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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 213.

The question was taken.

Mr. PETRI. Madam 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 213.

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

There was no objection.

SENSE OF HOUSE THAT U.S. REMAINS COMMITTED TO NATO

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 59) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States remains committed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 59

Whereas for 50 years the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (hereafter in this preamble referred to as ''NATO'') has served as the preeminent organization to defend the territories of its member states against all external threats;

Whereas NATO, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law, has proved an indispensable instrument for forging a trans-Atlantic community of nations working together to safeguard the freedom and common heritage of its peoples, and promoting stability in the North Atlantic area;

Whereas NATO has acted to address new risks emerging from outside the treaty area in the interests of preserving peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic area, and maintains a unique collective capability to address these new challenges which may affect Allied interests and values;

Whereas such challenges to NATO Allied interests and values include the potential for the re-emergence of a hegemonic power confronting Europe; rogue states and non-state actors possessing nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons and their means of delivery; transnational terrorism and disruption of the flow of vital resources; and conflicts outside the treaty area stemming from unresolved historical disputes and the actions of undemocratic governments and sub-state actors who reject the peaceful settlement of disputes;

Whereas the security of NATO member states is inseparably linked to that of the whole of Europe, and the consolidation and strengthening of democratic and free societies on the entire continent, in accordance with the principles and commitments of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, is of direct and material concern to the NATO Alliance and its partners;

Whereas the 50th anniversary NATO summit meeting, held on April 24–25, 1999, in Washington, D.C., provided an historic opportunity to chart a course for NATO in the next millennium;

Whereas NATO enhances the security of the United States by providing an integrated military structure and a framework for consultations on political and security concerns of any member state;

Whereas NATO remains the embodiment of United States engagement in Europe and therefore membership in NATO remains a vital national security interest of the United States;

Whereas the European members of NATO are today developing within the Alliance a European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI) in order to enhance their role within the Alliance, while at the same time the European Union (EU) is seeking to forge among its members a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP);

Whereas the Berlin decisions of 1996 provided the framework for strengthening the European pillar in NATO;

Whereas NATO should remain the core security organization of the evolving Euro-Atlantic architecture in which all states enjoy the same freedom, cooperation, and security;

Whereas NATO has embarked upon an historic mission to share its benefits and patterns of consultation and cooperation with other nations in the Euro-Atlantic area through both enlargement and active partnership;

Whereas the membership of the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland has strengthened NATO's ability to perform the full range of NATO missions and bolstered its capability to integrate former communist adversary nations into a community of democracies;

Whereas the organization of NATO national parliamentarians, the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, serves as a unique transatlantic forum for generating and maintaining legislative and public support for the Alliance, and has played a key role in initiating constructive dialogue between NATO parliamentarians and parliamentarians in Central and Eastern Europe; and

Whereas NATO Parliamentary Assembly activities, such as the Rose-Roth program to engage and educate Central and Eastern European parliamentarians, have played a pioneering role in familiarizing the new democracies with democratic institutions and a civil society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (hereafter in this resolution referred to as ''NATO'') is to be commended for its pivotal role in preserving trans-Atlantic peace and stability;

(2) the new NATO strategic concept, adopted by the Allies at the summit meeting held in Washington, D.C. in April of 1999, articulates a concrete vision for the Alliance in the 21st century, clearly setting out the continued importance of NATO for the citizens of the Allied nations, and establishing that defense of shared interests and values is as important for peace and stability as maintaining a vigorous capability to carry out collective defense;

(3) the Alliance, while maintaining collective defense as its core function, should, as a fundamental Alliance task, identify crisis management operations outside the NATO treaty area, based on case-by-case consensual Alliance decisions;

(4) the Alliance must recognize and act upon the threat posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism by intensifying consultations among political and military leaders, and deploying comprehensive capabilities to counter these threats to the international community at the earliest possible date;

(5) the Alliance should make clear commitments to remedy shortfalls in areas such as logistics, command, control, communications, intelligence, ground surveillance, readiness, deployability, mobility, sustainability, survivability, armaments cooperation, and effective engagement, including early progress in the NATO force structure review;

(6) the Alliance must ensure equitable sharing of contributions to the NATO common budgets and overall defense expenditure and capability-building;

(7) the Alliance should welcome efforts by members of the European Union (EU) to strengthen their military capabilities and enhance their role within the Alliance through the European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI);

(8) the key to a vibrant and more influential ESDI is the improvement of European military capabilities that will strengthen the Alliance;

(9) in order to preserve the solidarity and effectiveness that has been achieved within the Alliance over the last 50 years, it is essential that security arrangements elaborated under the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) complement, rather than duplicate NATO efforts and institutions, and be linked to, rather than decoupled from NATO structures, and provide for full and active involvement of all European Allies rather than discriminating against European Allies that are not members of the EU;

