries to begin paying their fair share for their own defense. Legislation in 1989 called upon Japan to increase its share of the cost of stationing United States troops there. This amendment has led to billions of dollars in savings for the U.S. taxpayer since then, including over $3.7 billion last year. Japan now contributes 78 percent of the non-personnel cost of stationing United States troops there.

It is essential that we continue to stress the importance of burdensharing principles. Annually, we spend about 4 percent of our gross national product on defense while France spends a mere 2.5 percent and Germany a paltry 1.5 percent. As we have seen with the Japanese, if we apply pressure to nations capable of sharing in the cost of their defense, we will save United States tax dollars without removing one United States troop from foreign soil. I believe this bill is an important first step in improving our Nation's infrastructure and making our wealthy allies share the burden of their defense.

VETERANS' DAY 1997

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 8, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 11th day of the 11th month of the year 1997 we take time to remember those men and women who risked and sacrificed their lives for our Nation. It is a day to remember not only those who have lost their lives in battle but, also those who served valiantly and survived. Our greatness as a Nation could not have been achieved without the strong will and sacrifice of our citizens.

Veterans Day has been an American tradition since 1919, when Woodrow Wilson proclaimed Armistice Day to commemorate the November 11, 1918, Armistice that ended the fighting between the Allies and the central powers. This was our first step onto the international scene. It was a day of observance and remembrance for the 58,000 Americans who had died in World War I.

When the name for the day of observance was changed from Armistice Day to Veterans Day in 1954, it was proclaimed a day for honoring the veterans from all of our wars. The day however, still remained the 11th day of the 11th month, a date which marked the end of bloodshed that left the hope of lasting peace. While that peace did not last there is still hope that one day the world will learn to live together in harmony.

Until then it is important to remember those men who fought for freedom and dreamed that their efforts would bring peace to the world.

Our service men and women have also been our models. They have set a standard for our Nation in the eyes of the world.

As Woodrow Wilson stated on September 4, 1917: ''Let it be your pride, therefore, to show all men everywhere not only what good soldiers you are, but also what good men you are, keeping ourselves fit and straight in everything, and pure and clean through and through. Let us set for ourselves a standard so high that it will be a glory to live up to it, and then let us live up to it and add a new laurel to the crown of America.''

If we do not remember, we might forget and then their efforts might have been in vain.

President Eisenhower once called for Americans everywhere to rededicate themselves to the cause of peace. It is not only the job of our soldiers but the responsibility of all of us as American citizens to do what we can.

Our Nation's veterans have secured our Nation not only from attack but have secured our principles of freedom, equality, and democracy. These are the principles by which we, as American citizens live by.

For these reasons, let us remember all that our veterans have done for our Nation and our people not only today, but every day.

SALUTE TO KAUFMAN COUNTY RED RIBBON CONTEST WINNERS

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 8, 1997

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of presenting awards on October 18 to the essay contest winners of the Kaufman County Red Ribbon Drug Abuse Awareness campaign. These students are Amber Whatley of Mabank High School, Krystal Nye of Terrell Intermediate School, and Kristin Hanie of Forney Middle School. All three wrote about the issue of teenage drinking, and they made some valid points.

Amber Whatley reflected on the death of Princess Diana of Wales and the reports that the driver of her car was intoxicated. She noted that every 27 minutes someone is killed in a drunk-driving related accident, a tragedy that leaves loved ones ''marred with grief and angered that society continues to produce propaganda promoting the appeal of alcohol.''

Krystal Nye discussed the adverse effects of alcohol and the pressures that sometime cause teenagers to begin drinking. She noted that parents should be role models for their children and that the media ''should not make drinking look like it is something that is healthy for you.''

Kristin Hanie also wrote about the effects of alcohol and some of the reasons why teens might be tempted to try it. She mentioned several programs that help teens with alcohol problems, such as Ala-Teen and Al-Anon, and concluded, ''I pray everyday that people will learn alcohol is not the solution, and that someday this problem will be stopped.''

I enjoyed visiting with these students at the awards ceremony, and I commend their efforts to enhance teenage awareness of alcohol abuse. This Red Ribbon Campaign is an annual effort sponsored by the Texas Agricultural Extension Service in cooperation with the Texas A&M University System. Red Ribbon Week is recognized by the National Red Ribbon Campaign, which was celebrated October 18–25. I am always honored when Rita Winton invites me to participate in this important occasion.

