United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1998 No. 48

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 27, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, Jr., to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray using the words of Psalm 100.

Make a joyful noise to the Lord, all the lands. Serve the Lord with gladness. Come into his presence with singing. Know that the Lord is God. It is he that made us, and we are his. We are his people, and the sheep of his pasture. Enter his gates with thanksgiving, and his courts with praise. Give thanks to him, bless his name. For the Lord is good, his steadfast love endures forever, and his faithfulness to all generations. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MILLER of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution to acknowledge the Historic Northern Ireland Peace Agreement.

The message also announced that the Secretary of the Senate is directed to request the House to return to the Senate the official papers on S. 414, ''An Act to amend the Shipping Act of 1984 to encourage competition in international shipping and growth of United States exports, and for other purposes,'' and upon return of the official papers from the House, the Secretary of the Senate is directed to make the following change in the text of the bill, viz:

In the amendment of section 8(f) of the Shipping Act of 1984 by section 106(e) of the bill, insert a comma and ''including limitations of liability for cargo loss or damage,'' after ''practices''.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 105–92, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, appoints John David Davenport, of Oklahoma, as a participant in the 1998 National Summit on Retirement Income Savings, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276h, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. KOLBE of Arizona, Chairman, and Mr. GILMAN of New York, Vice Chairman.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276d, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. HOUGHTON of New York, Chairman.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Joshua D. Cantor, staff member of Hon. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 20, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena ad testificandum issued by the Pasadena Superior Court, in the case of *People* v. *Anthony Albert Jimenez,* Case No. GA 034516.

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that the subpoena relates to my official duties, and that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

JOSHUA D. CANTOR.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS CENTERED IN COLOMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105–241)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report concerning the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

1. On October 21, 1995, I signed Executive Order 12978, ''Blocking Assets and Prohibiting Transactions with Significant Narcotics Traffickers'' (the ''Order'') (60 Fed. Reg. 54579, October 24, 1995). The Order blocks all property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of four significant foreign narcotics traffickers, one of whom is now deceased, who were principals in the so-called Cali drug cartel centered in Colombia. These persons are listed in the annex to the Order. The Order also blocks the property and interests in property of foreign persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, (a) to play a significant role in international narcotics trafficking centered in Colombia or (b) to materially assist in or provide financial or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, the narcotics trafficking activities of persons designated in or pursuant to the Order. In addition the Order blocks all property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, persons designated in or pursuant to the Order (collectively ''Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers'' or ''SDNTs'').

The Order further prohibits any transaction or dealing by a United States person or within the United States in property or interests in property of SDNTs, and any transaction that evades or avoids, has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, the prohibitions contained in the Order.

Designations of foreign persons blocked pursuant to the Order are effective upon the date of determination by the Director of the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Public notice of blocking is effective upon the date of filing with the Federal Register, or upon prior actual notice.

2. On October 24, 1995, the Department of the Treasury issued a notice containing 76 additional names of persons determined to meet the criteria set forth in Executive Order 12978 (60 Fed. Reg. 54582, October 24, 1995). Additional notices expanding and updating the list of SDNTs were published on November 29, 1995 (60 Fed. Reg. 61288), March 8, 1996 (61 Fed. Reg. 9523), and January 21, 1997 (62 Fed. Reg. 2903).

Effective February 28, 1997, OFAC issued the Narcotics Trafficking Sanctions Regulations (''NTSR'' or the ''Regulations''), 31 C.F.R. Part 536 , to further implement my declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against significant foreign narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia (62 Fed. Reg. 9959, March 5, 1997).

On April 17, 1997 (62 Fed. Reg. 19500, April 22, 1997), July 30, 1997 (62 Fed. Reg. 41850, August 4, 1997), and September 9, 1997 (62 Fed. Reg. 48177, September 15, 1997), OFAC amended appendices A and B to 31 C.F.R. chapter V, revising information concerning individuals and entities who have been determined to play a significant role in international narcotics trafficking centered in Colombia or have been determined to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, or to be acting as fronts for the Cali cartel in Colombia. These actions are part of the ongoing interagency implementation of Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995. These changes to the previous SDNT list brought it to a total of 426 businesses and individuals with whom financial and business dealings are prohibited and whose assets are blocked under the Order.

3. OFAC has disseminated and routinely updated details of this program to the financial, securities, and international trade communities by both electronic and conventional media. In addition to bulletins to banking institutions via the Federal Reserve System and the Clearing House Interbank Payments System (CHIPS), individual notices were provided to all relevant State and Federal regulatory agencies, automated clearing houses, and State and independent banking associations across the country. OFAC contacted all major securities industry associations and regulators. It posted electronic notices on the Internet and over 10 computer bulletin boards and 2 fax-on-demand services, and provided the same material to the U.S. Embassy in Bogota for distribution to U.S. companies operating in Colombia.

4. As of March 25, 1998, OFAC had issued nine specific licenses pursuant to Executive Order 12978. These licenses were issued in accordance with established Treasury policy authorizing the completion of presanctions transactions and the provision of legal services to and payment of fees for representation of SDNTs in proceedings within the United States arising from the imposition of sanctions.

5. The narcotics trafficking sanctions have had a significant impact on the Cali drug cartel. Of the 133 business entities designated as SDNTs as of February 20, 1998, 41, or nearly a third, having a combined net worth estimated at more than $45 million and a combined income of more than $200 million, had been determined to have gone into liquidation. As a result of OFAC designations, 3 Colombian banks have closed about 300 SDNT accounts of nearly 100 designated individuals. One of the largest SDNT commercial entities, a discount drugstore with an annual income exceeding $136 million, has been reduced to operating on a cash basis. These specific results augment the less quantifiable but significant impact of denying the designated individuals and entities of the cartel access to U.S. financial and commercial facilities.

Various enforcement actions carried over from prior reporting periods are continuing and new reports of violations are being aggressively pursued. Two criminal investigations are ongoing. Since my last report, OFAC has collected its first civil monetary penalty for violations of IEEPA and the Regulations under the program. OFAC collected $2,625 from a commercial agent for ocean-going oil tankers for violative funds transfers.

6. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from October 21, 1997, through April 20, 1998, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency with respect to Significant Narcotics Traffickers are estimated at approximately $620,000. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of Justice, and the Department of State. These data do not reflect certain costs of operations by the intelligence and law enforcement communities.

7. Executive Order 12978 provides my Administration with a tool for combatting the actions of significant foreign narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia and the unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm that they cause in the United States and abroad. The Order is designed to deny these traffickers the benefit of any assets subject to the jurisdiction of the United States

and to prevent United States persons from engaging in any commercial dealings with them, their front companies, and their agents. Executive Order 12978 demonstrates the United States commitment to end the damage that such traffickers wreak upon society in the United States and abroad.

The magnitude and the dimension of the problem in Colombia—perhaps the most pivotal country of all in terms of the world's cocaine trade—are extremely grave. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against significant foreign narcotics traffickers and their violent and corrupting activities as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 24, 1998.*

SPECIAL ORDERS

INDUSTRIAL GROUP PLANS TO BATTLE CLIMATE TREATY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday the American public was presented with a front-page article in the New York Times outlining a plan by an industrial group to battle the climate change treaty. This is a treaty that was arrived at in Kyoto, Japan earlier this year, which brought together the international community in a plan to fight against an increase in greenhouse gases that threaten this world with climate change.

It was a plan that was negotiated between all of the nations in attendance. Many nations signed on and many other nations have yet to sign on. It is a plan that is necessary if in fact we are going to prevent the worst impacts of global climate change.

What the New York Times article tells us is that a group of corporations, mainly large international oil companies, have put together a plan to spend millions of dollars to try to convince the American public that the overwhelming scientific evidence regarding global climate change is somehow shaky and not to be trusted, and that therefore we should not go forward with actions in this and other countries, and with efforts to bring developing countries on board the Kyoto treaty, that we should walk away from that treaty; and that certainly we should not attend the meetings in Buenos Aires later this year where we will attempt to bring on large developing countries such as China, Mexico, Brazil and other such nations that are contributing huge amounts of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere of our world.

But rather than work on that progressive agenda, rather than work in an effort to try to see how we can stem greenhouse gases, these oil companies would rather try to convince people that in fact the science is not very good. Now that is contrary to the science itself and is contrary to the vast number of scientists around the world who have joined this effort to look at the science, to look at the data and try to help us predict what in fact is taking place with respect to greenhouse gases and global climate change.

But rather than participate in the serious scientific discourse, this group of oil companies has decided that they would take millions of dollars and try to convince the average citizen, under the portion of their plan that says victory will be achieved when the average citizen recognizes the uncertainties in climate science. Recognition of the uncertainties becomes part of conventional wisdom. So when you think about global climate change, about the threat of climate change, about warming, the oil companies want you to think, ''well, the science is not very good so probably nothing much is going to happen.''

Then they would like to move on and have the media recognize the uncertainties of climate science, so when the media presents stories about global change, about what is happening in our world, they would then say, ''Well, we really do not know if this science is very good.'' Then they take more of their money and they would try to make the media balance out, try to get stories into the media about how the science is not very good, and they would hope that the media would then accept, if they spend enough money to convince the media, that they would accept that it is conventional wisdom that the science is not very good.

Now mind you, this all comes at a time, it is not a question whether the science is very good or not—the science is getting better and better. But unfortunately, what the science tells us is that the problem of global warming is becoming more and more a realistic problem for the future of the world and that steps must be taken.

But that is not what these oil companies do. They want to change the mind set of the media, of the American public, of industry and certainly of the government. And what they really want to do is arrive at a point where the Kyoto treaty is dead, there will be no further action on that treaty, as they spell out in their strategies and their tactics, and to make sure that we do not go forward, we do not go forward in Buenos Aires to bring other nations on to that treaty.

How would they measure this? They are going to track the percentage of media articles that raise questions about climate science. They are going to register the number of Members that they have been able to contact and send materials to change their mind about the climate science, the number of communications on climate science received by Members of Congress. So they are going to spend a few hundred thousand dollars tracking their efforts to see whether or not it is working.

You know, we have seen this all before, my colleagues. We saw it when the tobacco companies got together to try to convince the American public that there was no link between tobacco and cancer, that there was no link between the usage of tobacco and the incredible rate of lung cancer in this country and of other cancers.

They spent millions of dollars to undermine the scientists who were saying there is a link, to undermine the evidence. They told us more and more every year, and when the science came against their wishes, they paid scientists to keep it down, to not tell the American public. Now for the first time what we see are thousands, millions of pages of documents with the tobacco companies engaged in an effort to keep from the American public science that would tell them that tobacco and cancer are linked.

Now we see an effort where some industries do not like the scientists, independent scientists. They do not like what they have come up with on global warming. So what they want to do is, they want to establish what they would consider an independent global climate science data center, and from this center would flow information to Members of Congress, to the public, to State legislatures, to the mayors, city council people. But this independent center reportedly would be initially staffed, this is according to the memo from the public relations firm advising the oil companies, it will be staffed initially with professionals on loan from the various oil companies and associations of the major interests in climate change.

□ 1415

So here we are going to have a bunch of people who work for oil companies as scientists who are now going to tell us what the independent science is on global warming, as opposed to the independent scientists who have been out there now for a number of years working for universities and foundations and others to try to find out what is happening. They want to create the impression that they have scientists who radically disagree with the prevailing science about the harms of greenhouse gases and the consequential global warming.

Mr. Speaker, we have to understand that there is something going on in business in America. Many of us in Congress have had complaints from our constituents about the impacts of HMOs and managed care. People come into our offices because they cannot get care for their spouse who is very ill, and they cannot get care for their children because somebody who is supposed to give a second opinion, some 800 number, they have to call where they talk to somebody, and they say, oh, no, we do not allow that care under your insurance plan.

So the Congress got together on a bipartisan basis and decided that what they would do is they would try to have a patients' bill of rights so that patients knew what kind of coverage they had, they would know what kind of care they had, so they had access to specialists, so they had a right to sue managed care plans if some bureaucrat in another city was making a decision against a doctor's recommendation and somebody was harmed.

On a bipartisan basis, in the Senate and the House, many State legislatures are doing this, and what do we see? We see corporations in America coming together, raising millions of dollars to try to tell the Congress, ''This is not a problem. These complaints from your constituents are not real. We have it all under control.'' They had a corporate fly-in where they had people fly in from all over the country to tell them we do not need to change anything with managed health care, it is just fine.

So we see the tobacco companies, they set up their spin organizations; the health care corporations, they set up their spin organizations; and now the oil companies are going to set up their spin organizations to tell us that all of this we have heard about climate change, greenhouse gases, global warming is nothing for us to be concerned about. Well, the fact is it is something for us to be very concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that not all oil companies apparently have joined this organization. In the article it suggested Shell Oil USA has not joined this organization. They do not see the merit to it. In fact, Shell Oil USA is one of those oil companies that believes that a good part of its future is going to be about clean energy, about renewable energy, wind energy, solar energy. It has joined companies like British Petroleum that have made major investments in solar energy. Billions of dollars of markets in solar energy are now recognizable, and we see those companies taking a different tack.

But yet there are a few companies that have decided that the best they can do is to try to confuse the American public on global warming, try to lobby their Representatives in the Congress not to accept, not to accept what the scientists are telling us now is the future of this planet if global warming continues.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Kyoto this year with the Chairman of the Science Committee, and I witnessed the U.S. delegation's diligence in forging a treaty that both protects the U.S. interests and at the same time sets important goals for slowing global warming.

The world is looking to the U.S. for leadership on this issue, and while clearly the solution must include participation from developing nations, there is much the United States can do to reduce global greenhouse gases, emissions that cause immediate health effects on our children and the elderly, contaminate our air, water and land, and cost taxpayers dearly to clean up.

The truth is the steps necessary to curb global warming present an enormous economic opportunity for the people of the United States. The scientific evidence about global warming compels strong action, not a head-in-the-sand approach that characterizes the organized opposition to the Kyoto Protocol and U.S. energy efficiency measures.

To hear some critics describe the Administration's actions to try to push forward with renewable energy and energy efficiency and clean sources of energy, one would think that protecting the environment is a crime against humanity, and that President Clinton should be tried at the Hague. They are accusing the President of trying to use Federal tax dollars to spur public and private investment in energy in energy efficiency and renewable energy.

We are seeing more and more countries, more and more companies looking at renewable energy sources as a path to the future. America ought to participate in that. We have the technology, we have the know-how, we have the products. We ought to recognize the economic opportunity that that provides.

In fact, the global market for energy efficiency products and services is $80 billion per year and is expected to reach $125 billion a year by the year 2015. Several studies estimated that job growth from energy efficiency and technology innovation will exceed 800,000 new jobs over the next 15 years.

I do not know where these critics live, but they do not live in the district that I represent.

Earlier this year, in fact, 71 percent of my constituents recently answered a questionnaire that they thought the U.S. should take strong steps against global warming, even if it cost taxpayers more in the beginning to do so. The same is true across the country. In January, Ohio State University conducted a national survey on the American opinion on global warming, finding that 77 percent of Americans believe that global warming has been happening, and 67 percent believe that steps should be taken to combat global warming, and that reducing air pollution is an effective way to do so. Eighty-eight percent thought the U.S. Government should limit air pollution for businesses, and 77 percent thought they were willing to pay more for electricity, gas and oil to reduce the amount of air pollution.

It is that poll that is driving the oil companies crazy. It is that poll that is causing the oil companies to consider spending $5 million to change Americans' opinion about the urgency of global warming. It is that consortium that is coming together that recognizes that the American people understand what is going on, and now they want to change their mind.

It is too bad, because most of the last couple of decades, this country has been built on greater and greater efficiencies. We see it in the computer industry, in telecommunications, in marketing, in transportation. We see it throughout the entire global economy. But somehow, when we get to energy, the coal companies and the oil companies, they do not want us to be efficient. They want us to burn more oil and more coal; it is just that simple, folks. If we can do it more efficiently and we can save the environment and we can save dollars in the cost of that electricity, and if we can provide jobs and new economic opportunities in the export of American products, they do not want us to hear about it, they do not want us to believe it. They want us just to go on burning the coal and burning the oil in the same old fashion we have been doing for the last 50 years.

The problem is if we all do that, and if the developing countries—China, Mexico, India, Indonesia, Brazil—who are increasing their use of oil and coal as their economies grow, if they just do it the same way we did it over the last 50 years, we will choke this planet to death. We will destroy the environment for our children and our grandchildren, and we will threaten the economic well-being of a good portion of the world.

That is what the American people understand. That is what is reflected in the polling data. They trust the independent scientists. They are not going to trust a bunch of scientists on the oil company payrolls to tell them that they are wrong about the science, that it is really shaky.

But we have to be diligent in this matter. We have to be aware of what is happening, because as we start to see attacks on the scientists who have studied global warming, attacks on this administration that is trying to bring developing countries on board a treaty to reduce those greenhouse gases—and hopefully at the end of this year in Buenos Aires some developing countries will sign on—as they are trying to do that, they are going to come under attack. They are going to come under attack by a consortium put together by oil companies and coal companies to say that we are all wrong, that global warming is not a problem.

Well, I think by now we have seen enough evidence to suggest that global warning is a problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that people would be alert to what is taking place and to what is proposed by these oil and coal companies to try and put their spin on the hard evidence that has been derived by independent scientists from many, many countries, from many, many disciplines, over many years, being very conservative about the changes that they have seen. But as scientists drill the ice cores, as they look at what has happened in the past, Nature magazine just reported that the Northern Hemisphere mean annual temperatures for 3 of the past 8 years were warmer than any year since

AD 1400. We have to understand the kind of changes that means for the American economy and for the environment of the world.