(10) the Alliance should remain prepared to extend invitations for accession negotiations to any appropriate European democracy meeting the criteria for NATO membership as established in the Alliance's 1995 Study on NATO Enlargement and section 203(d)(3)(A) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 1928 note), on the same conditions as applied to the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland;

(11) while maintaining its unchallenged right to make its own decisions, NATO should seek to strengthen its relations with Russia and Ukraine as essential partners in building long-term peace in the Euro-Atlantic area; and

(12) the Alliance should fully support the NATO Parliamentary Assembly's activities in enhancing and stabilizing parliamentary democracy in the nations of Central and Eastern Europe, ensuring ratification of appropriate new NATO members, continuing to deepen cooperation within the Alliance, and forging democratic links with the new European democracies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution and claim control of the time for the opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) in favor of the motion?

Mr. CROWLEY. Yes, I am, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that basis, pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XV, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) will control the 20 minutes reserved for the opposition.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) be permitted to control 10 minutes of my time and that he be able to yield that time.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for his initiative in bringing this resolution forward. The gentleman from Nebraska serves as the chairman of our Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific and chairs the House delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. And I commend the original cosponsors the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for joining in this effort and for sharing with us their expertise in European security matters.

House Resolution 59 expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has for 50 years served as the preeminent organization to defend the territory of its member states against all external threats; welcomes the admission to NATO last March of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic; and reiterates that America's NATO membership remains a vital national security interest of our Nation.

These are sentiments to which we can all enthusiastically subscribe, and it is only fitting that we reaffirm them this year as we celebrate the 50th anniversary of NATO's founding.

I am particularly pleased that this resolution touches on two additional matters that are important to the future of NATO and that warrant the full attention of the House of Representatives.

The first of these matters is NATO enlargement. Beyond welcoming the recent addition of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to the Alliance, House Resolution 59 expresses Congress' unequivocal support for the so-called ''open door'' policy toward future NATO enlargement that was articulated at the NATO summit meeting in Madrid, Spain, in July of 1997. That open door policy is a powerful signal of hope that we offer to the emerging democracies of Central and Eastern Europe that have not yet been invited to join NATO. It further underscores that we are mindful of their security concerns, that we consider them future allies, and that we remain determined to facilitate their integration into the mainstream of Europe. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and I led the House delegation to the Madrid summit and we strongly supported their decisions at that time.

□ 1100

Congress expressed its support for the open door policy in the European Security Act which the House first passed in 1997 and which President Clinton signed into law last year. It is helpful for the Congress to reiterate its support for this open door policy, particularly inasmuch as NATO's Washington summit last April disappointed some of the aspiring NATO Members in Central and Eastern Europe of postponing for the time giving any serious consideration of their candidacies for full membership in NATO.

The second important matter addressed by House Resolution 59 is the ongoing effort to rethink their relationship with NATO. I am referring here to such an issue as the European Security and Defense Identity within NATO, the so-called ESDI, and the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy, or the CFSP.

To the degree that these initiatives are about European allies contributing more to our common defense within NATO, we applaud them. After all, most of us would have been delighted if our European allies had been able to handle the Bosnian crisis on their own or if they could have contributed more to the allied operations in Kosovo.

But many of us are troubled by indications that these initiatives may be the first step toward a divorce between the European and North American pillars of NATO. Some of our European allies seem to long for an independent military capability, one that is not just separable from NATO, but that is separate.

Last December in Saint-Malo, France, the United Kingdom and France issued a declaration calling for the establishment of a ''national or multinational European means outside the NATO framework.''

Subsequent to the Cologne Summit last June, the leaders of the European Union declared that the Union ''must have the capacity for autonomous action backed by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them and a readiness to do so without prejudice to actions by NATO.''

For those of us who have long supported the transatlantic security bond that is represented by NATO, these are troubling sentiments. If the European Union develops a security mechanism on the Continent that excludes not only our Nation but also all the other non-European Members of NATO, including such important allies as Norway, Poland, and Turkey, then very serious damage will have been done to the fabric of the transatlantic security bond, and the logic of the continued U.S. security commitments to Europe that may be called into question.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 59 addresses this concern by pointing out that the key to a vibrant and a more influential ESDI is not new institutions, but the improvement of European military capabilities. The resolution further causes our allies in the European Union to elaborate their CFSP in a manner that does not duplicate NATO efforts and institutions, is not decoupled from NATO, and does not discriminate against European allies like Norway, Poland, and Turkey that are members of the EU. These are important concerns that need to be discussed within the alliance.

Accordingly, Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I urge the House to agree to House Resolution 59.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, first of all let me say I have the utmost respect for the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), who has done a tremendous job in leading our Committee on International Relations. The gentleman has the respect of everyone who deals with him. He has been one of the most fair and thoughtful chairmen of the committee that we have had, and I respectfully disagree with him on this issue, as well as respectfully disagree with my good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), who we have a disagreement, but these type of fundamental disagreements is what democracy is all about.