Mr. Speaker, as we adjourn today, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting these outstanding students of Kaufman County and all those young people throughout our Nation who recognize the dangers of teenage drinking and who are doing their best to help their fellow classmates and friends combat this problem. As Miss Whatley concluded, ''If action is taken by teenagers, America can look forward to society's success in developing alcohol-free individuals and a more productive future.''

SECTION 110 OF 1996 IMMIGRATION REFORM NEEDS THOUGHTFUL GO-SLOW APPROACH TO PREVENT CHAOS

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 8, 1997

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, 1997, I introduced legislation to amend section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 by exempting Canadian nationals who are not otherwise required by law to possess a visa, passport, or border-crossing identification card. This bill, H.R. 2481, now has 41 cosponsors who recognize the urgency of correcting the flaws in section 110.

Section 110 of the 1996 Reform Act mandates that an automated entry-exit system be established that would allow INS officers to match the entrance date with exit dates of legally admitted aliens. Congress included this section at the last minute during the House-Senate conference of the bill with the intent of solving the problem of overstaying visa holders—aliens who enter the United States legally but overstay their allotted time. Because the U.S. does not have a departure management system to track who leaves the United States, a new entry-exit system was thought to be the vehicle to solve the problem.

In the rush to complete the bill before the end of the fiscal year on September 30, conferees did not have time to give this provision the scrutiny it deserves. As a result, Congress missed the realities of our northern border with Canada. Historically, Canadian citizens have not been required to show documentation, other than proof of citizenship, when entering the United States. The same courtesy is granted to United States citizens entering Canada.

Any attempt to install a documentation system at the northern border will bring intolerable chaos and congestion to a system already strained. Last year, more than 116 million people entered the United States by land from Canada. Of these, more than 76 million were Canadian nationals or United States permanent residents. More than $1 billion in goods and services trade crossed our border daily adding to the enormous traffic flow. To implement section 110 as it now stands would not only impede the flow of people and goods, it would counter the purpose of the United States-Canada Accord on Our Shared Border to ease and facilitate the increased crossings of people and goods between the United States and Canada.

As I have said before, I have a particular interest in the problem of delays and congestion at our northern-border crossings. My district, which includes Buffalo and Niagara Falls, has more crossings than any other district along the border. In a relatively small area, we boast four highway bridges and two railroad bridges. I know from personal experience the problems that delays and congestion can cause at these crossings.

Moreover, it is important to recognize the sense of borderless community that those living on the United States and Canadian sides of the border experience on a daily basis. Friends, family, and business associates travel easily, indeed seamlessly, across the invisible border to shop, enjoy theater and restaurants, athletic events, and other recreational opportunities. Hampering this camaraderie of community because of the need to resolve border problems that are not an issue at the northern border would be folly.

When I introduced H.R. 2481, my intent was not only to correct a flaw, but to initiate debate on the issue, to get the ball rolling, if you will, toward resolving a critical problem. This objective has been achieved. The response and enthusiastic support for this effort tells me unmistakably that this is a serious problem that must be fixed.

Today, I am introducing a bill that addresses the issue more broadly. The Border Improvement and Immigration Act of 1977 not only seeks to correct the problem at the northern border created by section 110, but it also takes a comprehensive but go-slow approach to analyzing the problem and determining the best solutions.

First, the bill would allow an entry-exit system to be implemented only at airports. It specifically exempts from section 110: any alien entering at land borders; any alien lawfully admitted as a U.S. permanent resident, or greencard holder; any alien for whom documentation requirements have been waived under the Immigration and Nationality Act, primarily Canadians.

Second, the bill requires the Attorney General to submit a report to Congress in 2 years on the feasibility of developing and implementing an automated entry-exit control system as prescribed in section 110, including arrivals and departures at land borders. The study must assess the cost and feasibility of various means of operating such an entry-exit system, including various means for developing a system and the use of pilot projects if appropriate. The report also would include how departure data would be collected if the system were limited to airports and a person arriving at an airport departed via land border.

Of particular note is the inclusion of possible bilateral agreements with Canada and Mexico to share entry and exist systems as a means to achieve the objectives of section 110. The proposal, which I have raised with the Canadian Ambassador and the Commissioner of the INS, would allow the United States to use, for example, Canada's entry data as our exit data; while Canada would similarly use United States entry data as its exit data. I believe this is an important cooperative effort that could be studied and possibly pursued under the umbrella of the United States-Canada Shared Border Accord.

Third, the bill will increase the number of INS border inspectors in each of 3 fiscal