So I would hope that Members of Congress would not give credibility to this effort by the oil companies to put their spin on what is very good, even if incomplete evidence about the problems raised by the continuing burning of fossil fuels and creation of greenhouse gases.

I commend to my colleagues the article and memo, which I have enclosed here.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 26, 1998]

INDUSTRIAL GROUP PLANS TO BATTLE CLIMATE TREATY

DRAFT PROPOSAL SEEKS TO DEPICT GLOBAL WARMING THEORY AS A CASE OF BAD SCIENCE

(By John H. Cushman Jr.)

WASHINGTON, April 25—Industry opponents of a treaty to fight global warming have drafted an ambitious proposal to spend millions of dollars to convince the public that the environmental accord is based on shaky science.

Among their ideas is a campaign to recruit a cadre of scientists who share the industry's views of climate science and to train them in public relations so they can help convince journalists, politicians and the public that the risk of global warming is too uncertain to justify controls on greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide that trap the sun's heat near Earth.

An informal group of people working for big oil companies, trade associations and conservative policy research organizations that oppose the treaty have been meeting recently at the Washington office of the American Petroleum Institute to put the plan together.

Joe Walker, a public relations representative of the petroleum institute who is leading the project, said in an interview that the plan had been under consideration for about two months and was ''very, very tentative.'' Mr. Walker said no industry executives had yet been approached to pay for it.

But an eight-page memorandum that he wrote shows in detail how some industry lobbyists are going about opposing the climate treaty.

It is a daunting pubic relations task. Whenever the treaty's advocates, including the Clinton Administration, discuss global warming, they present the science as essentially settled and unchallengeable, and they compare dissenting scientists to discredited apologists for the tobacco companies. That view has become widely accepted among reporters and the public.

Although mainstream scientists do identify considerable uncertainties in their climate predictions, which are based on computer models, they are increasingly confident that global warming is a serious problem and often say that the uncertainties do not justify inaction.

Based on the latest science, most of the world's nations agreed in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 that industrial nations should cut emissions of greenhouse gases, and the treaty was modified last year to require further reductions in emissions to levels well below those of 1990, over the next 10 to 15 years. But the United States Senate has not yet agreed to that treaty provision, which could require deep reductions in American consumption of fossil fuels.

Documents describing the proposal to undermine the mainstream view were given to The New York Times by the National Environmental Trust, whose work in support of the global-warming treaty is financed by philanthropic organizations, including the Pew Charitable Trusts, the biggest of the nation's pro-environmental grant makers.

Phil Clapp, the president of the environmental trust, said he obtained the papers from an industry official. Exposing the plan at this stage, Mr. Clapp said, would probably ruin the effort to raise money to carry out the plan.

Industry representatives confirmed that the documents were authentic, but emphasized that the plans had not been formally approved by participating organizations. The document listed representatives of the Exxon Corporation, the Chevron Corporation and the Southern Company as being involved. Representatives of Chevron and Southern acknowledged attending meetings on the project; the Exxon representative could not be reached for comment.

The draft plan calls for recruiting scientists to argue against the Administration, and suggests that they include ''individuals who do not have a long history of visibility and/or participation in the climate change debate.''

But among the plan's advocates are groups already linked to the best-known critics of global-warming science.

They include the Science and Environment Policy Project, founded by Fred Singer, a physicist noted for opposing the mainstream view of climate science. Frederick Seitz, another prominent skeptic on global warming, is involved with two other groups mentioned in the plan: the George C. Marshall Institute, where Dr. Seitz is chairman, and the Advancement of Sound Science Coalition, where he is on the science advisory board.

On Monday, the National Academy of Sciences disassociated itself from the most recent effort to drum up support among skeptical scientists. That effort came in the form of a statement and petition on global warming circulated by Dr. Seitz, a physicist who was president of the academy in the 1960's.

The petition, attacking the scientific conclusions underlying the treaty on climate change, was accompanied by an article that was formatted to resemble one that might have been published in the academy's prestigious peer-reviewed journal. It was not.

The draft plan, recently discussed at the oil industry offices, calls for giving such dissenters on climate science ''the logistical and moral support they have been lacking.''

It also calls for spending $5 million over two years to ''maximize the impact of scientific views consistent with ours on Congress, the media and other key audiences.''

It would measure progress by counting, among other things, the percentage of news articles that raise questions about climate science and the number of radio talk show appearances by scientists questioning the prevailing views.

The document says that industry's polling, conducted by Charlton Research, has found that while Americans see climate change as a serious threat, ''public opinion is open to change on climate science.''

Supporters of the plan want to raise money quickly to spend much of it between now and the November negotiating session in Buenos Aires, where important details of the international treaty are to be decided.

A proposed media-relations budget of $600,000, not counting any money for advertising, would be directed at science writers, editors, columnists and television network correspondents, using as many as 20 ''respected climate scientists'' recruited expressly ''to inject credible science and scientific accountability into the global climate debate, thereby raising questions about and undercutting the 'prevailing scientific wisdom.'''

Among the tasks, the petroleum institute's memorandum said, would be to ''identify, recruit and train a team of five independent scientists to participate in media outreach.''

What the industry group wanted to provide, the memorandum said, was ''a one-stop resource on climate science for members of Congress, the media, industry and all others concerned.''

The industry group said it wanted to develop ''a sound scientific alternative'' to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a large group of scientists advising the United Nations that has published the most authoritative scientific assessments of global warming. That panel has predicted that the next century will bring widespread climatic disruptions if actions are not taken to reverse the accumulation of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

The draft plan suggests that despite industry efforts to convince the public that the climate treaty would be costly to carry out and unfair to the United States, the treaty remains popular partly because environmentalists are winning the debate on the science.

''Indeed, the public has been highly receptive to the Clinton Administration's plans,'' the memorandum said. ''There has been little, if any, public resistance or pressure applied to Congress to reject the treaty, except by those 'inside the Beltway' with vested interests.''

To: Global Climate Science Team
Subject: Draft Global Climate Science Communications Plan

As promised, attached is the draft Global Climate Science Communications Plan that we developed during our workshop last Friday. Thanks especially to those of you who participated in the workshop, and in particular to John Adams for his very helpful thoughts following up our meeting, and Alan Caudill for turning around the notes from our workshop so quickly.

Please review the plan and get back to me with your comments as soon as possible.

As those of you who were at the workshop know, we have scheduled a follow-up team meeting to review the plan in person on Friday, April 17, from 1 to 3 p.m. at the API headquarters. After that, we hope to have a ''plan champion'' help us move it forward to potential funding sources, perhaps starting with the global climate ''Coordinating Council.'' That will be an item for discussion on April 17.

Again, thanks for your hard work on this project. Please e-mail, call or fax me with your comments. Thanks.

Regards,

JOE WALKER.

APRIL 3, 1998.

GLOBAL CLIMATE SCIENCE COMMUNICATIONS ACTION PLAN

Situation analysis

In December 1997, the Clinton Administration agreed in Kyoto, Japan, to a treaty to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to prevent what it purports to be changes in the global climate caused by the continuing release of such emissions. The so-called greenhouse gases have many sources. For example, water vapor is a greenhouse gas. But the Clinton Administration's action, if eventually approved by the U.S. Senate, will mainly affect emissions from fossil fuel (gasoline, coal, natural gas, etc.) combustion.

As the climate change debate has evolved, those who oppose action have argued mainly that signing such a treaty will place the U.S. at a competitive disadvantage with most other nations, and will be extremely expensive to implement. Much of the cost will be

borne by American consumers who will pay higher prices for most energy and transportation.

The climate change theory being advanced by the treaty supporters is based primarily on forecasting models with a very high degree of uncertainty. In fact, it not known for sure whether (a) climate change actually is occurring or (b) if it is, whether humans really have any influence on it.

Despite these weaknesses in scientific understanding, those who oppose the treaty have done little to build a case against precipitous action on climate change based on the scientific uncertainty. As a result, the Clinton Administration and environmental groups essentially have had the field to themselves. They have conducted an effective public relations program to convince the American public that the climate is changing, we humans are at fault, and we must do something about it before calamity strikes.

The environmental groups know they have been successful. Commenting after the Kyoto negotiations about recent media coverage of climate change, Tom Wathen, executive vice president of the National Environmental Trust, wrote:

''. . . As important as the extent of the coverage was the tone and tenor of it. In a change from just six months ago, most media stories no longer presented global warming as just a theory over which reasonable scientists could differ. Most stories described predictions of global warming as the position of the overwhelming number of mainstream scientists. That the environmental community had, to a great extent, settled the scientific issue with the U.S. media is the other great success that began perhaps several months earlier but became apparent during Kyoto.''

Because the science underpinning the global climate change theory has not been challenged effectively in the media or through other vehicles reaching the American public, there is widespread ignorance, which works in favor of the Kyoto treaty and against the best interests of the United States. Indeed, the public has been highly receptive to the Clinton Administration's plans. There has been little, if any, public resistance or pressure applied to Congress to reject the treaty, except by those ''inside the Beltway'' with vested interests.

Moreover, from the political viewpoint, it is difficult for the United States to oppose the treaty solely on economic grounds, valid as the economic issues are. It makes it too easy for others to portray the United States as putting preservation of its own lifestyle above the greater concerns of mankind. This argument, in turn, forces our negotiators to make concessions that have not been well thought through, and in the end may do far more harm than good. This is the process that unfolded at Kyoto, and is very likely to be repeated in Buenos Aires in November 1998.

The advocates of global warming have been successful on the basis of skillfully misrepresenting the science and the extent of agreement on the science, while industry and its partners ceded the science and fought on the economic issues. Yet if we can show that science does not support the Kyoto treaty—which most true climate scientists believe to be the case—this puts the United States in a stronger moral position and frees its negotiators from the need to make concessions as a defense against perceived selfish economic concerns.

Upon this tableau, the Global Climate Science Communciations Team (GCSCT) developed an action plan to inform the American public that science does not support the precipitous actions Kyoto would dictate, thereby providing a climate for the right policy decisions to be made. The team considered results from a new public opinion survey in developing the plan.

Charlton Research's survey of 1,100 ''informed Americans'' suggests that while Americans currently perceive climate change to be a great threat, public opinion is open to change on climate science. When informed that ''some scientists believe there is not enough evidence to suggest that [what is called global climate change] is a long-term change due to human behavior and activities,'' 58 percent of those surveyed said they were more likely to oppose the Kyoto treaty. Moreover, half the respondents harbored doubts about climate science.

GCSCT members who contributed to the development of the plan are A. John Adams, John Adams Associates; Candace Crandall, Science and Environmental Policy Project; David Rothbard, Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow; Jeffrey Salmon, The Marshall Institute; Lee Garrigan, Environmental Issues Council; Lynn Bouchey and Myron Ebell, Frontiers of Freedom; Peter Cleary, Americans for Tax Reform; Randy Randol, Exxon Corp.; Robert Gehri, The Southern Company; Sharon Kneiss, Chevron Corp.; Steve Milloy, The Advdancement of Sound Science Coalition; and Joseph Walker, American Petroleum Institute.

The action plan is detailed on the following pages.

GLOBAL CLIMATE SCIENCE COMMUNICATIONS ACTION PLAN

Project goal

A majority of the American public including industry leadership, recognizes that significant uncertainties exist in climate science, and therefore raises questions among those (e.g. Congress) who chart the future U.S. course on global climate change.

Progress will be measured toward the goal. A measurement of the public's perspective on climate science will be taken before the plan is launched, and the same measurement will be taken at one or more as-yet-to-be-determined intervals as the plan is implemented.

Victory will be achieved when

Average citizens ''understand'' (recognize) uncertainties in climate science; recognition of uncertainties becomes part of the ''conventional wisdom''; media ''understands'' (recognizes) uncertainties in climate science; media coverage reflects balance on climate science and recognition of the validity of viewpoints that challenge the current ''conventional wisdom''; industry senior leadership understands uncertainties in climate science, making them stronger ambassadors to those who shape climate policy; and those promoting the Kyoto treaty on the basis of extant science appear to be out of touch with reality.

Current reality

Unless ''climate change'' becomes a non-issue, meaning that the Kyoto proposal is defeated and there are no further initiatives to thwart the threat of climate change, there may be no moment when we can declare victory for our efforts. It will be necessary to establish measurements for the science effort to track progress toward achieving the goal and strategic success.

Strategies and tactics

I. National Media Relations Program: Develop and implement a national media relations program to inform the media about uncertainties in climate science; to generate national, regional and local media coverage on the scientific uncertainties, and thereby educate and inform the public, stimulating them to raise questions with policy makers.

Tactics: These tactics will be undertaken between now and the next climate meeting in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in November 1998, and will be continued thereafter, as appropriate. Activities will be launched as soon as the plan is approved, funding obtained, and the necessary resources (e.g., public relations counsel) arranged and deployed. In all cases, tactical implementation will be fully integrated with other elements of this action plan, most especially Strategy II (National Climate Science Data Center).

Identify, recruit and train a team of five independent scientists to participate in media outreach. These will be individuals who do not have a long history of visibility and/or participation in the climate change debate. Rather, this team will consist of new faces who will add their voices to those recognized scientists who already are vocal.

Develop a global climate science information kit for media including peer-reviewed papers that undercut the ''conventional wisdom'' on climate science. This kit also will include understandable communications, including simple fact sheets that present scientific uncertainties in language that the media and public can understand.

Conduct briefings by media-trained scientists for science writers in the top 20 media markets, using the information kits. Distribute the information kits to daily newspapers nationwide with offer of scientists to brief reporters at each paper. Develop, disseminate radio news releases scientists nationwide, and offer scientists to appear on radio talk shows across the country.

Produce, distribute a steady stream of climate science information via facsimile and e-mail to science writers around the country.

Produce, distribute via syndicate and directly to newspapers nationwide a steady stream of op-ed columns and letters to the editor authored by scientists.

Convince one of the major news national TV journalists (e.g., John Stossel) to produce a report examining the scientific underpinnings of the Kyoto treaty.

Organize, promote and conduct through grassroots organizations a series of campus/community workshops/debates on climate science in 10 most important states during the period mid-August through October, 1998.

Consider advertising the scientific uncertainties in select markets to support national, regional and local (e.g., workshops/debates), as appropriate.

National Media Program Budget—$600,000 plus paid advertising

II. Global Climate Science Information Source: Develop and implement a program to inject credible science and scientific accountability into the global climate debate, thereby raising questions about and undercutting the ''prevailing scientific wisdom.'' The strategy will have the added benefit of providing a platform for credible, constructive criticism of the opposition's position on the science.

Tactics: As with the National Media Relations Program, these activities will be undertaken between now and the next climate meeting in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in November 1998, and will continue thereafter. Initiatives will be launched as soon as the plan is approved, funding obtained, and the necessary resources arranged and deployed.

Establish a Global Climate Science Data Center. The GCSDC will be established in Washington as a non-profit educational foundation with an advisory board of respected climate scientists. It will be staffed initially with professionals on loan from various companies and associations with a major interest in the climate issue. These executives will bring with them knowledge and experience in the following areas: Overall history

of climate research and the IPCC process; congressional relations and knowledge of where individual Senators stand on the climate issue; knowledge of key climate scientists and where they stand; ability to identify and recruit as many as 20 respected climate scientists to serve on the science advisory board; knowledge and expertise in media relations and with established relationships with science and energy writers, columnists and editorial writers; expertise in grassroots organization; and campaign organization and administration.

The GCSDC will be led by a dynamic senior executive with a major personal commitment to the goals of the campaign and easy access to business leaders at the CEO level. The Center will be run on a day-to-day basis by an executive director with responsibility for ensuring targets are met. The Center will be funded at a level that will permit it to succeed, including funding for research contracts that may be deemed appropriate to fill gaps in climate science (e.g., a complete scientific critique of the IPCC research and its conclusions).

The GCSDC will become a one-stop resource on climate science for members of Congress, the media, industry and all others concerned. It will be in constant contact with the best climate scientists and ensure that their findings and views receive appropriate attention. It will provide them with the logistical and moral support they have been lacking. In short, it will be a sound scientific alternative to the IPCC. Its functions will include:

Providing as an easily accessible database (including a website) of all mainstream climate science information.

Identifying and establishing cooperative relationships with all major scientists whose research in this field supports our position.

Establishing cooperative relationships with other mainstream scientific organizations (e.g., meteorologists, geophysicists) to bring their perspectives to bear on the debate, as appropriate.

Developing opportunities to maximize the impact of scientific views consistent with ours with Congress, the media and other key audiences.

Monitoring and serving as an early warning system for scientific developments with the potential to impact on the climate science debate, pro and con.

Responding to claims from the scientific alarmists and media.

Providing grants for advocacy on climate science, as deemed appropriate.

Global Climate Science Data Center Budget—$5,000,000 (spread over two years minimum)

III. National Direct Outreach and Education: Develop and implement a direct outreach program to inform and educate members of Congress, state officials, industry leadership, and school teachers/students about uncertainties in climate science. This strategy will enable Congress, state officials and industry leaders to be able to raise such serious questions about the Kyoto treaty's scientific underpinnings that American policy-makers not only will refuse to endorse it, they will seek to prevent progress toward implementation at the Buenos Aires meeting in November or through other ways. Informing teachers/students about uncertainties in climate science will begin to erect a barrier against further efforts to impose Kyoto-like measures in the future.