Let me say that 20 years ago when we talked about NATO I was one of NATO's biggest boosters. As a speech writer for Ronald Reagan during the height of the Cold War, I worked to strengthen NATO and worked diligently to see that NATO would remain what it was supposed to be; and it was designed specifically to deter a land attack by the Soviet Union on Western Europe. NATO succeeded brilliantly. It helped stave off that attack until the Soviet Union collapsed in the weight of communism's vile contradictions as well as its own evil. But the Cold War is over. It is time for us to take a fundamental look at what our post-Cold War strategy will be and what is in the best interests of the United States now that the Cold War is over.

There are new threats now to world peace, especially in the Pacific, and we have got to re-analyze where our priorities will be. Continuing to spend our limited resources on NATO actually

undermines America's ability to deal with the number one threat to world peace, which, as I say, is on the other side of the planet from Europe. Specifically world peace is most greatly threatened now by the aggressiveness of Communist China. If we are to confront this threat to the world, we cannot just spend the money and resources that we have, the limited resources we have, protecting Western Europe against an invasion from the Soviet Union which no longer exists.

We are told we must continue this spending of our limited defense dollars on NATO because it provides stability in Europe. Well, let the Europeans provide their own stability.

I recently met, along with the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN), the head of the German Bundestag, and, as a matter of fact, he told me that Germany would be spending less, not more, on its defense for at least the next 5 years.

Well, why should the Europeans not think, Let the Americans do it? Because we are doing it for them. We are subsidizing the cost for the defense of people and nations who are much richer than we are.

Furthermore, our continued commitment to NATO is bound to get us mixed up in more conflicts like Bosnia and Kosovo. With the expansion of NATO, we will start hearing about conflicts like the one in Moldova. Now, we may sympathize with one faction or the other in Moldova, but do we really want to open up the possibility of sending our troops there as part of a NATO peacekeeping operation to ensure the stability of Europe? I do not think so.

America has a vital role to play in determining the future of this planet and preserving peace and freedom on this planet. Our task has been, since the Second World War, to take on the biggest threats to democracy and freedom, threats that, if it were not for us, would irreversibly alter the balance of power toward tyranny and militarism.

During the Second World War we saved the world from the Nazis and the Japanese militarists. We can be very proud of that. During the Cold War we stood firm against the Soviet Union and Communist expansion.

Using our limited resources now for the stability of Europe, or to bring about peace to every troubled spot, to right every wrong, is counterproductive idealism and will weaken our ability to confront the major challenges to peace and freedom on this planet.

NATO is the European way of playing we Americans as suckers once again. If we try to do everything for everybody, we will not be able to do anything for anybody. We will not be able to protect our own national security interests in the long run.

This is not isolationism. This is a sound policy of an engagement strategy of picking and choosing commitments of where to spend our limited dollars.

So, with that, I would ask people to consider seriously whether we should be supporting the expansion of NATO, or even America's current role in NATO.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 59, as amended. I would like to commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for introducing this resolution. Fifty years of membership in this extraordinary alliance has reaffirmed that NATO is at the heart of American national security.

The original resolution passed our committee unanimously back in March. Understandably, in the wake of the military conflict in Kosovo, the full House postponed consideration of this matter. I am glad today we can resume deliberation on this worthy resolution.

This resolution, as amended, makes technical changes to update the bill's chronology and to reflect the success of the Washington summit earlier this year. In addition, the resolution now expresses the sense of Congress about the building efforts among our European allies to create a stronger European Security and Defense Identity, ESDI, and a Common Foreign and Security Policy, CFSP.

I once again commend the majority for cooperating with the minority in crafting this language on this issue. I also want to thank the chairman for allowing us this 10 minutes of debate. Along with the administration, we in Congress support these efforts by our European allies to shoulder a greater burden of military activities within NATO.

In concert with the administration, we stress that these new efforts build on and compliment existing cooperation between the North American and European allies. Our partnership has provided security on the European continent for half a century. Today, in the aftermath of a Cold War, a strong NATO is as important as ever. If Bosnia and Kosovo have taught us anything, it is that security problems and the threats of war have not evaporated from the heart of Europe simply because the Soviet Union no longer exists.

As I have said many times, we should always keep a door open for future membership for nations that will strengthen NATO and the security outlook in Europe. At the same time, we must also look to continually strengthen our relations with Russia and our partnership with them in the Ukraine in building long-term peace in Europe.

Madam Speaker, I again commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for including this language in the resolution. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam Speaker, there are three problems with this resolution. The first is that the NATO treaty is defensive only, and by this resolution we expand NATO's purposes to permit actions outside of the defensive area of the NATO members.

Secondly, the mechanism for approval of such actions in this resolution is referred to as ''a case by case consensual alliance'' decision, which, to me, is incompatible with the constitutional requirement that the use of force, in a context that a normal understanding would call war, would have to be done by resolution of both Houses of Congress.

Third and last, because of the timing of this resolution, particularly that it was introduced on February 11 during the Kosovo war, I believe that it is open to the misinterpretation as a ratification, admittedly posthoc ratification, of the use of force under the NATO aegis in that context.

I draw specific attention now to the text of the resolution that supports each of these three points. On page 4, the resolved clause says that the new NATO strategic concept ''articulates a concrete vision'' establishing that ''defense of shared interests and values'' is ''as important for peace and stability as maintaining a vigorous capability to carry out collective defense.''

I pause in my quotation for a moment. So whereas the original NATO treaty deals with collective defense, this resolution says it is equally important that we prosecute shared interests and values. What are those shared interests and values?

The answer is found on Page 2 in the whereas clauses, we learn what some of those are. ''Whereas such challenges to NATO allied interests and values include . . .'' continuing quote, ''conflicts outside the treaty area stemming from unresolved historical disputes.'' An obvious reference, at least to me, given the date of this resolution in February of this year, to the Kosovo war, and an obvious example (I could not ask for a more clear one) of the use of force outside the treaty area, whereas the NATO treaty itself specifies that the NATO countries will treat an attack upon the sovereign integrity of anyone as an attack upon all. It was a defensive territorial-focused treaty.

Lastly, on page 5, in the third resolved clause, beginning on page 4, the resolution provides that the alliance should, again just picking out the words, now I quote, ''identify crisis management operations outside the NATO treaty area based on a case-by-case consensual alliance decision.''

In other words, the alliance will make its decisions on a consensual basis for when to go outside of area. That is what it says, outside of the NATO treaty area, outside of the authorized area for the use of force under the terms of the NATO treaty as it was ratified by the Senate.

□ 1115

And who will decide? It will be by consensual decisions of the Alliance, not by the Senate and House of the United States Congress, which is what the Constitution requires.

I close with a word of concern about my effort to try to instill respect for the Constitution in the area of war-making authority. I have fought to bring the resolution regarding the war to the floor during the Kosovo war. I am happy to say that we did our constitutional duty. We stood up and said no, we did not authorize the use of force.

Nevertheless, the President went ahead and for 79 days bombed Yugoslavia which was not at war with the United States, which had not threatened the territorial integrity of a single NATO country. In that context, this resolution was introduced.

It will appear to a court, I believe, as though we are today sending a message of ratification that we did not at that time. Nor is this an extreme or far-fetched belief, because the Federal District Court, in rejecting the lawsuit with which I followed my actions on the House floor, the Federal District Court ruled that a Member of Congress lacked standing to assert the Constitution when there was war happening in Kosovo, that a Member of Congress could not bring the lawsuit.

The reason the judge said so was not because of what Congress had done in voting against the use of force, in voting against the bombing, but what Congress had not done: that the House had not voted to withdraw the troops. In other words, the Federal District judge took an implication from the failure of the House to act.

That is a remarkable stretch for judicial interpretation. How much more easily will a court interpret a resolution we pass today applauding the use of extraterritorial NATO force, according to consensual NATO processes?

I fear for the Nation when the safeguards placed in operation by our Founders in the Constitution are cavalierly set aside, as I believe they were during the Kosovo war. I have nothing but the highest regard for those who offered this resolution, but I must disagree with their effort.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and for the good survey that he has provided in his initial comments.

One of the reasons this legislation is so important, the resolution being moved today, is because many of us have concerns about the new European pillar that would be created within the European Union as a result of the Franco-British accord and the Cologne summit of the EU that followed. There is the likelihood, the way things are proceeding, that the European pillar, the ESDI, would be created outside NATO within the European Union.

As the chairman indicated, we are concerned about decoupling this European capacity from NATO, that is one D; about discrimination against members of NATO that are not members of the European Union, that is the second D; and about duplication of effort, the third D, duplication between NATO's capacities and the capacity that would be created within the European Union.

For these reasons addressed by the resolve clause in this resolution, its passage is particularly important today.

I do want to assure the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) that I certainly understand the security concerns we have in the Asia-Pacific region. After all, as the chairman of that subcommittee, I focus on these things. But as this resolution puts forth, there are other concerns today that the members of NATO really did not expect to be facing. They relate, for example, to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism.

I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), that I think his concerns, which are legitimate in general, are overwrought and do not directly relate to this resolution.

It is true the resolution was originally introduced in February. It is not meant to have nor do I think it does have any impact upon a ratification of the use of force with respect to Bosnia or in Kosovo, for that matter.

I want to also emphasize for my colleagues that nothing provided in our NATO membership impinges upon the constitutional guarantees for the use of force, for example, in which Congress should have a role, which this Congressman from California has diligently been trying to pursue, to his credit. This does not impinge upon the constitutional processes of any member state, including the United States.