Tactics: Informing and educating members of Congress, state officials and industry leaders will be undertaken as soon as the plan is approved, funding is obtained, and the necessary resources are arrayed and will continue through Buenos Aires and for the foreseeable future. The teachers/students outreach program will be developed and launched in early 1999. In all cases, tactical implementation will be fully integrated with other elements of this action plan.

Develop and conduct through the Global Climate Science Data Center science briefings for Congress, governors, state legislators, and industry leaders by August 1998.

* * * * *

Organize under the GCSDC a ''Science Education Task Group'' that will serve as the point of outreach to the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) and other influential science education organizations. Work with NSTA to develop school materials that present a credible, balanced picture of climate science for use in classrooms nationwide.

Distribute educational materials directly to schools and through grassroots organizations of climate science partners (companies, organizations that participate in this effort).

National Direct Outreach Program Budget—$300,000

IV. Funding/Fund Allocation: Develop and implement program to obtain funding, and to allocate funds to ensure that the program it is carried out effectively.

Tactics: This strategy will be implemented as soon as we have the go-ahead to proceed.

Potential funding source were identified as American Petroleum Institute (API) and its members; Business Round Table (BRT) and its members, Edison Electric Institute (EEI) and its members; Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA) and its members; and the National Mining Association (NMA) and its members.

Potential fund allocators were identified as the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT), Competitive Enterprise Institute, Frontiers of Freedom and The Marshall Institute.

Total Funds Required to Implement Program through November 1998— $2,000,000 (A significant portion of funding for the GCSDC will be deferred until 1999 and beyond)

Measurements

Various metrics will be used to track progress. These measurements will have to be determined in fleshing out the action plan and may include:

Baseline public/government official opinion surveys and periodic follow-up surveys on the percentage of Americans and government officials who recognize significant uncertainties in climate science.

Tracking the percent of media articles that raise questions about climate science.

Number of Members of Congress exposed to our materials on climate science.

Number of communications on climate science received by Members of Congress from their constituents.

* * * * *

Number of school teachers/students reached with our information on climate science.

Number of science writers briefed and who report upon climate science uncertainties.

Total audience exposed to newspaper, radio, television coverage of science uncertainties.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STOKES.
Ms. SLAUGHTER.
Mr. SCHUMER.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution to acknowledge the Historic Northern Ireland Peace Agreement; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 28, 1998, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8663. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area [Docket No. 97–056–9] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8664. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area [Docket No. 97–102–2] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8665. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Georgia [Docket No. 98–018–1] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8666. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Dairy Tariff-Rate Import Quota Licensing (7 CFR Part 6) received April 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8667. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Propiconazole; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300637; FRL–5783–5] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received April 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8668. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fenoxaprop-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300635; FRL–5782–1] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received April 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8669. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Canola Oil; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP–3000623; FRL–5773–9] received April 14, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8670. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Spinosad; Pesticide Tolerances [OPP–300644; FRL–5785–7] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received April 14, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8671. A letter from the Acting Deputy Chief for Operations, Forest Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Notice, Comment, and Appeal Procedures for National Forest System Projects and Activities [36 CFR Part 215] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8672. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the Reserve Forces Policy Board for Fiscal Year 1997, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113 (c) and (e); to the Committee on National Security.

8673. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration (MARAD) for Fiscal Year 1997, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on National Security.

8674. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's certification that the survivability and lethality testing of the CH 47 Improved Cargo Helicopter (ICH) would be unreasonably expensive and impractical, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2313(c); to the Committee on National Security.

8675. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a delay in the report on Reserve retirement initiatives, pursuant to Public Law 104—201; to the Committee on National Security.

8676. A letter from the Acting Deputy Under Secretary (Logistics), Department of Defense, transmitting a request for deferment until August 1st off the report containing a plan to reduce overhead costs of the supply management activities of the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) and the military departments (known as Iventory Control Points (ICPs) so that the overhead costs for each fiscal year after fiscal year 2000 do not exceed eight percent of net sales at standard price by Inventory Control Points during that year, pursuant to Public Law 105—85, section 394; to the Committee on National Security.

8677. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the review of the maintenance medication dispensing policy with a view towards modifying the current policy to dispense maintenance medications for a 90-day period; to the Committee on National Security.

8678. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the premium collection procedures for the dental insurance programs, pursuant to Public Law 105—85, Section 733(c); to the Committee on National Security.

8679. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report that specifies for each military treatment facility the amount collected from third party payers during the preceding fiscal year, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1095; to the Committee on National Security.

8680. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report detailing the costs and savings attributable to base closures and realignments (BRAC), pursuant to Public Law 105—85, section 2824; to the Committee on National Security.

8681. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on enlistment waiver trends for Fiscal Years 1991–1997, pursuant to Public Law 105—85, section 531; to the Committee on National Security.

8682. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the determination 98–18 that it is in the national interest for the Export-Import Bank to extend a loan, guarantee, insure or lease any product to Vietnam, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(2)(D)(iv); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8683. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Unsafe and Unsound Banking Practices [Docket No. 97–02] (RIN: 1557–AB56) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8684. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Occupant Crash Protection [Docket No. NHTSA–97–2714] (RIN: 2127–AG17) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8685. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Side Impact Protection—Side Impact Dummy [Docket No. NHTSA–98–3668] (RIN: 2127–AG37) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8686. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Nebraska; Control of Landfill Gas Emissions From Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [NE 052–1052a; FRL–6002–4] received April 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8687. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Iowa; Control of Landfill Gas Emissions From Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [IA 051–1051a; FRL–6002–8] received April 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8688. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Fuel Fleet Program [FRL–5994–5] (RIN: 2060–AH56) received April 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8689. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [MO 042–1042(a); FRL–5979–4] received April 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8690. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amendments to the Test Procedures for Heavy-Duty Engines, and Light-Duty Vehicles and Trucks and Amendments to the Emission Standard Provisions for Gaseous Fueled Vehicles and Engines [FRL–5999–7] received April 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8691. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California—South Coast Air Quality Management District [CA—189—0059; FRL–5996–5] received April 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8692. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: Washington [WA 66–71741a; FRL–5998–3] received April 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8693. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California—Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [CA—203—0062; FRL–5996–4] received April 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8694. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Acid Rain Program: Revisions to Sulfur Dioxide Opt-Ins [FRL–5996–6] (RIN: 2060–AH36) received April 14, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8695. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled ''The Medicaid Quality of Care Medical Records Study,'' pursuant to Public Law 99—509, section 9432(c); to the Committee on Commerce.

8696. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1997 report on implementation of the support for East European Democracy Act (SEED) Program, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 5474; to the Committee on International Relations.

8697. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12–323, ''Real Property Tax Rates and Assessment Initiative Amendment Act of 1998'' received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8698. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12–317, ''Sex Offender Register Immunity From Liability Temporary Amendment Act of 1998'' received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8699. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12–326, ''Omnibus Personnel Reform Amendment Act of 1998'' received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8700. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12–319, ''Solid Waste Facility Permit Temporary Amendment Act of 1998'' received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8701. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12–322, ''Southeastern University Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 1998'' received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8702. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a

copy of D.C. Act 12–324, ''Real Property Tax Rates and Assessment Initiative Temporary Amendment Act of 1998'' received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8703. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12–316, ''Omnibus Regulatory Reform Amendment Act of 1998 Temporary Repealer Act of 1998'' received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8704. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12–275, ''Real Property Tax Reassessment Temporary Amendment Act of 1998'' received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8705. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12–318, ''Mutual Holding Company Mergers and Acquisition Temporary Amendment Act of 1998'' received April 21, 1998, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8706. A letter from the Chairman, Census Monitoring Board, transmitting a statement informing Congress that the Board cannot issue its first report by April 1, 1998 because the President has not yet appointed four members to the Census Monitoring Board, pursuant to Public Law 105—119; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8707. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Disclosure of Information (RIN: 3064–AC10) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8708. A letter from the Executive Director, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8709. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Government National Mortgage Association (Ginnie Mae) management report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1997, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8710. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Extension of Effective Date of Environmental Impact Assessment of Nongovernmental Activities in Antarctica [FRL–5994–2] received April 14, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8711. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Threatened Status for One Plant, Arctostaphylos pallida (Pallid Manzanita), from the Northern Diablo Range of California (RIN: 1018–AD35) received April 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8712. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Offshore Component Pacific Cod in the Central Regulatory Area [Docket No. 971208297–8054–02;I.D. 033098A] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8713. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, transmitting the Office's final rule—Maryland Regulatory Program [MD–042–FOR] received April 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8714. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting two reports on the 1997 Activities of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and the 1997 Judicial Business of the United States Courts, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 604(a)(4), (h)(2), and 2412(d)(5); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8715. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Federal Register Certifying Officer, Financial Management Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Transfer of Debts to Treasury for Collection (RIN: 1510–AA68) received March 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8716. A letter from the Director, Government Relations, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the Girl Scouts of the United States of America 1997 Annual Report, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 37; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8717. A letter from the Director, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting the Federal Judicial Center's Annual Report for 1997, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 623(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8718. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Explosives Detection Systems [Docket No. 28671] (RIN: 2120–AF95) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8719. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Apple Valley, CA [Airspace Docket No. 96–AWP–3] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8720. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Davis/Woodland/Winters, CA [Airspace Docket No. 97–AWP–20] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8721. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Globe, AZ [Airspace Docket No. 98–AWP–8] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8722. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. Models PA–31, PA–31–300, PA–31–325, PA–31–350, and PA–31P Airplanes [Docket No. 90–CE–65–AD; Amendment 39–10467; AD 98–08–18] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8723. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes Equipped with Pratt & Whitney JT9D–3 and -7 Series Engines [Docket No. 97–NM–267–AD; Amendment 39–10284; AD 98–02–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8724. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class E Airspace; McCall, ID [Airspace Docket No. 97–ANM–16] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8725. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revocation of Class E Airspace; Blue Mesa, CO; and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Gunnison, CO [Airspace Docket No. 97–ANM–15] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8726. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification to the Gulf of Mexico High Offshore Airspace Area [Airspace Docket No. 96–ASW–30] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8727. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29186; Amdt. No. 1862] (RIN: 2120–AA65) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8728. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures [Docket No. 29185; Amdt. No. 1861] (RIN: 2120–AA65) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8729. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29187; Amdt. No. 1863] (RIN: 2120–AA65) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8730. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce, plc RB211 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 94–ANE–39; Amendment 39–10426; AD 98–07–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8731. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Model 1329–23 and -25 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–93–AD; Amendment 39–10442; AD 98–07–21] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8732. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF 340A and SAAB Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–291–AD; Amendment 39–10465; AD 98–08–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8733. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–100, -200, and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–83–AD; Amendment 39–10464; AD 98–08–15] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8734. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Turbo-Propeller Powered General Dynamics (Convair) Model 240, 340, and 440

Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–69–AD; Amendment 39–10466; AD 98–08–17] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8735. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB 2000 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–97–AD; Amendment 39–10459; AD 98–08–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8736. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Twin Commander Aircraft Corporation 500, 600, and 700 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 95–CE–92–AD; Amendment 39–10468; AD 98–08–19] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8737. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 and 767 Series Airplanes Equipped with General Electric (GE) CF6–80C2 Engines [Docket No. 98–NM–79–AD; Amendment 39–10472; AD 98–08–23] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8738. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Model PC–7 Airplanes [Docket No. 97–CE–130–AD; Amendment 39–10471; AD 98–08–22] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8739. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–10,-20,-30,-40, and -50 Series Airplanes, and C–9 (Military) Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–40–AD; Amendment 39–10473; AD 98–08–24] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8740. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; AlliedSignal Aerospace Bendix/King Model KSA 470 Autopilot Servo Actuators, part numbers 065–0076–10 through 065–0076–15 [Docket No. 97–CE–74–AD; Amendment 39–10469; AD 98–08–20] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8741. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA— Groupe AEROSPATIALE Models TB10 and TB200 Airplanes [Docket No. 95–CE–71–AD; Amendment 39–10470; AD 98–08–21] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8742. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA.315B, SA.316B, SA.316C, SA.319B, and SE.3160 Helicopters [Docket No. 98–SW–09–AD; Amendment 39–10479; AD 98–04–40] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8743. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Industrie Aeronautiche e Meccaniche Model Piaggio P–180 Airplanes [Docket No. 97–CE–142–AD; Amendment 39–10454; AD 98–08–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8744. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Vessel Identification System; Effective Date Change [CGD 89–050] (RIN: 2115–AD35) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8745. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—SAFETY ZONE: Bath / Woolwich Bridge Construction [CGD1–98–029] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8746. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Anacostia River, Washington D.C. [CGDO5–98–017] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8747. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Unescorted Access Privilege: Address change [Docket No. 29193; Amendment No. 107–11; 108–16] received April 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8748. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Improvements to Hazardous Materials Identification Systems; Editorial revisions and Responses to Petitions for Reconsideration and Appeal [Docket No. HM–206] (RIN: 2137–AB75) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8749. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; RAPCO, Inc. Filter, Part Numbers RA–1J4–4, RA–1J4–6, and RA–1J4–7 from Lot Numbers 05597, 07797, and 12597 [Docket No. 97–CE–71–AD; Amendment 39–10103; AD 97–16–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8750. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Proposed Amendment to Class E Airspace; Le Mars, IA [Airspace Docket No. 98–ACE–7] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8751. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class D and Class E Airspace; Poplar Bluff, MO; Correction [Airspace Docket No. 97–ACE–28] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8752. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Aurora, NE [Airspace Docket No. 98–ACE–13] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8753. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Norfolk, NE; Correction [Airspace Docket No. 97–ACE–33] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8754. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Marshall Army Airfield, Fort Riley, KS [Airspace Docket No. 97–ACE–20] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8755. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Sabreliner Model NA–265–40, -60, -70, and -80 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–171–AD; Amendment 39–10349, AD 98–04–37] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8756. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320–111 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–22–AD; Amendment 39–10410] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8757. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amendment of the Provisions to Eliminate and Phase-out Mixing Zones for Bioaccumulative Chemicals of Concern and Amendment to Procedure 8.D. of Appendix F (Pollutant Minimization Program) for the Final Water Quality Guidance for the Great Lakes System [FRL–5999–8] received April 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8758. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the 36th Annual Report of the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 1997, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8759. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on the pipeline safety user fee assessment basis, pursuant to Public Law 104—34; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8760. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 07–98—received April 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8761. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report entitled ''Evaluation of Short-Time Compensation Programs: Final Report,'' pursuant to Public Law 102—318, section 401; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8762. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's quarterly report on the Portfolio Reengineering Demonstration Program for the fourth quarter of Fiscal Year (FY) 1997, pursuant to Public Law 104—134; jointly to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services and Appropriations.

8763. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service [CC Docket No. 96–45] received April 15, 1998, pursuant to Public Law 105—119, 111 Stat. 2440; jointly to the Committees on Commerce and Appropriations.

8764. A letter from the Executive Director, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, transmitting a report on the second quarter

of Fiscal Year 1998, pursuant to Public Law 105—100; jointly to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight and Appropriations.

8765. A letter from the National Film Preservation Foundation, transmitting the first Annual Report of the National Film Preservation Foundation for the calendar year ending December 31, 1997, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 5706 Public Law 104—285, Title II; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and House Oversight.

8766. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting copies of the FY 1999 budget requests of the Federal Aviation Administration to the Department, including requests for ''Facilities and Equipment'' and ''Research, Engineering, and Development,'' pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2205(f); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Science, and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 1872. A bill to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 105–494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker.

[The following action occurred on April 24, 1998]

H.R. 1965. Referral to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than May 8, 1998.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of Rule X and clause 4 of Rule XXII,

Mr. RYUN introduced a bill (H.R. 3733) to authorize the National Science Foundation to make grants for applied engineering and technology education equipment and capital improvements; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

290. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 151 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take certain actions regarding the implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996; to the Committee on Agriculture.

291. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Senate Resolution 2995 memorializing Congress to amend title ten, United States Code relating to the compensation of retired military; to the Committee on National Security.

292. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, relative to Senate Resolution 766 memorializing the United States Congress to reject any legislation that would exempt health plans sponsored by associations and multiple employer welfare arrangements from state insurance standards and oversight; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

293. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of The Mariana Islands, relative to House Resolution No. 11–23 requesting the federal officials for a waiver on the Covenant matching fund to help expedite and foster infrastructure development in the CNMI; to the Committee on Resources.

294. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives for the Commonwealth of The Mariana Islands, relative to House Resolution No. 11–25 expressing full, undeniable and unquestionable support on the provisions of the Covenant by the people and their government of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and in particular under section 902 of said provisions; to the Committee on Resources.

295. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 97 memorializing Congress to authorize a ten-year extension of the Delaware and Lehigh Navigation Canal National Heritage Corridor Act and to authorize Federal support for Corridor projects; to the Committee on Resources.

296. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Resolution No. 106 memorializing the United States Congress to maintain the incentive grant approach to accomplishing shared public safety objectives and to refrain from imposing federal mandates to accomplish such objectives; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

297. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 211 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to raise the cap on mortgage revenue bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

298. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Maine, relative to Joint Resolution 871 memorializing Congress To Ensure The Viability of the United States Social Security System adopted by the 118th Maine Legislature; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

299. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, relative to Resolution No. 8 urging the President and the Congress of the United States to resolve differences that exist between the Province of Ontario and the State of Minnesota relating to the taking of fish in Canadian boundary waters by Americans staying in American resorts; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1047: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1375: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1531: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2009: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2189: Mr. CAMPBELL and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 2693: Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 2990: Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DIXON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3253: Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 3279: Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 3376: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 3400: Ms. KAPTUR and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 3494: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3531: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. YATES, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3571: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 3624: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MANTON, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. YATES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.J. Res. 102: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H. Con. Res. 203: Mr. BALDACCI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

58. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Office of the City Clerk, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, relative to Resolution No. 119 imploring the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate to pass H.R.1151; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

59. Also, a petition of the City Commission of the State of Florida, relative to Resolution 98–7 petitioning the United States Senate and House of Representatives to appropriate $250,000 to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers so that the Corps can complete the plans and specifications for a much needed shore protection project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 6

OFFERED BY: MR. LAZIO OF NEW YORK

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 192, after line 10, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 430. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section—

(1) to bring more highly trained individuals into the early child care profession; and

(2) to keep more highly trained child care providers in the early child care field for longer periods of time.

(b) LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.—Part B (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 428J (as added by section 432) (20 U.S.C. 1078–10) the following:

''SEC. 428K. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CHILD CARE FACILITY.—The term 'child care facility' means a facility, including a home, that—

''(A) provides child care services; and

''(B) meets applicable State or local government licensing, certification, approval, or registration requirements, if any.

''(2) CHILD CARE SERVICES.—The term 'child care services' means activities and services provided for the education and care of children from birth through age 5 by an individual who has a degree in early childhood education.

''(3) DEGREE.—The term 'degree' means an associate's or bachelor's degree awarded by an institution of higher education.

''(4) EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.—The term 'early childhood education' means education in the areas of early child education, child care, or any other educational area related to child care that the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(b) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out a demonstration program of assuming the obligation to repay, pursuant to subsection (c), a loan made, insured or guaranteed under this part or part D (excluding loans made under sections 428B and 428C) for any new borrower after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, who—

''(A) completes a degree in early childhood education;

''(B) obtains employment in a child care facility; and

''(C) is working full-time and is earning an amount which does not exceed the greater of an amount equal to 100 percent of the poverty line for a family of 2 as determined in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act.

''(2) AWARD BASIS; PRIORITY.—

''(A) AWARD BASIS.—Subject to subparagraph (B), loan repayment under this section shall be on a first-come, first-served basis and subject to the availability of appropriations.

''(B) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall give priority in providing loan repayment under this section for a fiscal year to student borrowers who received loan repayment under this section for the preceding fiscal year.

''(3) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

''(c) LOAN REPAYMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall assume the obligation to repay—

''(A) after the second year of employment described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (b)(1), 20 percent of the total amount of all loans made after date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, to a student under this part or part D;

''(B) after the third year of such employment, 20 percent of the total amount of all such loans; and

''(C) after each of the fourth and fifth years of such employment, 30 percent of the total amount of all such loans.

''(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the refunding of any repayment of a loan made under this part or part D.

''(3) INTEREST.—If a portion of a loan is repaid by the Secretary under this section for any year, the proportionate amount of interest on such loan which accrues for such year shall be repaid by the Secretary.

''(4) SPECIAL RULE.—In the case where a student borrower who is not participating in loan repayment pursuant to this section returns to an institution of higher education after graduation from an institution of higher education for the purpose of obtaining a degree in early childhood education, the Secretary is authorized to assume the obligation to repay the total amount of loans made under this part or part D incurred for a maximum of two academic years in returning to an institution of higher education for the purpose of obtaining a degree in early childhood education. Such loans shall only be repaid for borrowers who qualify for loan repayment pursuant to the provisions of this section, and shall be repaid in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (1).

''(5) INELIGIBILITY OF NATIONAL SERVICE AWARD RECIPIENTS.—No student borrower may, for the same volunteer service, receive a benefit under both this section and subtitle D of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12601 et seq.).

''(d) REPAYMENT TO ELIGIBLE LENDERS.—The Secretary shall pay to each eligible lender or holder for each fiscal year an amount equal to the aggregate amount of loans which are subject to repayment pursuant to this section for such year.

''(e) APPLICATION FOR REPAYMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible individual desiring loan repayment under this section shall submit a complete and accurate application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(2) CONDITIONS.—An eligible individual may apply for loan repayment under this section after completing each year of qualifying employment. The borrower shall receive forbearance while engaged in qualifying employment unless the borrower is in deferment while so engaged.

''(f) EVALUATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct, by grant or contract, an independent national evaluation of the impact of the demonstration program assisted under this section on the field of early childhood education.

''(2) COMPETITIVE BASIS.—The grant or contract described in subsection (a) shall be awarded on a competitive basis.

''(3) CONTENTS.—The evaluation described in this subsection shall—

''(A) determine the number of individuals who were encouraged by the demonstration program assisted under this section to pursue early childhood education;

''(B) determine the number of individuals who remain employed in a child care facility as a result of participation in the program;

''(C) identify the barriers to the effectiveness of the program;

''(D) assess the cost-effectiveness of the program in improving the quality of—

''(i) early childhood education; and

''(ii) child care services;

''(E) identify the reasons why participants in the program have chosen to take part in the program;

''(F) identify the number of individuals participating in the program who received an associate's degree and the number of such individuals who received a bachelor's degree; and

''(G) identify the number of years each individual participates in the program.

''(4) INTERIM AND FINAL EVALUATION REPORTS.—The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President and the Congress such interim reports regarding the evaluation described in this subsection as the Secretary deems appropriate, and shall prepare and so submit a final report regarding the evaluation by January 1, 2002.

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.''.

H.R. 6

OFFERED BY: MR. LAZIO OF NEW YORK

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 192, after line 10, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 430. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section—

(1) to bring more highly trained individuals into the early child care profession; and

(2) to keep more highly trained child care providers in the early child care field for longer periods of time.

(b) LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.—Part B (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 428J (as added by section 432) (20 U.S.C. 1078–10) the following:

''SEC. 428K. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CHILD CARE FACILITY.—The term 'child care facility' means a facility, including a home, that—

''(A) provides child care services; and

''(B) meets applicable State or local government licensing, certification, approval, or registration requirements, if any.

''(2) CHILD CARE SERVICES.—The term 'child care services' means activities and services provided for the education and care of children from birth through age 5 by an individual who has a degree in early childhood education.

''(3) DEGREE.—The term 'degree' means an associate's or bachelor's degree awarded by an institution of higher education.

''(4) EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.—The term 'early childhood education' means education in the areas of early child education, child care, or any other educational area related to child care that the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(b) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out a demonstration program of assuming the obligation to repay, pursuant to subsection (c), a loan made, insured or guaranteed under this part or part D (excluding loans made under sections 428B and 428C) for any new borrower after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, who—

''(A) completes a degree in early childhood education; and

''(B) obtains employment in a child care facility.

''(2) AWARD BASIS; PRIORITY.—

''(A) AWARD BASIS.—Subject to subparagraph (B), loan repayment under this section shall be on a first-come, first-served basis and subject to the availability of appropriations.

''(B) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall give priority in providing loan repayment under this section for a fiscal year to student borrowers who received loan repayment under this section for the preceding fiscal year.

''(3) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

''(c) LOAN REPAYMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall assume the obligation to repay—

''(A) after the second year of employment described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (b)(1), 20 percent of the total amount of all loans made after date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, to a student under this part or part D;

''(B) after the third year of such employment, 20 percent of the total amount of all such loans; and

''(C) after each of the fourth and fifth years of such employment, 30 percent of the total amount of all such loans.

''(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the refunding of any repayment of a loan made under this part or part D.

''(3) INTEREST.—If a portion of a loan is repaid by the Secretary under this section for

any year, the proportionate amount of interest on such loan which accrues for such year shall be repaid by the Secretary.

''(4) SPECIAL RULE.—In the case where a student borrower who is not participating in loan repayment pursuant to this section returns to an institution of higher education after graduation from an institution of higher education for the purpose of obtaining a degree in early childhood education, the Secretary is authorized to assume the obligation to repay the total amount of loans made under this part or part D incurred for a maximum of two academic years in returning to an institution of higher education for the purpose of obtaining a degree in early childhood education. Such loans shall only be repaid for borrowers who qualify for loan repayment pursuant to the provisions of this section, and shall be repaid in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (1).

''(5) INELIGIBILITY OF NATIONAL SERVICE AWARD RECIPIENTS.—No student borrower may, for the same volunteer service, receive a benefit under both this section and subtitle D of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12601 et seq.).

''(d) REPAYMENT TO ELIGIBLE LENDERS.—The Secretary shall pay to each eligible lender or holder for each fiscal year an amount equal to the aggregate amount of loans which are subject to repayment pursuant to this section for such year.

''(e) APPLICATION FOR REPAYMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible individual desiring loan repayment under this section shall submit a complete and accurate application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(2) CONDITIONS.—An eligible individual may apply for loan repayment under this section after completing each year of qualifying employment. The borrower shall receive forbearance while engaged in qualifying employment unless the borrower is in deferment while so engaged.

''(f) EVALUATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct, by grant or contract, an independent national evaluation of the impact of the demonstration program assisted under this section on the field of early childhood education.

''(2) COMPETITIVE BASIS.—The grant or contract described in subsection (a) shall be awarded on a competitive basis.

''(3) CONTENTS.—The evaluation described in this subsection shall—

''(A) determine the number of individuals who were encouraged by the demonstration program assisted under this section to pursue early childhood education;

''(B) determine the number of individuals who remain employed in a child care facility as a result of participation in the program;

''(C) identify the barriers to the effectiveness of the program;

''(D) assess the cost-effectiveness of the program in improving the quality of—

''(i) early childhood education; and

''(ii) child care services;

''(E) identify the reasons why participants in the program have chosen to take part in the program;

''(F) identify the number of individuals participating in the program who received an associate's degree and the number of such individuals who received a bachelor's degree; and

''(G) identify the number of years each individual participates in the program.

''(4) INTERIM AND FINAL EVALUATION REPORTS.—The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President and the Congress such interim reports regarding the evaluation described in this subsection as the Secretary deems appropriate, and shall prepare and so submit a final report regarding the evaluation by January 1, 2002.

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.''.

H.R. 6

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 246, line 23, after the period insert close quotation marks and ''; and'', and strike line 24 and all that follows through line 5 on page 247.

H.R. 6

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the Bill, add the following new title:

TITLE XI—DISCRIMINATION AND PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT

SEC. 1101. PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION AND PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT.

(a) PROHIBITION.—No institution of higher education that participates in any program authorized under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) shall, in connection with admission to such institution, discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any person or group based on whole or in part on the race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin of such person or group.

(b) EXCEPTION.—This section does not apply to any institution of undergraduate higher education which is a private institution that traditionally and continually from its establishment has had a policy of admitting only students of one sex.

(c) OUTREACH ACTIVITIES PERMITTED.—Subsection (a) does not prohibit or limit any effort by an institution of higher education to encourage and recruit qualified women and minorities to seek admission to such institution if such recruitment or encouragement does not involve granting preferential treatment, in selecting any person for admission, that is based in whole or in part on race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1998 No. 48

Senate

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Lord, as we begin this new week, we claim that You are in our midst. Fill this Senate Chamber with Your glory. May we humbly trust You as the sovereign Lord of our lives and of America.

Because Your strength is limitless, our inner wells need never be empty. Your strength is artesian, constantly surging up to give us exactly what we need in every moment. You give us supernatural thinking power beyond our IQ; You provide emotional equipoise when we are under pressure; You engender resoluteness in our wills and vision for our leadership; and You energize our bodies with physical resiliency.

Lord, quiet our turbulent hearts with Your unqualified, indefatigable love. Give us profound confidence, security, and peace. We have absolute trust in Your faithfulness and we commit ourselves to You anew. Tune our hearts to the frequency of Your inner voice. Give us the clarity as we need to lead our Nation. In Your never-failing power, we humbly pray, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able acting majority leader from Alabama is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, this morning the Senate will be in a period of morning business until the hour of 12 noon. At noon, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the treaty on NATO enlargement. It is hoped that Senators will come to the floor to debate the treaty and to offer amendments. As a reminder to all Members, a rollcall vote will occur this evening at 6 p.m. on the confirmation of the nomination of Scott Fleming to be Assistant Secretary for Legislation and Congressional Affairs at the Department of Education.

As a further reminder, a rollcall vote will occur on the State Department reorganization conference report at 2:25 p.m. on Tuesday, April 28. This will not necessarily be the first vote of Tuesday's session, and the Members will be notified of an updated voting schedule.

Also during this week's session, the Senate could be asked to consider the supplemental appropriations conference report, if available from the conference committee.

In addition, the Senate could be asked to consider, possibly under a brief time agreement, the Work-Force Development Act. A couple of amendments are expected to be offered, and, as always, Members will be notified as the schedule becomes clearer later in the week.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business.

The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. FORD pertaining to the introduction of S. 1989 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS, is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRIORITIES

VISION 20–20

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, this is a morning with a little bit of break between issues. It is an opportunity, it seems to me, to share some of the thoughts some of us have as priorities. Obviously, when we get involved in a particular bill, as we did last week, it took the whole week. Some of the things we care a lot about we tend to sort of set aside.

I speak this morning briefly on a couple of issues that I think are very important, and are particularly important to me. One is the bill called Vision 20–20. It is the product of a great deal of effort that we put in in the Parks Subcommittee with respect to revitalizing our national parks. We have had one hearing in the subcommittee. We have another planned for this week. Finally, we will have four hearings and then, hopefully, bring it to the floor sometime in May or early June.

National parks, of course, are increasingly well thought of in this country. They are increasingly popular. Visitations go up. We have more and more people taking advantage of the parks, parks that preserve either natural resources or cultural resources that have been a tradition.

We celebrated last year the 125th anniversary of the first park, Yellowstone Park in Wyoming, as a matter of fact. Unfortunately, at the same time that we have increased our caring about parks, we find ourselves, according to the park agency, in addition to being $5 billion behind in the infrastructure, taking care of those parks and preserving those parks. The purpose, of course, of a park is to preserve those resources, whether they be natural or cultural. But equally as important, and the second issue, certainly is to provide a

● This ''bullet'' symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

pleasant visit to the owners of the park who are the people of the United States. That, of course, becomes more difficult as this infrastructure needs repair.

We are seeking to do a number of things. We are seeking to increase the resources that are available that will be supplemental to the budget money, to the tax money that all taxpayers pay, by doing things like extending the fee period where additional trial fees have been added to the parks, and to extend that for some time to see that people who enter the park can actually share more of the responsibility of paying for it. We are also talking about a stamp, collectible stamps, such as a duck stamp, in which the resources would go to the park. We are talking about those people who come on international tours to be able as part of their tour to buy a 30-day entry to parks with some of those funds going to national parks.

We are talking about bonding many of the larger parks. Have things like streets and sewers, and it is very difficult to keep those up on annual budgets. So we are seeking to do that which is difficult since there is no real capital budget in the Federal establishment at work in doing that.

In addition, we hope to give an opportunity for taxpayers to deduct a portion of their return—the money that comes back to them—and dedicate it to the parks, if they choose to. We think that is an opportunity to support the parks and those people who care a great deal about it.

In addition, we are talking about the management. I think that is fair because they have more resources. There is evidence, of course, that management is not always what it might be. The most recent one, of course, is the cost of some of the construction there that has been extremely, unusually, inappropriately high. We are asking that there be a strategic plan, that is a national strategic plan also revisited on down to each unit, and that each unit have a strategic plan that complies with the flat plan. That has a measurable goal in it. This is a large business; there needs to be planning for it.

We are talking about the concessions—the way that the concessions can contribute more financially to the parks. They are a commercial function within the park. We would like to see more private expertise in the management of these kinds of commercial activities within the Park Service. We also would like to have it more competitive so that people who want to get into the business can do that. We deal with the preferential right. In addition to that, of course, in order to invest millions of dollars, there needs to be some proprietary interest protecting that as well.

These are some of the things we are doing. We are talking about education of the park employees, which I think is an advantage for them. Park employees are some of the most committed people I know of in the Federal Government to their role in the parks.

We are excited about that, and hope that can be one of the things that this Congress accomplishes as they strengthen in making sure that the parks are going to be there for us in the next century and, therefore, our kids and our grandkids.

THE BUDGET PROCESS

Mr. President, we are also working, I think, as we move on into the allocation of funds through the budget and through the appropriations. I think we ought to take another look at a 2-year budget. We are going to find ourselves spending at least half of this year talking about budgeting and appropriations. Many State legislatures have shown that it is successful to do it on a biannual basis. What we ought to do, in my opinion—and we are also joined by the chairman of the Budget Committee, as well as the majority and minority whip—is that we ought to do this on a 2-year basis so that we can do it 1 year, set up the budgets the next year, and have oversight, which is something we need to do more of in Congress. I think it is good for agencies. They would have a longer period of time to know what resources are available to them. Somehow we don't seem to be able to get to it. It is a reasonable procedural thing that we ought to do. But, as is often the case and too often the case in Government and in this Congress, we have always done it that way. That is not a good enough reason. That is not a good enough reason. If there are ways we can do things more efficiently, if there are ways we can do things that will produce better results, that is what we ought to be doing. I am persuaded that is one of them.