I would say this point needs to be made to the gentleman, that any kind of out-of-area action by NATO must be held to the standard that that kind of out-of-area action must be important to the security of one or more of the members of NATO. That is the only justification for out-of-area action by NATO forces. Even if it is a combined joint task force, a coalition, if the U.S. would participate, we must insist upon that out-of-area action being important to the security of one or more of the members of NATO, of the 19 countries that are part of that treaty.

I think it is an important resolution to pass. I think it is particularly important in light of what is happening in the European Union.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, deep under the Ural Mountains, under a mountain called Yamantau, the Russians continue to build and expand the world's largest, deepest, most nuclear-secure facility.

Started under Brezhnev, they have now spent $4.5 billion on this super-secret facility. They are doing this, and by the way, they are now increasing, they are ramping up their efforts. They are doing this at a time when they cannot pay their military, when they cannot provide housing for their military.

I asked my colleagues and I asked administration officials, why would they do this? What I am told is they do this because they are paranoid.

I have had a super top secret code word briefing on what is called silver bullets. These are efforts on the part of the Russians to leapfrog our war-making capabilities. They know they cannot compete with us in conventional weaponry, so they are seeking to leapfrog our technologies so our war-making capabilities will be neutralized.

I asked again, why would they do this? What I am told is they do this because they are paranoid. They have so many, so many needs in their country, why would they spend money doing this?

If they are doing these things because they are paranoid, then I ask the question, why would we want to feed their paranoia by expanding NATO? They see NATO as a threat. Why would we want to feed their paranoia? NATO may have a role to play. That role should not be in antagonizing the Russians, in feeding their paranoia. If we are to pass a resolution like this, it needs to be reworded so it will not be threatening to the Russians.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I have read the resolution. I do not view any word in the resolution as threatening in any way to Russia. That is why I can rise in strong support of the resolution today.

There is no doubt that America must remain firmly committed to NATO, as it remains firmly committed to ensuring the peace and stability on the European continent and throughout the North Atlantic region.

This resolution was drafted in anticipation of the 50th anniversary of NATO held here in Washington last April. For 50 years NATO has stood as the preeminent defense alliance protecting this Nation, its allies, and its vital interests from the threat of aggression and the threat of regional instability.

For 50 years NATO has provided this Nation with the invaluable opportunity to remain constantly and actively engaged with its key allies. For 50 years

NATO has proven that Nations sharing common ideologies, common values, and common goals can in fact stand stronger together than if alone, and can maintain peace in difficult, dangerous times.

Fifty years ago, NATO was created to hedge against the spread of tyranny in a war-ravaged Europe. At the time there were doubters, those who believed, even after the United States found itself drawn into two world wars within 25 years, that we should go it alone and close the gates to fortress America.

Thankfully, this country did not adopt such a strategy. Instead, we employed the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe from the ashes of conflict, and we established NATO to provide for the defense against the post-war totalitarianism in the region.

Isolationism did not prevail then, and it is very appropriate, 50 years after the creation of that Alliance, to deflect the scattered cries for a new form of isolationism in this country.

For 40 years NATO stood not only as a line of defense but as an incredibly effective deterrent. For the last 10 years NATO has stood ready to preserve European stability. It has been successful in its evolving mission. Most recently, and while facing very daunting challenges, NATO has sought to bring peace and stability to the Balkans, the very region that provided the spark that led to the conflagration known as the First World War.

Back in 1949, many in the United States claimed that we should not be engaged in Europe because we could not maintain peace in a region naturally drawn to war. It was argued then that the history of Europe was one of nationalism and ethnic extremism, and war among those nations was inevitable. Yet, because of NATO, Western Europe has seen one of the most peaceful and prosperous periods in its history.

Throughout the nineties we have heard the same argument regarding any attempts to maintain peace in central Europe. In fact, not many months ago, many in this House insisted that NATO would not remain unified in its action against the tyranny of Milosevic. Yet the Alliance stood firm, and military success was achieved.

The peace will be hard fought, but by tapping into the resolve and commitment of exhibited by the members of NATO, which now including members close to the Balkans, peace and stability can be established in the wake of military successes.

NATO ENLARGEMENT

This resolution also commemorates the enlargement of NATO to include Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. The success of NATO and its members' drive to contain, and ultimately de-construct, Soviet authoritarianism, has led to the flourishing of democratic movements throughout Central and Eastern Europe. The inclusion in NATO of three key nations formerly bound by the Iron Curtain speaks volumes for the power of the alliance and its relevance in today's changing geopolitical landscape.

NEW THREATS DEMANDS A COMMITMENT TO NATO

As this nation, its allies, and the alliances to which we belong, face new and unconventional threats from rogue nations, terrorist states and weapons of mass destruction, the deterrent effect of NATO remains relevant and vital. If those who would commit atrocities can look to the cohesiveness and determination of a broader reaching NATO, they will be more likely to give pause to any rash acts against alliance members or their interests. The United States must maintain a leadership role in NATO's preparedness against these new threats. Our citizens travel the world. Their government must be there with them—strong and committed.

No alliance, no strategy, and no plan creates certainty in international relations. However, NATO's unparalleled success in protecting Europe and the North Atlantic region proves that, with courage and determination, this Nation can boldly assert the values of democracy and peace.

In conclusion, let me just commend today not only the institution of NATO and its member nations but those who actually make the peace possible, our troops stationed abroad with their Alliance colleagues, working together to ensure the mutual security of all our families.

I look forward to the future successes of NATO and the ideals it protects.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

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

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, my classmate from California, and even though we do have a disagreement in this, his generosity shows in letting us discuss this and having a useful debate.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Chairman BEREUTER) for their extraordinary leadership on this issue.

I think it is important to know that it is a different world today and a more dangerous world. NATO has been the anchor for our national security in Europe for lo these many decades, since the Second World War. It still is our anchor. It is still a value-added organization for the member states and their related partners in the organization for a couple of reasons.

First, the common defense is very obvious. Greater efforts toward peace and stability are what we all strive at when we are dealing with foreign affairs and national security.

Secondly, the interrelationships between the member states to stress working cooperation on areas where they can cooperate, rather than to relate to some of the differences they have had historically that have led to tragic consequences on that continent, I think is a very important by-product of the NATO organization.

But third, and the thing that is before us today, and the reason this resolution is so important to support, is the challenge of how should NATO focus its energies in today's world and what should NATO's capabilities therefore be.

I think it is critically important that the United States of America be a very strong voice in those deliberations and in those decisions and the discussion. I think that is exactly why we are here today sending a resolution saying we will be a strong voice, and also resolving some of the issues that our colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), have brought forward properly that do need to be resolved.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, for 50 years it has been ritualistic for American public officials in public bodies to affirm support and solidarity for NATO. We should remember why. NATO was formed as a protection against the possibility of a Soviet attack, armed attack, armed aggression, against Western Europe, and to bring the United States and Western Europe together as a defense alliance.

That purpose and that danger no longer exists. NATO nonetheless has many other purposes, and they are properly delineated in this resolution.

□ 1130

I must oppose this resolution nonetheless because of three paragraphs in it. The resolution states, ''approval for the membership of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland in NATO and invites further enlargement of NATO from other former Warsaw Pact countries,'' and then says contradictorily, ''NATO should seek to strengthen its relations with Russia and Ukraine as its central partners in building long-term peace in the Euro Atlantic area.''

Madam Speaker, the Soviet Union no longer exists, but Russia is still a large nation and potentially a friendly one or potentially a dangerous one, and our policy should be directed at trying to enhance those forces within Russia, trying to transform that country into a democratic market economy, into a friendly country, into a responsible country, instead of doing what we can to provoke nationalistic forces, to provoke xenophobic forces, to provoke dictatorial forces in Russia.

The expansion of NATO is a direct provocation to all segments of Russia's political spectrum; weakens the democratic forces; weakens the pro-market forces, weakens the pro-Western forces and strengthens the xenophobic and ultranationalistic forces. It is unnecessary, and it makes this world a more dangerous place.

This resolution, were it not for those three paragraphs, would be worthy of support and with those three paragraphs it goes in the wrong direction and I urge its defeat.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, NATO was originally formed in 1949 as a defensive alliance. It was formed to protect against attacks, not to initiate attacks. Moreover, NATO's charter, Article 5 defines the alliance as ''collective defense against armed attack and limits NATO to attacking only in self-defense.'' Article 5 of the NATO treaty states, ''the parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.''

I believe that nations should have that security and have the ability to defend themselves against unprovoked aggression. NATO provided this blanket of security for the North Atlantic countries for the past 50 years. That is why Hungary, the Czech Republic, Poland, wanted to join. This is why Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Croatia, Romania and others want to join NATO, for increased protection, for increased security; and so NATO has changed.

The recent attack on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was the first action ever taken by NATO against a sovereign nation. This action did not satisfy Article 5 of the NATO charter, which limits NATO to defensive attacks. No country attacked a NATO country prior to the NATO attack in the Kosovo province and Yugoslavia.

So while today this resolution would recommit the United States to NATO and European security, we must honestly ask if the mission of NATO and the NATO treaty was violated by the Kosovo bombing. In mid-April as the war continued over Yugoslavia, NATO modified its charter combining both defensive and offensive actions. The strategic concept, which Congress will endorse with this resolution, now states in part 4, section 41, that NATO ''must be prepared to contribute to conflict prevention and to conduct non-Article 5 crisis response operations,'' end of quote, which means NATO can conduct unilateral bombing against any nation.