We are also in the process of trying to set up a system that provides for more entrepreneurial private involvement in some of the things that Government does. Basically, we have a bill that will probably be heard in the House this week that simply says to OMB to define those things that are basically commercial in nature, that are done by the Federal Government, and then require under the so-called 876 process that each of those kinds of things be made available for private contracting if you can show that it can be done more efficiently that way.

The private contractor should get to bid on those things that are basically commercial in nature and be more efficient. We reduce the size of Government, and I think it makes a lot of sense. Of course, some of the labor unions in the Government agencies are not excited about that. The fact is that many of those people would be also doing the same thing in the private sector, and probably would be at least as well off.

These are some of the things that we are doing.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. President, I guess as an expression of some frustration, I have been hearing reports of last week's talk about education. I am surprised, frankly, that the national media has promoted some of the kinds of things that simply, it seems to me, are not the basis of the discussion. Yesterday, on TV, I heard them sitting around for 20 minutes talking about the idea that this bill was simply to define private school funding. It is not what it is about at all. It provides an opportunity for people to have a savings to use for their own children during kindergarten through college, an expansion of the $500 credit that is now $2,000 set aside. It is your money. It is not tax money. It is money that you are allowed to set aside after taxes but the income has not been taxed.

But the real issue, and what seems to be missed by most people, is what should the involvement of the Federal Government be in elementary and secondary education. What we are really debating is whether or not there ought to be a set of Federal entitlements set up that would go on forever by the Federal Government and would eventually, of course, impede or infringe upon local control of elementary and secondary schools. That is what the debate was about.

I am surprised sometimes that does not seem to permeate through the national media. Part of that is, of course, because the administration and our friends on the other side of the aisle tried to make that point. I guess when we govern and people are involved in self-government, as we all should be doing, that there has to be some semblance of factual information going out to people so that they can be involved.

I spoke this morning with a group of kids. There is one from each State here to talk about Government. The point that I try to make and that all of us try to make is that this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and that all of us should try to make that democracy work, to make the Constitution work, to make the system work, and that we have to participate. To participate, you have to have some facts, not media hype, and not show business, but facts.

It seems to me, increasingly prompted some by politicians, to be sure, that we find ourselves more and more being faced with the political process becoming something of show business. That is not what it is. It is government deciding based on facts what is best for freedom, freedom for democracy, and for the American people. It is frustrating from time to time that those issues that are really basic to the decisions get lost somewhere. They get lost somewhere. I find them frustrating.

It is interesting, Mr. President, that in your home State,—as it is in Wyoming, where yesterday I had conversations—you hear things that are totally different than with some you talk with here. It is really interesting that folks at home are thinking about those things that are really important to them, and here we are talking about

the gossip. But that is the way it works. So we all will continue to make it work that way.

Mr. President, as you can tell, I have used this opportunity to share some of the concerns and interests that I have having to do with national parks, having to do with allowing the private sector to participate in many of the things that are commercial in nature in the Government; talking about what I think is a more efficient manner of handling our budget on a 2-year budget cycle, and using the other year to have oversight to ensure those dollars are being spent in the best way they can.

They complain a little bit, I guess, which is OK, all of us do it, about the lack of ability to really portray and get out into the public the real issues and the real controversies. That is what we are really about here—is talking about different views and different directions. And to the extent that all of us can participate in making those decisions through the political process, which is how we govern ourselves, then it's important, I think—vital—to have that information available.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, April 24, 1998, the federal debt stood at $5,505,293,755,428.21 (Five trillion, five hundred five billion, two hundred ninety-three million, seven hundred fifty-five thousand, four hundred twenty-eight dollars and twenty-one cents).

One year ago, April 24, 1997, the federal debt stood at $5,343,217,000,000 (Five trillion, three hundred forty-three billion, two hundred seventeen million).

Twenty-five years ago, April 24, 1973, the federal debt stood at $455,284,000,000 (Four hundred fifty-five billion, two hundred eighty-four million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,050,009,755,428.21 (Five trillion, fifty billion, nine million, seven hundred fifty-five thousand, four hundred twenty-eight dollars and twenty-one cents) during the past 25 years.

THE MISSOURI RIVER ENERGY SERVICES

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today I would like to share with my colleagues a development that is occurring in my region with an organization that has long been an agent of change. The Missouri Basin Municipal Power Agency is a joint action agency that provides affordable electricity, through its 58 municipal utility members, to over 200,000 consumers in my home state of South Dakota, and to citizens of North Dakota, Minnesota and Iowa.

The agency was formed in 1960 to coordinate municipalities' efforts to negotiate the purchase of power and energy from the Federal government. In 1970, the Federal government informed public power systems in the region that their growing power supply needs could no longer be met through the Federal hydropower program. Missouri Basin stepped in and met the supplemental power supply of its member communities by participating in, among other arrangements, the Laramie River Station coal-fired plant, one of the cleanest coal plants in the country.

Over the years, the agency has played a vital role in meeting the energy needs of the region. The agency has promoted integrated resource planning, carried out an aggressive tree planting program, and continued to provide its customers with affordable, reliable electricity.

Faced with a changing electricity market, Missouri Basin this month changed its name to Missouri River Energy Services, signaling its readiness to embrace a new era in which utilities will provide many added services and benefits for their customers. Missouri River Energy Services is rising to meet this challenge admirably.

I appreciate the work Missouri River Energy Services has done for our communities and wish the agency the best of luck as it helps forge the future of the electricity industry.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

PROTOCOLS TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY OF 1949 ON ACCESSION OF POLAND, HUNGARY, AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now go into executive session and proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 16, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Treaty Document No. 105–36, Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic.

The Senate resumed consideration of the treaty.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, prior to the Easter recess, there was some rather spirited discussion on the question of NATO expansion, and the debate so far has shown, I believe, that most Senators are reaching the correct conclusion that bringing Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic into the NATO alliance is the right thing to do.

To be sure, there are some commentators who vow they know more than all the rest of us and who make a living on the talk shows and in newspaper op-ed pages, and they have been wringing their hands declaring how awful it is that the U.S. Senate is not taking this vital foreign policy issue seriously. How awful, they lament, it is that the Senate is not paying adequate attention to this important issue.

Sometimes when I hear comments completely off the wall like that, I am tempted to say to these know-it-alls, ''Heal thyselves.'' In fact, most of them have ignored the debate that the Senate has been having for months on this issue, and most of the commentators have been following something else, maybe an intern at the White House, or whatever. If they had been paying attention, they would have known why the Senate today appears to have reached a broad consensus as to the wisdom of NATO expansion and they would not be confusing that consensus with the lack of serious discussion and debate.

The fact is, Mr. President, we have been working with the administration leaders for 9 straight months now to fix their original approach to the NATO expansion. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate NATO observer group have made concerted efforts to address the contentious issue early on precisely to ensure that the major problems with NATO expansion were addressed by the time 12 noon today arrived and we reached the Senate floor with this proposal.

Last fall, when we began the Foreign Relations Committee's extensive hearings on NATO expansion, I gave the administration a clear warning emphasizing that there was a right way and a wrong way to expand NATO and that, in my view, and in the view of many Senators, the administration was doing it the wrong way.

Some may recall that when Secretary Albright first came to testify before the Foreign Relations Committee, I told that fine lady that while I wanted to be helpful to her in achieving Senate ratification of NATO expansion, it was essential that we work together to fix what was wrong with the administration's approach and make sure it was done the right way. During the ensuing months, that is precisely what we have done.

We have held eight—count them—eight separate hearings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to discuss and debate every aspect of the administration's plan for NATO expansion. We heard from 38 different witnesses, who testified at some length each, and we produced a hearing transcript that is 552 printed pages long.

In the Foreign Relations Committee, we had worked with Secretary Albright

to make the necessary course corrections in the administration's original approach to expansion. I can report now that we have successfully made those course corrections. When we finally vote on the Senate's resolution of ratification, we will not just be voting to expand NATO, we will be voting to expand NATO the right way.

The administration has agreed to a tightly worded resolution of ratification which includes strict, legally binding language that, among other things, requires that the core purpose of NATO must continue to be the collective defense of the territory of all NATO members, not just peacekeeping or the achievement of so-called nonmilitary goals.

It requires that NATO defense planning command structures and force goals be centered on ensuring the territorial defense of a number of countries.

It builds impenetrable firewalls in the NATO-Russia relationship, ensuring that Russia will have neither a voice nor a veto in NATO decision-making and that the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council be a forum for explaining, not negotiating, NATO policy decisions.

It requires extensive consultation with the Senate in the case of any proposed changes in the strategic concept of NATO.

It reaffirms that NATO does not require the consent of the United Nations or any other international organization to take any actions it deems necessary to defend the security interests of its members.

It requires the administration to develop and to report to Congress on a plan for a NATO ballistic missile defense system to protect Europe.

And it places strict limits on the cost to the American taxpayers for expansion, ensuring that our current NATO allies pay their fair share of the cost and that the American taxpayers will no longer be required to subsidize the national expenses of any countries, including the new members—Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic—for them to meet their NATO commitments.

If the administration had refused to accept these and other conditions contained in the resolution, Mr. President, I guarantee we would not have the consensus that we have here this afternoon. I would, under that circumstance, be on the Senate floor all this week leading the fight to delay NATO expansion until the administration did accept those conditions, and the professional commentators would probably be criticizing the Senate for holding this important administration priority hostage.

The consensus is not unanimity. A number of my Senate colleagues, for whom I have enormous respect, still have concerns. For one, we have heard some Senators raise the issue of NATO dilution. I am concerned about the dilution of NATO as well, but let's not confuse the issue. No one—no one—should be concerned that adding these new members will somehow dilute NATO. What we need to prevent is the dilution of NATO's mission and NATO's purpose, and we need to make sure that peacekeeping and nation building do not eclipse territorial defense as a primary alliance function.

I believe we have done that with our resolution of ratification by requiring that NATO defense planning remain focused on territorial defense and tied to the security of NATO members, not vague concepts like stability in Europe. There is none of that in this resolution of ratification.

The most important step we can take to stop NATO dilution is to bring Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic into the NATO alliance, and these countries know better than anybody else the need to keep NATO focused on territorial defense. Each of these countries spent the better part of this century, remember, either under foreign occupation or as satellites of a hostile superpower. They represent three more votes within the councils of NATO for the view of NATO with a clear-cut but limited mission.

Some have suggested that we take steps to curtail NATO's ability to act ''out of area,'' as they put it; that is to say, outside of the North Atlantic area. That would be a serious mistake. The threats to the NATO alliance are changing and evolving. The day may not be far off when the principal threat to the territory of NATO members would not be a resurgent Russia but a missile strike or a terrorist attack launched by rogue states such as Iran, Iraq, Syria, or Libya.

The point is this, Mr. President: Would we really want to constrain NATO's ability to respond out of area with disproportionate force against a regime who dared to use chemical or biological weapons on the territory of a NATO member? Would we want to bar NATO's ability to strike out of area to prevent such attacks? Of course we wouldn't. With the end of the cold war, NATO's ability to act out of area will be more important as threats to the territory of NATO members change and evolve.

Some have said that NATO expansion is unnecessarily provocative to Russia. That is just plain wrong. NATO expansion in no way threatens Russian democracy or precludes building friendly relations with Russia. If anything, it will make it easier for us to maintain friendly relations with Russia, because an expanded NATO will shut off Russia's avenue to more destructive patterns of behavior.

Henry Kissinger pointed out that NATO expansion will ''encourage Russian leaders to break with the fateful rhythm of Russian history . . . and discourage Russia's historical policy of creating a security belt of important and, if possible, politically dependent states around its borders.''

In other words, what he was saying is Russia will no longer have the option, should the temptation ever arise, of seeking to restore its hegemony in Central Europe. With that avenue shut off, Russia is more likely to seek constructive options in its relations with the West.

Some others have suggested that the Senate require that Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic first gain admission to the European Union before we admit them to NATO. With all due respect to our friends in Europe, the European Union could not find its way out of a wet paper bag, and we need to face up to that.

Giving the European Union a veto over who does and who does not get into NATO would be nothing less than the abdication of American leadership in Europe. The fact is this: Admitting Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to NATO is in America's best interest. If it were not, I would not be standing here this afternoon. These nations will be among the most reliable pro-American NATO allies that we could ever hope for. Indeed, I would go so far as to say that not only do these countries need NATO, America needs these countries in NATO.

That was certainly clear to me during the standoff with Iraq earlier this year. While many of our current NATO allies stuck their heads in the sand and wiggled their fannies, Poland and Hungary and the Czech Republic did not do that. They immediately and without hesitation said, ''We will send troops in alongside the American forces if a military response is necessary in Iraq.''

Furthermore, while many of our friends in Europe pursue policies in Cuba and China—that is, self-serving policies—these countries stand with us in working to promote human rights and to promote democracy in those last few bastions of communism.

So, Mr. President, I am convinced that Poland and Hungary and the Czech Republic will be among the first to stand with us in times of crisis and will support America as we work to ensure that NATO remains what it is today—the most effective military alliance in human history.

As I have tried to make clear, through the efforts of many Senators we have ensured with this pending resolution of ratification that NATO expansion is done the right way. I urge all Senators to vote for this resolution and right the historical wrongs of Yalta and support NATO expansion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The distinguished majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased the Senate is beginning to formally debate now the enlargement of NATO. I want to emphasize that this is the ''formal'' beginning of the debate. The real beginning goes back more than 4 years.

I want to again commend and congratulate the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for his work on

this issue and his leadership, and, of course, the ranking member, the Senator from Delaware. I note the presence of two other distinguished Senators on the floor, Senator WARNER and Senator MOYNIHAN. They have some very important views which they will express, and they will have an amendment or amendments that I think will be very carefully considered by the Senate.

I do think it is important that we note that this issue has been debated for years. We did have some discussion a month ago. But because Senators felt that they needed more time to consider the issues—at least one Senator expressed the desire to actually go to Europe and meet with our allies, meet with NATO ambassadors, go to the affected countries. I thought that was a legitimate request, so some time was allowed to pass.

But now I think it is important that we stay focused on this. There will be no other issue that will be debated today or tomorrow or Wednesday other than NATO enlargement so that Senators will have a chance to focus, and so that the news media will feel this debate has been focused, and we can give it the consideration that a historic treaty of this nature deserves.

I had hoped that the U.S. Senate could have been the first country to vote on the enlargement of NATO. But Canada, Germany and Denmark have already ratified the enlargement by overwhelming margins.

I must express some surprise over media accounts which claim the Senate is giving NATO enlargement short shrift and we are rushing to judgment. We have not. We will not. The Senate should not rush to judgment on a treaty of this magnitude.

In 1994, in 1995, and in 1996 the Senate explicitly voted on urging NATO enlargement. The implications of this issue were all raised by opponents of that legislation, and in each case the legislation was overwhelmingly passed. But it has been debated and discussed and considered by the previous administration, by this administration, and by Congresses and the Senate since 1994.

Last April, I realized how serious this issue was. That is why I, along with the Democratic leader, created a special group, with the endorsement of the President, beyond the existing committee structure, to make sure that Senators were involved and were thinking about this enlargement question, to make sure that Senators on both sides of the aisle, not on the committees directly involved, would have a chance to attend hearings and go to Europe.

The Senate NATO enlargement group included 28 percent of the Senate—28 Senators. I made it a particular point to make sure that Senators who had reservations that had already been expressed would be included. That is why Senator WARNER was in the group, Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON was in the group. Senator MOYNIHAN was included. And it did include members from the Appropriations Committee, the Armed Services Committee, the Intelligence and Foreign Relations Committees.

The observer group held 17 meetings with administration officials as well as political and military leaders from Europe. Senator ROTH led two observer group delegations to Europe.

I want to say at this point that I, too, took the time to go and meet with our allies. I went to London, and then I went to Brussels. I met with all of the NATO ambassadors. I went to Budapest, Hungary. I have taken advantage of opportunities to meet with leaders from the Czech Republic and Poland as well as Hungary to make sure I understood all the ramifications of this very important issue.

I think the criticism that we moved too quickly or have not seriously considered the issues of NATO enlargement does a real disservice to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Their hearing record, for instance, from just 6 weeks last year is 552 pages long, reflecting six hearings with 32 witnesses.

More than 20 Senators have already spoken on NATO enlargement here on the floor when it was considered last month. GAO and CRS have issued more than 30 reports on NATO enlargement. More than 1,000 op-eds, editorials and articles have been published in newspapers and academic journals on NATO enlargement. In fact, just recently I have seen endorsements, I believe, from the Washington Post and the Washington Times and criticism from the New York Times. So there has been a lot of thought, and a lot of articles and editorials have been written on this very important matter.

Let me provide an answer to one of the questions about the timing and nature of the Senate debate on this momentous issue. Why is there not more controversy? The answer is the supporters of NATO enlargement have been successfully making the case for 5 years. The arguments in support of NATO enlargement have convinced an impressive array of individuals and organizations. Much of the groundwork has been laid. That is why the 1996 platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties endorsed NATO enlargement. That is why every living former Secretary of State supports NATO enlargement.

I have made up my mind to support NATO enlargement. I believe it is in the strategic, moral, and political interests of the United States, as well as Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic.

Later this week all Senators will have a chance to vote on this issue. I think they will have all the time—I am going to make sure they have all the time they need to express themselves. I think the vote will be decided by an overwhelming margin. And it is a question not only of the security of the United States, but expanding the NATO alliance to these three countries. I think it will shape the future of Europe for many years to come.