This is a blank check to wage war. The implications of this change will be serious, and this Congress must take note of it so that NATO does not become a law unto itself, a blind, unconscious force which usurps democrat process and values and becomes an impersonal force, and it is more powerful than individual nations.

If NATO is endorsed as an offensive force, what does this mean? Does it mean an end to the United Nations security role? Will it mean that NATO may act unilaterally anywhere in the world according to what it deems is a threat? Does it mean that there are no limits to NATO's potential military actions, since all NATO has to do is to change its charter to justify mission creep?

Now, I support the defensive security which NATO has to offer. NATO was formed to protect against attacks, not to initiate attacks.

I believe that this Congress must retake its role as described in the constitution, article 1, Section 8, that this Congress has the power and the authority alone to put this country into war. We should not cede it to a President, and we should not cede it to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for his generosity in yielding me this time.

Another gentleman from New York talked about his concerns about the expansion of NATO, and I understand that there is controversy about the fact that the Czech Republic and Poland and Hungary were brought into the first tranche of new membership, moving the membership from 16 to 19, but the Congress in both Houses by various means in direct action on the floor of the House and the Senate have approved that expansion and our executive branch has implemented it by the treaty change.

In fact, I think there is strong sentiment to responsibly, carefully expand NATO as other countries prepare and do meet the qualifications for membership. It is certainly understandable why the countries of Eastern and Central Europe want to be a part of NATO. NATO, after all, was founded on the principle of the rule of law and individual liberty.

It has become the cornerstone of Western peace and prosperity. It has permitted a sharing of the burden of national defense where all 16 countries, now 19, agree that attack on one is an attack against all. Because we no longer have a looming threat to our very survival since the collapse of the Iron Curtain and the absolute significance of this collective guarantee has faded from some memories, the gentleman of Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) has just reminded us about the need for NATO. I think he reinforced the need for NATO. I think it is fair to say, therefore, that without NATO, tens of millions, perhaps hundreds of millions of people would have been subjected to continuing tyranny.

NATO has been a dramatic success; and now, as I mentioned, Europe, our NATO allies and indeed the United States faces a whole range of additional threats and concerns which, in part, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) spoke to a few minutes ago. NATO nevertheless remains the ultimate bulwark against a reemergence of a destabilizing hegemonic power. We hope that is not Russia but, in fact, some of the concerns that the gentleman from Maryland raised are there in people's minds. We are extending, in a variety of fashions, through the NATO structure, a hand of peace and assistance to Russia and indeed the Ukraine, but they have to be willing to accept it; and we are committed to working with them.

I think it is important that we focus finally on why it is that this resolution is before us. It is a concern that NATO may be weakened to address traditional mutual defense responsibilities or new threats to NATO countries by a dividing of the European Union's responsibilities with NATO.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) is recognized for 45 seconds.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, in conclusion let me reiterate that the U.S. continues to have a vital interest in a strong and in an enlarged NATO. To my colleague from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), I would say that he and I agree about the threats to international peace and security that exist and are growing in the Asia Pacific region; but it is helpful to us, not harmful, to be an alliance with like-minded democracies as we develop strategies to address these threats. We are infinitely stronger in dealing with countries like China and North Korea when we combine resources and align ourselves with the democracies in Western Europe.

To the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), I say that there is nothing in this resolution that suggests or is intended to suggest that we are surrendering our constitutional prerogatives to declare war when NATO contemplates military action.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam Speaker, the chairman of our full committee gave his assurance and he is a man of honor and I am grateful for that assurance on the Record. However, the words of the resolution say that we commend NATO for choosing, as a new role, to identify crisis management operations outside the NATO treaty area based on case-by-case consensual alliance decisions, and the resolution was dated February 11, in the middle of the Kosovo war.

Madam Speaker, there is no ambiguity that this will be taken as an approval for the mechanism that was being used at that moment. My dear friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), says that the NATO treaty is consistent with the constitution. Yes, but the war in Kosovo was not; it was not.

The House did not declare war. The Senate did not declare war. And it was war. The President said it was armed conflict, not war. The American people know it was war, and in the midst of that war when this resolution was introduced, this resolution says that we applaud and agree with this new task

for NATO to choose crisis management operations outside the treaty area.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Madam Speaker, today we have heard a very useful debate, but it is a very serious debate; and it is especially serious for the next generation of Americans. Where are we going to put our emphasis? Where are we going to put our dollars? Where are we going to put our commitments? NATO costs between $10 billion and $20 billion every year just to be a part of NATO.

After 5 years of spending with NATO or 10 years of NATO spending, we could have a missile defense system for the United States of America, but we are giving that up by simply providing $10 billion to $20 billion a year for European stability.

This resolution is designed, of course, for the expansion of NATO, and by its very nature will cause fear in Russia and, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) pointed out, is counterproductive, will lead to worse relations with Russia when we should be trying to help the democratic elements in Russia not fear the United States of America. It will leave us weaker in the Pacific.