I do subscribe to the view expressed by some—I believe Senator BIDEN has said this—that it is a natural extension of having won the cold war in that it is extending the ring of freedom to those countries that would like to join NATO.

That is one thing that impressed me so much. In Hungary, they have made progress toward democracy. They are making progress toward a stronger economy. They do want to have better communication and cooperation between our military capabilities. They are committed to doing the things that are necessary to help their country as a member of NATO and as they move toward full membership in the European Union. I think they would be greatly disturbed if at this point, after all these considerations and after the efforts they have taken after the votes that they had in their own countries, if we walked away from this opportunity.

There are those who say, ''Well, what about Russia? Won't they be alarmed by this?'' First, it is interesting to me that some of our colleagues who have felt the strongest against the Soviet Union and have raised the most concerns about Russia are the ones now saying, ''Oh, well, what will Russia think?'' Well, I think we should consider that.

But look at Senator LUGAR, who for years has been trying to make sure that the United States worked on its relations with Russia. He is for the NATO enlargement. He would certainly not want to do something that would harm the interests we share in a developing relationship with Russia. The bottom line is that NATO poses no threat to Russia or Russians unless Russia has ambitions against current or prospective NATO members.

As I noted, Senator WARNER will have an amendment to have a 3-year pause before NATO acts to invite additional members. There is no Member who is more thoughtful than Senator JOHN WARNER of Virginia when it comes to our national security, our military, NATO, and European security interests. I do not think that he is right in this instance that we need this pause. I think it would send the wrong signals.

I think we can make the right judgment as to how much time should be required or when additional countries would be invited to join. But I do think it is important we think about that and that we give all the time that is desired to the Senators who want to advance this amendment so that we can think clearly about what will the future hold as far as other countries that might be considered for admission to NATO and where it will eventually lead.

But we do have unanimous support from, as I said, the former Secretaries of State. We have the support of former President Bush, former President Carter, and a bipartisan group of five former Senators. I ask unanimous consent that their letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSTON, TX,
February 24, 1998.

His Excellency VACLAV HAVEL,
President of the Czech Republic,
Prague.

DEAR VACLAV: I was delighted to receive your letter of February 10 favoring NATO expansion. Though I have no authority anymore, I certainly will take into consideration your arguments when discussing NATO expansion, which I strongly favor.

It is my view that Russia itself is better off with an expanded NATO, though Russia clearly does not see it that way yet.

On another subject, I was very pleased to see that picture of you greeting one of your Olympic heroes. You look well and that pleases me, for I have been concerned about your health.

Warm best wishes from your friend,

GEORGE BUSH.

THE CARTER CENTER,
Atlanta, GA, March 18, 1998.

Hon. Senate Majority Leader TRENT LOTT,
Senate Russell Office Building,
Washington, DC.

To Senate Majority Leader TRENT LOTT: I understand that the full Senate will soon consider the amendments to the Washington Treaty of 1949, which created NATO, to admit The Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary as new members.

Given the strong bipartisan support for NATO expansion as reflected in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee vote, I hope that through your leadership the full Senate will give its overwhelming endorsement as well.

I was initially very concerned about the potential negative reactions within Russia. Like many, I was concerned that forces within Russia who perceived NATO expansion as a reflection of Russian weakness could marshall public opinion in opposition to close ties to the West and to further moves toward disarmament, particularly nuclear. My concerns have, however, been considerably alleviated through the open and forthright way Russia's fears have been addressed, although I realize there are still many opposed in Russia, which may be reflected in the Duma's debate over ratification of the Start II Treaty.

I believe it is vitally important to US foreign policy and security interests that NATO remain the cornerstone of cooperation on security matters in Europe, all the more as we witness the continued unrest in the Balkans. Strong, bipartisan support from the Senate would be seen in Europe as a clear indication of US commitment. I therefore encourage all Senators to view NATO expansion as very much in the US interest and give my full endorsement.

Sincerely,

JIMMY CARTER.

APRIL 23, 1998.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Senate Majority Leader,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MAJORITY LEADER: In the next few days, the United States Senate will be confronted with a historic vote: the expansion of NATO to include Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

We have watched the rapid progress of these three countries as they have rejoined the free societies of the world community. We are convinced that expanding NATO is good for the Alliance and for the United States.

It is unquestionably in the interest of the American people for Europe to remain free and democratic, safe and secure. Having won the Cold War, we now have a fleeting chance to secure through peace what we once fought to achieve through war.

The Senate has held numerous hearings regarding NATO expansion, all of which have examined the issues surrounding the NATO debate. At least three different committees have examined every aspect of NATO enlargement. Even more importantly, the full Senate has acted on a number of occasions on legislation that would help speed the transition of Central European countries into NATO. The Senate has held several major debates and taken recorded votes as early as January 1994 that demonstrate overwhelming support for rapid transition for Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic into NATO. The process, therefore, has been protracted, intensive and conclusive.

Now, the world watches for a sign of American leadership. To hesitate would send a signal that the U.S. role in the world has begun to drift. We urge our former colleagues to shine forth with a strong signal of leadership by voting in support of NATO expansion.

Sincerely,

HANK BROWN.
ALAN DIXON.
ALAN SIMPSON.
PAUL SIMON.
GEORGE MITCHELL.

Mr. LOTT. I am looking forward to listening to the debate. I know that it will rise to the standard that the Senate has always reached in consideration of historic matters of this type. I think when we get to the conclusion, hopefully by Wednesday, the American people will feel we have done our duty appropriately.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my distinguished leader and very dear friend for his kind remarks. But I would say that if the issue of sufficient time to debate was ever an issue, then it is long since to be put aside because, as the distinguished leader recited very carefully this morning, the Senate has given a lot of very conscientious deliberation to this issue, and now we have had a recess of some several weeks during which a number of colleagues, I say to the leader, and others, have had the opportunity to reflect adequately, in my judgment, on the seriousness of this question. It is time that we proceed today. I am confident at such time as the Senate reaches the vote this week, there will be no voice in opposition based on the absence of an adequate opportunity to consider it. So I thank the distinguished majority leader, and indeed the minority leader who collaborated in seeing that the Senate had adequate time.

We have our differences, Mr. President. And I should propound a question or two to my distinguished colleague momentarily, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. But first I think it is important—Senator MOYNIHAN and I have joined in our collaborative efforts to bring to the attention of the Senate our concerns in the form of two amendments.

I will say, although not present at the moment on the floor, there are many others who have joined with us. Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, I spoke with him just moments ago. He will be joining in the debate this afternoon—Mr. HARKIN.

It is truly, Mr. President, a bipartisan effort of some Senators who spent many long hours working together and discussing this issue very thoroughly. There is not to be found in this debate, in my judgment, a single element of partisanship. It is truly a debate of conscience.

For the assistance of Senators, Mr. MOYNIHAN and I will put in the RECORD today, without objection, Mr. President, a letter from Paul Nitze, of the School of Advanced International Studies and a letter from Mr. George Kennan, former Ambassador to the then-Soviet Union—two men who have dedicated much of their careers to the very issue about which we will be discussing, NATO and, most specifically, its enlargement. I ask unanimous consent those letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, THE PAUL H. NITZE SCHOOL OF ADVANCED INTERNATIONAL STUDIES,
Washington, DC, April 24, 1998.

Hon. DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: Your effort to introduce a more deliberate approach to the question of NATO expansion is most constructive. We are in a period of great change in the security challenges for which our country must be prepared, but it is also an era in which we would be foolish to squander the opportunities opened by the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Perhaps the most important such opportunity is the chance to bring Russia into the community of nations. A sensible policy to support that objective would concentrate on lending political and economic support to the development of a democratic, market-oriented society in Russia. NATO expansion distracts both us and the Russians from that goal. Indeed, the open-ended expansion being proposed for the alliance points toward increasing friction with post-Communist Russia for years to come. Driving Russia into a corner plays into the arguments of those most hostile to forging a productive relationship with the United States and its allies. It is not a sound basis for future stability in Europe, particularly when no current or projected threats warrant extending the alliance.

As you and Senator Warner have proposed, the preferable path surely lies in the direction of enlarging the European Union to embrace the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Negotiations have now begun for the accession to the EU of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, along with others. Encouraging those negotiations is the most useful emphasis the Senate could give to current trends in Europe. It makes no sense at all to enlarge NATO merely ''to fill the void,'' as one senior administration official described the current process. We should, on the contrary, use the period while the EU is negotiating its own enlargement to demonstrate that the Partnership for Peace—which now has more than 25 partners—is the suitable relationship for European countries which are not members of NATO.

In the present security environment, NATO expansion is not only unnecessary; it is gratuitous. If we want a Europe whole and free, we are not likely to get it by making NATO fat and feeble.

Sincerely,

PAUL H. NITZE.

[From the World Policy Journal, Spring, 1998]

MAROONED IN THE COLD WAR

(An Exchange between Mark Danner and George F. Kennan, Strobe Talbott, and Lee H. Hamilton)

(Mark Danner's article, ''Marooned in the Cold War: America, the Alliance, and the Quest for a Vanished World,'' which was published in the fall 1997 issue of this journal, elicited a strong response from prominent writers in government and out. An exchange of letters between Richard Holbrooke, former assistant secretary of state for European affairs, and Mr. Danner appeared in our winter 1997/98 issue. In the following pages, we are pleased to publish letters in response to ''Marooned in the Cold War'' addressed to Mr. Danner by the eminent historian and diplomat George F. Kennan, Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, and Rep. Lee H. Hamilton, ranking Democratic member of the House Committee on International Relations, along with Mr. Danner's replies.)

From George F. Kennan: I have read the article twice, once upon receiving it and again just a short time ago, before writing this letter. It is hard for me to express, without pressing the border of the fulsome, my reactions to it. Let me just say that I have seen no finer treatment than this one, both as a summary of the salient features of the conduct of American policy in earlier decades of this century, and as a treatment of the bewilderments into which we are now heading. What a pity, I find myself thinking, that this article could not be given the wide exposure it deserves and allowed to serve as cornerstone for a national debate on the problems and directions of American policy at this crucial post-Cold War moment. To put it briefly, the article is, to my way of thinking, in all respects excellent.

That neither this article, nor any other broad and thoughtful treatment of the questions you write about, could serve the purpose I have just mentioned, is obvious. It would be drowned in the cacophony created by the television, computer, and advertising industries which, each in its way, if they were to take any notice of it at all, would do so only in order to tear it to pieces and to exploit individual pieces as over-simplified sound-bites, here today and gone tomorrow. In itself, as I am sure you would agree, what is at stake in this sad state of affairs is a problem of tragic and momentous importance; for the situation now prevailing stands firmly in the way of the creation in influential American opinion of any quiet thoughtful concepts of American policy and hence of any really useful and constructive employment of the great and unique potential weight of this country in world affairs. But the national political establishment, as now existing, has shown itself totally incapable even of understanding the true dimensions of this problem, and much less in tackling it effectively; and one cannot now look to it for anything more than what it is capable of giving.

This was the reason why, in one of my books (*Around the Cragged Hill*) I urged the establishment of a wholly nonpolitical but prestigious advisory body, totally outside the boundaries of the political process, to address some of the deeper problems of the country and to let its advice, conclusions, and recommendations be pondered by presidents, Congresses, state and local governments, and people at large. But never, I am sure, have any of my words ever met with less resonance than did the pages on which that suggestion was put forward; and with this total indifference facing me, I have seen no reason to press it further.

So much for the article in general. Now for one nit-pick and a couple of comments.

You refer to the Russians, on page 18, as having ''accepted'' the expansion of the NATO borders. Whether this is or is not a correct understanding depends on the meaning you give to the word ''accepted.'' If it be taken to mean that one accepts something highly unwillingly and regretfully, persuaded that one has no other alternative, that is one thing. But if one accepts it in the sense that one has become persuaded of its merits, approves of it, welcomes it, and would not wish things to be otherwise, that, of course, is something else.

No one in authority in Russia today would, I am sure, accept the NATO expansion in the latter of these two senses. In the former? Yes, the vast majority would see it that way. What, after all, could they do about it? They could not oppose it by force of arms. The NATO leaders had said that they would not discuss it. They repeatedly emphasized that their decision was final, and that was that.

Yeltsin personally would probably accommodate himself to this state of affairs more easily than others would have done. He was plainly disinclined to make a serious issue of it in his relations with NATO, and with the United States in particular. But he too, has repeatedly stated publicly (and most recently only in the last few days) that he could not accept the expansion. On the contrary he regretted and deplored it. And in other sections of the regime, in the Parliament and among the military leadership, feelings were plainly angry and resentful. Neither of these circles, after all—neither the Parliamentarians nor the military leaders—had been, so far as the outsider can see, consulted or allowed to participate in the recent meetings between Yeltsin and Western leaders where these questions of the NATO expansion were discussed. The military, in particular, have felt themselves humiliated and demeaned in their professional dignity by this unilateral decision on the part of the Western powers, and have seen it as a shameful exploitation of a temporary and quite abnormal weakness in their own military posture.

The American authors of the expansion, disquieted, I suspect, by some of the adverse reactions their initiative has unleashed, have been at pains to persuade us that the Russians have actually accepted it voluntarily, that they are now quite happy about it, and that it will cause no serious difficulty. The nationalist elements in the Russian public, they point out, consist primarily of older people, now a passing generation, who have never had great electoral support. The youth, they would say, have for the most part supported Yeltsin. And the common people don't care.

Perhaps, perhaps. But the military have not yet been heard from. And aside from that, a process has now been put in motion that can hardly be stopped until NATO has come to take in practically all of Europe except the Balkans, at the risk of making of itself a dangerous absurdity rather than a meaningful alliance.

But enough of that. There is one more comment that I should like to make. Madame Albright is quoted as saying that NATO's foundation, 50 years ago, ''gave Europe confidence in economic recovery.'' I would have to challenge that statement quite flatly. It was not all the foundation of NATO but rather the Marshall Plan, put forward one to two years earlier, that had this effect. The foundation of NATO was actually a detraction from the beneficial effect that the Marshall Plan was at that time having on European opinion and particularly on the confidence of the Europeans in their own economic recovery. The foundation of NATO demanded that very large sums, which otherwise could have gone into the economic recovery process, were now to be diverted into the building up of armed forces in the center of Europe. And this, a number of us felt, was not only unnecessary, given the circumstances of that moment, but directly detrimental to certain of the positive developments which the Marshall Plan had put in motion.

The wider and more lasting basis for my own opposition to the NATO expansion will be visible to you, I think, from the enclosed copies of two of the final pages of my own last book (*At a Century's Ending*), pages that were written, I seem to recall, at the end of the year 1994.

My congratulations, once more, on the qualities of your article, not the least, if not the most important, of which was the excellence of the writing *October 15, 1997.*

Mr. Danner replies: As I sit down to write I must frankly admit that I run the clear risk—as you so well put it—of ''pressing the border of the fulsome.'' The fact is, the beauty and extraordinary generosity of what you wrote left me rather stunned.

In the last quarter century, I have read, I believe, nearly everything you have written. To me you became—and here I am afraid I tread very close to that perilous border—something of a hero. In large part, this was because of the tenacity of your principles (a phrase that should properly be redundant but in our world today sadly is not). Perhaps in equal part, though, it was because of the supreme artistry of your work.

Of course, I agree fully, and sadly, with you that ''the national political establishment . . . has shown itself totally incapable even of understanding the true dimensions of this problem.'' And yet nonetheless I find myself increasingly amazed by the steady and silent progress of the enlargement policy. I suppose I go on hoping that the debate must come; and yet as the days pass the phrases of our senior public officials simply grow murkier and murkier and the public discussion, what little of it there is, is directed more toward obscuring the underlying issues than uncovering and illuminating them. I wish, for example, I had had the wit to point out, as you do, that in declaring that NATO had originally given Europe ''confidence in economic recovery,'' Mrs. Albright not only speaks inaccurately but manages to falsify a history of competing military alliances and civilian institutions that might well have taught today's policymakers a critical lesson, if they had bothered to look.

Now, of course, arguments of frank absurdity hold the stage, notably Mrs. Albright's repeated declarations, as she promotes the expansion of the alliance, that in Europe there is now ''no more us and them.'' There is only one side.'' Many erstwhile critics, meantime, let themselves sink into bleak resignation.

I certainly agree, and hope I made clear in my message, that the Russians can be said to have ''accepted'' the expansion only in the most limited sense, so limited in fact that the word ''accept'' used in this way, might as well be meaningless. The least that can be said of this is that a dynamic process has begun, and no one can doubt that it takes relations between our two countries in a very different direction from the one in which we were traveling only four or five years ago. It seems impossible to say what might have

happened; but I am profoundly disappointed that some of the positive elements of those relations are now very unlikely to be pursued.

By the way, I know At the Century's Ending, and its beautifully crafted last pages, very well. Rereading the photocopies you sent has encouraged me to go back to the book's beginning, and I am now happily in the midst of making my way through its pages once more.

Mr. WARNER. Also, Mr. President, I would like to place in the RECORD excerpts from a speech delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from New York, Mr. MOYNIHAN, before the Associated Press on April 20, in which he outlined with some specificity, and indeed absolute clarity, his deep concerns. And he put it in a historical context. This is a document worthy of each Senator's consideration as they proceed to prepare themselves fully for this debate.

I will read one excerpt, as follows:

And there were reservations. George Kennan, for one, felt economic recovery as embodied in the Marshall Plan provided the best hope for peace. The eventual incorporation of a prospering Federal Republic of Germany surely attests to this thought. History is repeating itself, so much that it could be said we are on the verge of fighting the last war.