Finally, as this resolution is designed, it is designed to get us into more conflicts like Bosnia, like Kosovo, and perhaps in Africa, perhaps in Moldavia. We do not need to waste our precious resources and risk the lives of our people in these conflicts around the world. That is what this resolution is designed to do. It is a blank check for America's young people to go overseas and to spend our limited defense dollars in a counterproductive way.

NATO served its purpose. Let us declare victory in the Cold War and come home and set our new priorities which have more to do with the reality of today than the reality of 20 years ago and 40 years ago. I oppose this resolution.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for yielding me additional time.

Madam Speaker, in conclusion, NATO has served our national interest well for the last 50 years, will serve us well into the future and will help consolidate and expand democracy in Europe, and it will strengthen the forces of democracy in dealing with the emerging threats in Asia and elsewhere. This resolution is not a blank check that Congress must author. This is an important resolution. I urge my colleagues to fully support it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of House Resolution 59 to express the sense that the House should remain committed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. For fifty years NATO has protected our borders and the borders of our allies, preserving democracy, the rule of law and individual liberties. NATO has served as an important forum for promoting stability in the North Atlantic region and is representative of the collective effort of the North Atlantic states defending members against security risks. Indeed NATO remains the preeminent institution for addressing future external threats.

NATO has played a key role in developing democracies and instilling democratic ideals in Central and Eastern Europe. This too helps to solidify the security of the rest of the North Atlantic region.

Recognizing that the security of NATO member states is inseparably linked to that of the whole of Europe, and the consolidation and strengthening of democratic and free societies on the entire continent is an important concern to the NATO Alliance and its partners.

For these reasons, the House of Representatives should commend NATO and its work and should support its future efforts to maintain peace and stability in the North Atlantic region. The House must remain committed to the Alliance and should promote the adoption of a strategic concept clearly establishing that defense of shared interests and values that are as important for peace and stability as maintaining a vigorous capability to carry out collective defense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 59, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1145

FOREIGN NARCOTICS KINGPIN DESIGNATION ACT

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3164) to provide for the imposition of economic sanctions on certain foreign persons engaging in, or otherwise involved in, international narcotics trafficking.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3164

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 ''Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Presidential Decision Directive 42, issued on October 21, 1995, ordered agencies of the executive branch of the United States Government to, inter alia, increase the priority and resources devoted to the direct and immediate threat international crime presents to national security, work more closely with other governments to develop a global response to this threat, and use aggressively and creatively all legal means available to combat international crime.

(2) Executive Order No. 12978 of October 21, 1995, provides for the use of the authorities in the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to target and apply sanctions to 4 international narcotics traffickers and their organizations that operate from Colombia.

(3) IEEPA was successfully applied to international narcotics traffickers in Colombia and based on that successful case study, Congress believes similar authorities should be applied worldwide.

(4) There is a national emergency resulting from the activities of international narcotics traffickers and their organizations that threatens the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

(b) POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to apply economic and other financial sanctions to significant foreign narcotics traffickers and their organizations worldwide to protect the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States from the threat described in subsection (a)(4).

SEC. 3. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to provide authority for the identification of, and application of sanctions on a worldwide basis to, significant foreign narcotics traffickers, their organizations, and the foreign persons who provide support to those significant foreign narcotics traffickers and their organizations, whose activities threaten the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

SEC. 4. PUBLIC IDENTIFICATION OF SIGNIFICANT FOREIGN NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS AND REQUIRED REPORTS.

(a) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO THE PRESIDENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Director of Central Intelligence shall consult among themselves and provide the appropriate and necessary information to enable the President to submit the report under subsection (b). This information shall also be provided to the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

(b) PUBLIC IDENTIFICATION AND SANCTIONING OF SIGNIFICANT FOREIGN NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS.—Not later than June 1, 2000, and not later than June 1 of each year thereafter, the President shall submit a report to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committees on the Judiciary, International Relations, Armed Services, and Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and to the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committees on the Judiciary, Foreign Relations, Armed Services, and Finance of the Senate—

(1) identifying publicly the foreign persons that the President determines are appropriate for sanctions pursuant to this Act; and

(2) detailing publicly the President's intent to impose sanctions upon these significant foreign narcotics traffickers pursuant to this Act.

The report required in this subsection shall not include information on persons upon which United States sanctions imposed under this Act, or otherwise on account of narcotics trafficking, are already in effect.

(c) UNCLASSIFIED REPORT REQUIRED.—The report required by subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form and made available to the public.

(d) CLASSIFIED REPORT.—(1) Not later than July 1, 2000, and not later than July 1 of each year thereafter, the President shall provide the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate with a report in classified form describing in detail the status of the sanctions imposed under this Act, including the personnel and resources directed towards the