Half a century ago, the Soviets kept their eastern neighbors out of the Marshall Plan, so an Iron Curtain descended across Europe. Five decades later, it is the west Europeans who are not prepared to admit the Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, Slovenians, Estonians, who have made clear their hopes to join a continental common market, the European Union, which would make for a united and secure Europe. Last fall Ambassador Richard Holbrooke noted the irony, ''Almost a decade has gone by since the Berlin Wall fell and, instead of reaching out to Central Europe, the European Union turned toward a bizarre search for a common currency. So NATO enlargement had to fill the void.''

Allow me to suggest that wandering in this void we may stumble into the catastrophe of nuclear war with Russia.

This would come about not from Russian strength, but Russian weakness. This is an idea we find difficult to absorb and understandably so. But we had better do [that].

Russians have been trying to tell us this.

I will have the remainder of the excerpts printed in the RECORD, but I think as we proceed in this debate there are a number of documents that should be carefully considered. I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts I referred to be printed in the RECORD, along with the most recent cost estimate by the Congressional Budget Office, dated March 17, 1998.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM SENATOR MOYNIHAN'S SPEECH

The founding of NATO in 1949, then a pact of 12 nations, was an act of rare foresight and political will. Yet, it had its ambiguities. At the signing ceremony, President Truman observed that the alliance was made necessary because ''one of the major powers''—the USSR—had blocked the formation of an international force provided for in Article 43 of the Charter that was to have enabled the United Nations to preserve world peace. By contrast, the AP account of the signing ceremony recorded that the French Foreign Minister, ''speaking in his native tongue,'' noted that the new treaty in no way compromised his country's nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union. Rather, said the French Minister in the words of the dispatch, ''This is directed against a possible future German menace.'' Indeed, in 1966, President Charles de Gaulle, having developed an independent atomic potential, withdrew France from NATO and unceremoniously threw our headquarters cadre out of his country.

And there were reservations. George Kennan, for one, felt economic recovery as embodied in the Marshall Plan provided the best hope of peace. The eventual incorporation of a prospering Federal Republic of Germany surely attests to this thought.

Much of this history is repeating itself, so much that it could be said we are on the verge of fighting the last war. Half a century ago the Soviets kept their Eastern neighbors out of the Marshall Plan, and so an iron curtain descended across Europe. Five decades later it is the west Europeans who are not prepared to admit the Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, Slovenes, Estonians, who have made clear their hopes to join a continental common market, the European Union, which would make for a united and secure Europe. Last fall Ambassador Richard Holbrooke noted the irony, ''Almost a decade has gone by since the Berlin Wall fell and, instead of reaching out to Central Europe, the European Union turned toward a bizarre search for a common currency. So NATO enlargement had to fill a void.''

Allow me to suggest that wandering in this void we may stumble into the catastrophe of nuclear war with Russia.

This would come about not from Russian strength, but Russian weakness. This is an idea we find difficult to absorb and understandably so. But we had better do.

Russians have been trying to tell us this. On December 7, 1988, Mikhail Gorbachev gave an extraordinary speech to the General Assembly of the United Nations declaring, ''We in no way aspire to be the bearer of ultimate truth.'' The Marxist promise had failed in astonishing ways. (Thus, in 1996, a 16-year-old Russian male had only a 54 percent chance of surviving to age 60; two percentage points *less* than had he been born a century earlier!) In the meantime, ethnic hostilities, which were in theory meant to disappear, seemed to rise on every hand. In 1992, Gorbachev spoke to us in Statuary Hall in the Capitol of the problems of Russians now outside Russia:

''One problem which is assuming an acute and at times dramatic character in Russia is that of ethnic enclaves which, thanks to the breakup of the formerly unified state organism are being violently separated from their accustomed motherland, and now find themselves on the other side of a national boundary. . . .

''The situation is aggravated by the paroxysms of extreme nationalism which have here and there generated direct discrimination against minorities. Sometimes this is carried to a point which resembles apartheid. In this situation, any incautious step by anyone, however well intended it might be, can be misinterpreted and used in a way contrary to what was anticipated.''

''Any incautious step.'' As, for example, expanding NATO to the Soviet border of Kaliningrad. Or officials in Moscow comparing the leader of Latvia to Pol Pot, as happened just last week.

Also last week Charles Krauthammer, blunt as ever asked in The Washington Post column: ''Is NATO expansion directed against Russia?'' ''Of course it is,'' he answered.

If we don't see that, surely the Russians do. This is painfully clear in their National Security Blueprint issued by President Yeltsin on December 17, 1997. It is a 14,500 word assessment of their bleak situation and their only seeming option. ''The former defense system has been disrupted, and the creation of a new one is proceeding slowly. Long unprotected sections of the Russian Federation state border have appeared.'' What does remain and does work are the strategic nuclear forces. And so:

''Russia reserves the right to use all the forces and systems at its disposal, including nuclear weapons, if the unleashing of armed aggression results in a threat to the actual existence of the Russian Federation as an independent sovereign state.''

Conspiciously, the Duma has yet to ratify the START II Treaty signed in 1991. In a careful argument against NATO expansion first published in The Los Angeles Times, Howard Baker, Sam Nunn, Brent Scowcroft and Alton Frye termed this a doctrine of ''inflexible response.'' A generation of arms negotiations, beginning under President Eisenhower, all directed against ''first use'' nuclear policies seems now to have been rejected.

A Newsday editorial of March 15 began with George Kennan's stark assessment: ''Expanding NATO would be the most fateful error of American policy in the entire post-cold-war era.''

More recently Kennan has written in World Policy Journal:

''. . . what is at stake in this sad state of affairs is a problem of tragic and momentous importance; for the situation now prevailing stands firmly in the way of the creation in influential American opinion of any quiet thoughtful concepts of American policy and hence of any really useful and constructive employment of the great and unique potential weight of this country in world affairs. But the national political establishment, as now existing, has shown itself totally incapable even of understanding the true dimensions of this problem, and much less in tackling it effectively; and one cannot now look to it for anything more than what it is capable of giving.''

Now is the time to look to the Senate. There will be a debate. Thanks to the insistence of Senators such as John Warner, Bob Smith, and Tom Harkin, there will be a debate. As of now there is not much doubt as to the outcome. This could change. Public opinion would seem to be changing. As recent Pew opinion survey found that approval for NATO expansion has dropped to 49 percent, with a large undecided element.

But should the vote go as expected, may we at least hope that the people and that the ''national political establishment,'' as Ambassador Kennan has it, be alert to the risk we will have taken? We might even change our mind one day. We might even recall that Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations recognizes ''the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations. . . .'' Which includes every nation in Eastern Europe. This is grounds on which we went to war with Iraq. It is the law of nations. Concerning which at the General Assembly in 1988, Gorbachev declared ''Pacta Sunt Servanda.'' Agreements must be kept. That is all President Truman intended at that ceremony in 1949. The law of the Charter must be enforced. Such ''idealism'' no longer resonates with Americans. But surely it is the great standard we have given the world. Russia included. It deserves our attention.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 17, 1998.

Hon. JESSE HELMS,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for the Resolution of Ratification of Treaty Document 105–36.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Jeannette Deshong, who can be reached at 226–2840.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL.

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

RESOLUTION OF RATIFICATION OF TREATY DOCUMENT 105–36

(Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on Accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic)

Summary

The resolution would ratify protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 that would admit Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic as members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Expanding the alliance would require the United States to contribute additional funding for equipment or capabilities shared by members of NATO. CBO estimates that those costs would initially be in the tens of millions of dollars and would reach about $100 million a year after four or five years. Ultimately, the United States and its NATO allies have considerable discretion in how to implement the protocols and, therefore, in the costs that would be incurred.

Estimated Cost to the Federal Government

On December 16, 1997, the United States and the other parties to the North Atlantic Treaty signed protocols to expand NATO to include three new members. Article V of the treaty commits each nation to provide assistance—including the use of armed force—to restore and maintain the security of any threatened member. The protocols, if ratified, would extend full NATO membership to Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic including a security guarantee under Article V.

In addition to spending for special national needs, NATO members contribute funds for equipment and facilities needed to accomplish common goals. NATO members share the costs of the alliance's spending for civilian and military headquarters, the Airborne Early Warning Force, various science and public information programs, and the NATO Security Investment Program (SIP) that covers common infrastructure projects, communications and air defense systems. Overall totals for the commonly funded budgets are determined collectively, and individual contributions are based on formulas for burden sharing.

Expanding the alliance would entail greater costs for improving command, control, communications, logistics and infrastructure—primarily the activities covered under SIP. The United States and its NATO allies, however, would have considerable discretion in how to implement the protocols and, therefore, in the costs that would be incurred. For example, standards for facilities, equipment, and training cover a wide range. Depending on what standards NATO sets, the budgetary consequences could vary substantially. Nevertheless, NATO has provided some initial studies that lay out basic military requirements.

At the December 1997 ministerial meetings, NATO's Senior Resource Board (SRB) presented cost estimates for expansion-related projects that would be eligible for common funding. In that report, the SRB identified costs of $1.5 billion for the next ten years. Assuming that current rules for burden sharing would continue under the protocols, the United States would cover 25 percent of those costs, or approximately $40 million per year. Similarly, the Department of Defense (DoD) assumes that NATO funding will increase gradually over the next four to five years with U.S. assessments for additional military costs reaching $36 million in 2002.

CBO's estimate includes an allowance of $25 million a year for the likelihood that U.S. costs would rise as NATO finalizes implementation plans, engineering surveys, and eligibility criteria for common funding. U.S. costs might also be higher if new member countries face difficulties paying for infrastructure or if military plans become more ambitious. In addition, the United States is likely to incur bilateral costs for expanded exercises, training, and programs to incorporate NATO compatible equipment into the Central European militaries. CBO estimates these costs would be low in the near-term but could amount to $30 million to $45 million a year after 2001 based on additional exercise costs for one brigade and two air squadrons every year plus the cost of subsidies for weapons purchases by the new members.

Thus, CBO estimates that the costs to the United States of expanding NATO would total about $100 million a year after a transition period of four or five years. Roughly 90 percent of these costs would be charged to Defense Department accounts for operation and maintenance, and military construction. The remaining 10 percent would accrue to budget function 150, International Affairs.

Previous CBO estimate

The CBO paper *The Cost of Expanding the NATO Alliance* (March 1996) explored five different scenarios for extending the NATO security guarantee to four central European countries. The scenarios ranged from a low-threat security environment that called for minimal NATO reinforcement of Central Europe to a scenario assuming a resurgent Russian threat that required the forward positioning of NATO troops in Central Europe.

The cost estimates in that report focused on the total costs to all NATO members, including the new members who would bear the largest shares of the total. Average annual costs to the United States over a 15-year period ranged from about $300 million to $1.3 billion. However, since CBO prepared that study, the SRB has provided clearer indications of how NATO would use its discretion to implement the protocols.

Pay-as-you-go considerations: None.

Intergovernmental and Private-Sector Impact

Section 4 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 excludes from the application of that act any legislative provisions that are necessary for the ratification or implementation of international treaty obligations. CBO has determined that these protocols fit within that exclusion, because they make the Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary parties to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949.

Estimate Prepared by: Federal Costs: Jeannette Deshong (226–2840); Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Pepper Santalucia (225–3220; Impact on the Private Sector: Eric Labs (226–2900).

Estimate approved by: Paul N. Van de Water, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Mr. WARNER. I shall read briefly from it the cost estimate.

The resolution would ratify protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 that would admit Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic as members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Expanding the alliance would require the United States to contribute additional funding for equipment or capabilities shared by members of NATO. CBO estimates that those costs would initially be in the tens of millions of dollars and would reach about $100 million a year after four or five years. Ultimately, the United States and its NATO allies have considerable discretion in how to implement the protocols and, therefore, in the costs that would be incurred.

Mr. President, I think it is essential that the Senate spend a great deal of time during the course of this debate on costs. Right now, the United States spends about one-fourth of the costs of the entire NATO—let me repeat that—the taxpayers of the United States spend one-fourth of the entire cost of NATO, a membership of 16 nations, and now we are asked to add three more.

On each Senator's desk were the hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee. I will ask a question of the distinguished chairman. I have looked through this, and I suggest at some point today he have printed in the RECORD those references in this well-done document which relate to costs.

I have to say in all fairness to my distinguished friend and chairman, I find very little addressing the issue of cost in this. It would be my hope that the committee could provide such supplemental material that can be of assistance to Senators on this issue of cost. The costs range from a low of $1.5 billion over 10 years—that is the NATO–U.S. estimate—to $125 billion over the same time; that was the original CBO estimate. The administration claims the U.S. share of expansion will cost $40 million per year for 10 years. But the March 17 CBO estimate cost resolution of ratification had costs much higher—$100 million per year.

Mr. President, we are embarking here in a few days on a decision which will have far-ranging implications, not only to the men and women of the United States who proudly wear the uniform today and tomorrow and for a decade hence in terms of their own personal security, in terms of the admissions of NATO—and I will address that momentarily—but to the American taxpayer, who for years, literally 50 years, have borne the majority of the costs associated with this treaty.

The time has come, I think, that we have to examine those costs and the burdensharing very carefully, and we should do that in the context of the deliberation on this treaty.

Another document that is on each Senator's desk is legislative notice—at least on our side of the aisle, and I presume a similar document is on the other side—and it points out NATO's new missions. It is my understanding that the new mission of NATO is a subject which is under study at this time, yet to be determined by NATO itself, much less ratified by the 16 nations through the forum of the North Atlantic Council.

So, again, we are asked to vote on enlargement of the treaty without knowing the future missions to which men and women of our Armed Forces and the other nations could be committed in the future.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Sir, would you be aware—and obviously this is a rhetorical question because the Senator is very much aware—that the resolution of ratification has a section, ''The Strategic Concept of NATO,'' in which I read, ''The Senate declares that NATO may also, pursuant to article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty, on a case-by-case basis engage in other missions when there is consensus among its members that there is a threat to the security and interests of NATO members.''

Would my distinguished friend not regard that as a huge expansion of the mission and territorially defined role from a specific North Atlantic Treaty Organization to a global treaty?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator is so correct in his observation.

In the course of addressing the press the other day, I said we are literally trying to create, through this expansion and the indefinite new missions, a 911 organization—''Call if there is a problem''—dial-a-cop, dial-a-soldier.

Mr. President, the American public has no idea what is taking place with regard to the expenditure of their tax dollars, with regard to the commitment of their sons and daughters for future NATO service. That is why it is so important we focus on the very point the distinguished Senator from New York raises.

There is an amendment to be considered by the Senate, I presume shortly, by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, Mr. ASHCROFT. I am joined as a cosponsor. It raises the precise question with regard to the future missions—I think we should pass that amendment—the basis of which would be to reestablish the original purpose of NATO as a collective defense of the member nations and not to go beyond the border unless it is clearly a dispute that puts in jeopardy the security of one or more members of NATO.

I hope the Senate will adopt that amendment, together with others, because we cannot allow this organization to become a response unit to any crisis in that part of the world. We will have lost its purpose, a purpose which has been magnificently served for over 50 years.

I challenge any Senator to point out another military alliance, another military treaty, that has served the American people, that has served Europe, that has served the cause of peace in half the world better than this. If it works, it works well; why try to fix it? We would not turn our back on a clear act of naked aggression against these three nations that are being considered for membership. I am certain that there would be an alliance probably consisting of the principal members of NATO that would come to their defense.

We see a similar alliance today in war-torn Bosnia. I, for one, feel that that is a conflict which represents the type of conflicts the world is most likely to experience in the years to come. I just made a trip to the Caspian Sea recently. That region has potentially one of the largest oil and gas reserves in the world, a world which is becoming desperate for more energy resources. But the nations that surround it are still embroiled internally, and with their bordering nations, in old ethnic and religious hatreds that go back, some, for centuries.

If I may depart for a moment, when I look at the magnificence of the United States of America, just over 100 or so years ago this Nation was torn apart by a cruel, devastating civil war, but we put it behind us, we have gone on. We took a north and a south and brought them together and reestablished ourselves militarily and economically to where we are the strongest nation in the world today. And to the extent that we refer to that tragic period, it is done only now with serious, contemplative reflection on history, which remains perhaps the single most studied chapter in history in contemporary America. I know my State, in which the majority of the battles of this region were fought, is host to hundreds of thousands of visitors every year. But the point I wish to make is that we put it behind us, we reconciled our differences, and we went on to become the strongest nation in the world.

Somehow, that is not an achievement that so many other nations of the world can seem to reach, and they still are embroiled in conflict. That is why I certainly am going to join in the debate and focus on this strategic concept of what the future missions of NATO are, and do it very carefully, and hopefully, even if these three nations are permitted to join, restrict it to what was a collective defense of the individual nations.

Mr. President, I just want to ask my distinguished chairman here, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, What is his view as to the costs and what are the basic facts on which he relies in bringing forth this treaty at this time to the Senate?

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, my response to my friend from Virginia has to be in many parts. I just told my helpmate here that we did a drivel here and a drivel there, all formal and official estimates. Before we go any further, I want to get the Senator's question on paper, and then we will give the citations for the various figures. The problem is that the cost of operating NATO, oddly enough, reduces in the early years, and then it will go up, and then it will come down again. I want to explain that so that the Senator will understand it and, to be honest, so that I will understand it a little better myself. It is things like that. Why don't we get together and get the specific question about the specific figures, and we will give the Senator the responses on which we based our judgment.

Mr. WARNER. I think that is a most reasonable reply. I will carefully draft it up, submit it in a letter, and in due course I hope to have the opportunity to debate a response to my letter with my distinguished chairman. We will try as best we can to at least refine the extremes of the estimates and the likelihood that we can have any consensus—which I feel is unlikely—as to the costs, which I think is a very important part of this debate, I say to the Senator.

Mr. HELMS. Of course it is.

Mr. WARNER. Because we are about to commit the American taxpayers, in my judgment, to almost a blank check for almost an indefinite period of time. So we will go to work on that together.

Mr. HELMS. We will respond to that in particular. I am not inclined ever to give anybody a blank check for the American taxpayers' money. We will cover every detail the Senator wants to cover, as well as the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. WARNER. My second question to the chairman is—and he can put it in writing or otherwise—I would like to have a clarified understanding of what the committee's view is as to the future missions of NATO and whether or not my position is correct that it is undecided, undefined, and it is now being considered by the NATO staff and yet to be published. That publication will come, regrettably, long after the Senate action on this question of the three nations.

Mr. HELMS. The Senator is on sound ground in wanting to get that point cleared up. I will help him.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair and my distinguished chairman. I see my colleague from New York on his feet.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I first join in thanking the revered chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for the openness with which he has addressed this issue of cost, which has come to be a bit of an embarrassment. We start out by hearing it is only $150 billion, and in no time at all we learn that it is only $3.5 million. But those are not his fooling with the estimates; that comes from downtown.

I would like, sir, to address, just for balance, the question of who has entered objections, expressed fears, or concerns regarding NATO expansion. The majority leader was quite correct that the Secretary of State and others have joined in supporting this measure. It was their policy for many years, but it is also the case that the persons most responsible for the formation of NATO and the formation of the containment policies which NATO implemented, in a far off time that not everyone remembers—I believe it is the

case, sir, that half of the Members of the Senate were born after 1940, such that many would have been aged 9 when NATO was established. It is in a distant time.

Following World War II, American foreign policy faced the maniacal determination of Stalin to extend his effective borders and power—somewhat conceded by the United States at Yalta, in all truth. The Soviet expectation was that there would come a day, not far distant, when Socialism would manifest, with the U.S.S.R. and China leading the way to international unity. But the person who put in mind the notion that the Soviet Union will fail if you just contain them, that the internal contradictions are so awful, they can't pull this off, that man is George F. Kennan. He was a treasure then, and is doubly so now, as he is still alive to bear witness to the aftermath and the extraordinary success of his policy. His famous ''Long Cables From Moscow'' and the subsequent anonymous article publish in Foreign Affairs under the pseudonym ''X'' are part of the history of the United States, not just this particular period.

Sir, George Kennan has said that expanding NATO would be ''the most fateful error of American policy in the entire post-world war era''—''the most fateful error.'' More recently, in the World Policy Journal, he writes:

> What is at stake in this sad state of affairs is a problem of tragic and momentous importance; for the situation now prevailing stands firmly in the way of the creation in influential American opinion of any quiet thoughtful concept of American policy and hence of any really useful and constructive employment of the great and unique potential weight of this country in world affairs. But the national political establishment, as now existing, has shown itself totally incapable even of understanding the true dimensions of this problem, and much less in tackling it effectively; and one cannot now look to it for anything more than what it is capable of giving.

I have the honor to have known Ambassador Kennan for 30 years. He has been a historian for 45 years now at the Center for Graduate Studies at Princeton. He does not normally speak with such disdain of those in, as Shakespeare called ''our brief authority,'' here in Washington. He is a statesman. But he says that the persons involved in a moment of ''tragic and momentous importance'' are quite incapable of doing anything but what they have done.

That is George Kennan.

If there was one other iconic—and I will use that word—person of the age still with us, still active, and in Washington, it would be, of course, Ambassador Paul Nitze. Paul Nitze, active adviser to President Truman at a time when we formed this policy we call containment and when NATO's article 5 military guarantee, that an attack upon any one of us is an attack on all of us, was extended. And don't make any mistake about that. That was the beginning.

Paul Nitze has just this moment written in almost the same terms as George Kennan to say, don't do this. I am going to read, if I may, the letter which I received on Friday from Paul Nitze addressed, in effect, to me and to my distinguished colleague, Senator WARNER. It is from the Ambassador Paul H. Nitze, the Paul Nitze School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University. It says:

> DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: Your effort to introduce a more deliberate approach to the question of NATO expansion is most constructive. We are in a period of great change in the security challenges for which our country must be prepared, but it is also an era in which we would be foolish to squander the opportunities opened by the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union.
>
> Perhaps the most important such opportunity is the chance to bring Russia into the community of nations. A sensible policy to support that objective would concentrate on lending political and economic support to the development of a democratic, market-oriented society in Russia. NATO expansion distracts both us and the Russians from that goal. Indeed, the open-ended expansion being proposed for the alliance points toward increasing friction with post-Communist Russia for years to come. Driving Russia into a corner plays into the arguments of those most hostile to forging a productive relationship with the United States and its allies. It is not a sound basis for future stability in Europe, particularly when no current or projected threats warrant extending the alliance.
>
> As you and Senator Warner have proposed, the preferable path surely lies in the direction of enlarging the European Union to embrace the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Negotiations have now begun for the accession of the EU of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, along with others. Encouraging those negotiations is the most useful emphasis the Senate could give to current trends in Europe. It makes no sense at all to enlarge NATO merely ''to fill the void,'' as one senior administration official described the current process.

Might I interject here, Mr. President, to say that was Ambassador Holbrooke, and I commented on this in my address to the Associated Press.

To quote further:

> We should, on the contrary, use the period while the EU is negotiating its own enlargement to demonstrate that the Partnership for Peace—which now has more than 25 partners—is the suitable relationship for European countries which are not members of NATO.
>
> In the present security environment, NATO expansion is not only unnecessary; it is gratuitous. If we want a Europe whole and free, we are not likely to get it by making NATO fat and feeble.

Mr. President, one other question. I see my friend.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, could I interrupt my colleague for a moment,

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Certainly.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will ask him when it fits in with his presentation. Later on this week, I would like to speak on this. But I have some questions that I would like to put to my colleague. I have had tremendous respect for Senator MOYNIHAN over the years, long before I came to the Senate. I think this is such an important debate. I wanted to ask my colleague, when it does not break up the flow of his presentation, some questions.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. If I could say to my distinguished friend, I have about 5 more minutes at the most to comment on the nuclear matters. Then I will open to questions.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleague.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, on the nuclear issue, I raised this in an address to the Associated Press, their 150th anniversary, which was held in Dallas on April 20. I simply put the question: Could NATO expansion lead to nuclear war? The thrust of these remarks was that Russia is now a much weakened country—terribly weakened. They have recently issued the equivalent of our NSC–68, which Paul Nitze wrote in 1950, a national security memorandum. In the Russian National Security Blueprint, issued in December, describes how Russian armed forces have seriously declined, the army has melted away, the navy is rusted, and things like that. But it says, don't forget this. We have nuclear weapons, and don't think that we will not use them if our country is in danger. The whole of 40 years of national security doctrine, from President Eisenhower on, of thinking of conventional forces, of a graduated approach to conflict, of no first use of nuclear weapons—all that is off the table. Not because the Soviet Union is so powerful but because it is so weak. We can almost feel them pleading in this document to say, ''Don't you understand our situation?'' Back to the hair trigger of the 1950s.

I ask unanimous consent that address to the Associated Press be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COULD NATO EXPANSION LEAD TO NUCLEAR WAR?

(Address by Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan at the 150th anniversary annual meeting of the Associated Press, April 20, 1998)

As some of you may have learned, things are a bit confusing in Washington just now.

I have had some personal experience of this.

Some while ago, I was most generously invited by the President to a formal White House dinner. Our daughter had never been to one of these affairs, and so off we went, making our way past one Secret Service checkpoint after another, until at last we arrived at the East entrance where a bright young Agent, clipboard in hand, leaned through the car window and proclaimed, ''Good evening, Senator Thurmond.''

Next came my birthday, March 16, and a letter from the Vice President which began:

''Dear Daniel:

''I was very pleased to learn about the recent birth of your twins. Tipper joins me in sending our warmest congratulations and best wishes to you. We know that everyone close to you shares the excitement of the new additions to your family.''

The more, then, do I welcome this opportunity to talk to people who make it their business to get their facts straight.

The Associated Press at 150! Conceived by David Hale of the *Journal of Commerce*, still flourishing on West Street in Manhattan, meeting with editors from five other New York dailies. It happens that at that time there was another such organization, operating out of Brussels. This was the network of correspondence bureaus which Karl Marx and Frederich Engels had established connecting various European capitals. Soon they had a Communist League across Europe, and in 1848, issued the celebrated Communist Manifesto.

There is a sense in which the age that followed was a competition between the ideas embodied in these respective organizations. As an early AP correspondent, Lawrence A. Gobright, put it, ''My business is to communicate facts.''[1] To the Marxists and the other ideologues that would follow, facts were merely an epiphenomenon of vast historical forces, which could and should be shaped to great historical ends. That much grief came of the latter is well known. Lesser known, perhaps, is the achievement of the Associated Press and the ideals it represented in large polities in which democratic politics become possible because people basically have the same information, and accordingly, can reach common understandings.

This was the beginning of modernization. We go straight from Hale and Raymond and Greeley to the Internet. The whole world now has the same facts.

The transition has not been smooth and, indeed, at times seemed doubtful. There were many reasons, but in essence they were those that Marx and Engels set forth, namely that the transition to a modern world meant we would enter a period of ever mounting economic crises which would eventually destroy the system that created them. For a half century, until just recently, the world has been frozen in a Cold War between the Soviet Union, committed to this proposition, and the West, led by the United States which, well, hoped it wasn't so.

There was one person, however, who you could say knew it wasn't so, the English economist John Maynard Keynes. In 1932 he published here in the United States a small volume entitled, ''Essays in Persuasion.'' The whole of the Western world was then seized by a devastating economic crisis. How right Marx and Engels appeared to have been; how hopeless our own situation. Nonsense, wrote Keynes. His thesis was simple.

. . . the profound conviction that the Economic Problem, as one may call it for short, the problem of want and poverty and the economic struggle between classes and nations, is nothing but a frightful muddle, a transitory and an unnecessary muddle. For the Western World already has the resources and the technique, if we could create the organization to use them, capable of reducing the Economic Problem, which now absorbs our moral and material energies, to a position of secondary importance.[2]

He estimate it might take until about a hundred years.

Well, here we are, two thirds of the way and it begins to look as if Keynes might have been right. The past half century has been one of near continuous economic growth for the United States, and most of the industrial democracies. A story by David Skidmore on the AP wire last Tuesday began, ''Inflation disappeared from the U.S. economy for the second time in three months in March. . . .''[3] We have full employment and steady growth. Other nations that pay attention are having the same experience.

Just last week our distinguished Secretary of the Treasury Robert E. Rubin outlined an American initiative to avoid future economic convulsions of the kind that have unsettled Asia. It is time, he said, to update the international financial institutions which Keynes, for the British, along with various Americans, established at the end of the World War II. Time for international financial systems ''to be as modern as the markets.''[4] Which means as the AP would say, to get the facts out fast and straight. Work on the optimistic hypothesis, Keynes would say, and the hypothesis will tend to be realized.

A final reference to Keynes. In the preface to his essays, he has this seeming simple, but profound forecast:

''. . . [t]he day is not far off when the Economic Problems will take the back seat where it belongs, and that the arena of the heart and head will be occupied, or re-occupied, by our real problems—the problems of life and of human relations, of creation and behavior and religion.''[5]

Human relations, behavior, religion Hmm. We may yet long for the age of the General Strike! For, as we look about the world, we see dreadful civil strife, ethnic warfare, religious hatred of the most appalling kind. This is seen as somehow pre-modern, in that much of the most conspicuous conflict seems to occur in pre-modern settings. But I would offer you the thought that a number of us have been writing about for years that it is essentially post-modern, and is not about to go away. To be sure, we are developing international institutions to deal with such matters, from election observers to international criminal courts. An international common law is emerging, along with an ever more elaborate network of legal agreements. And yet, the Cold War no more ended, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, than the first European war in fifty years broke out in what had been Yugoslavia. I got into Sarajevo in 1992; one could feel the future.

This comes to us of a sudden, and our grasp of it all is only just beginning to develop. For it was sudden, the end of the Cold War. I spoke to your annual luncheon in 1976, almost a quarter century ago. It was a somewhat sullen talk. I felt we had been conceding too much to the Soviets, and for my pains had just been fired as U.S. Representative to the United Nations. I had previously been Ambassador to India and had left the subcontinent asking how long could anyone seriously suggest that the Russians would hang on to, let us say, Tajikstan. I remarked at lunch:

''Russia, after all, is merely the last 19th Century European Empire left, and it is just as likely to come apart one of these days as did its onetime peers.''[6]

This, I argued, would come about principally from centrifugal forces of ethnicity, religion, nationalism, which drive international politics in our age. But there was something more; the near death of the universalist Marxist belief in world communism in the Soviet Union itself. Moscow might then have been dispatching Cuban forces to Angola, invading Africa, if you like, but with small conviction. What I was not able to tell you in that talk was that Arkady N. Shevchenko, Under Secretary General of the United Nations, a man on most anyone's short list to succeed Andrei Gromyko as Foreign Minister of the U.S.S.R., had that winter defected to the United States. No such event had ever occurred. An official near the center of Kremlin policy had looked about him and decided that the whole Soviet idea had failed. No one in the Kremlin any longer believed in it, or, for that matter, understood it. Dissolution was inevitable. Shevchenko was kept ''in place,''[7] in the tradecraft term, for another two years. But his insights and forecasts were available from the first, even if few in Washington paid much heed.

This is central. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 took the West almost completely by surprise. We now have volumes like that of former Red Army political commissar, Dmitri Volkogonov, whose *Autopsy for an Empire* was published posthumously. It describes the stagnant decades in which decline became irreversible. In a review in The Wall Street Journal, Gabriel Schoenfeld writes that we should ask ourselves:

''. . .[W]hat failure of will led the West to behave so timidly, pursuing unobtainable friendship and detente with doddering mediocrities who engaged in the ceaseless accumulation of arms and who recklessly lit bonfires around the globe?''

We have never asked this question in Washington. At lease we have never answered it. Instead, we continue to act as through the Cold War is still a central reality of foreign policy, withal there has been a turnover and we now have the ball and it is time to move downfield. How else can we explain the astonishing decision to expand NATO to include three former members of the Warsaw Pact. And only the beginning. As Amos Perlmutter recently wrote in The Washington Times: ''the second phase, sometime at the end of 1999, will usher the entry of Croatia, Slovenia, Romania, Bulgaria, and assorted new and old entities.''[8] Thereafter, the three Baltic nations and after that, who can say?

Moreover, the Resolution of Ratification now before the Senate providing for the Accession of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic has this singular provision.

''(1) THE STRATEGIC CONCEPT OF NATO.—

''(A) THE FUNDAMENTAL IMPORTANCE OF COLLECTIVE DEFENSE.—The Senate declares that—

''(i) in order for the NATO to serve the security interests of the United States, the core purpose of NATO must continue to be the collective defense of the territory of all NATO members; and

''(ii) NATO may also, pursuant to Article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty, on a case-by-case basis, engage in other missions when there is a consensus among its members that there is a threat to the security and interests of NATO members.''[9]

Does this not read suspiciously like a license to get into a fight just about anywhere?

The founding of NATO in 1949, then a pact of 12 nations, was an act of rare foresight and political will. Yet, it had its ambiguities. At the signing ceremony, President Truman observed that the alliance was made necessary because ''one of the major powers''—the USSR—had blocked the formation of an international force provided for in Article 43 of the Charter that was to have enabled the United Nations to preserve world peace. By contrast, the AP account of the signing ceremony recorded that the French Foreign Minister, ''speaking in his native tongue,''[10] noted that the new treaty in no way compromised his country's nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union. Rather, said the French Minister in the words of the dispatch, ''This is directed against a possible future German menace.''[11] Indeed, in 1966, President Charles de Gaulle, having developed an independent atomic potential, withdrew France from NATO and unceremoniously threw our headquarters cadre out of his country.

And there were reservations. George Kennan, for one, felt economic recovery as embodied in the Marshall Plan provided the best hope of peace. The eventual incorporation of a prospering Federal Republic of Germany surely attests to this thought.

Footnotes at end of article.

Much of this history is repeating itself, so much that it could be said we are on the verge of fighting the last war. Half a century ago the Soviets kept their Eastern neighbors out of the Marshall Plan, and so an iron curtain descended across Europe. Five decades later it is the west Europeans who are not prepared to admit the Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, Slovenes, Estonians, who have made clear their hopes to join a continental common market, the European Union, which would make for a united and secure Europe. Last fall Ambassador Richard Holbrooke noted the irony,

''Almost a decade has gone by since the Berlin Wall fell and, instead of reaching out to Central Europe, the European Union turned toward a bizarre search for a common currency. So NATO enlargement had to fill the void.''[12]

Allow me to suggest that wandering in this void we may stumble into the catastrophe of nuclear war with Russia.

This would come about not from Russian strength, but Russian weakness. This is an idea we find difficult to absorb and understandably so. But we had better do.

Russians have been trying to tell us this. On December 7, 1988, Mikhail Gorbachev gave an extraordinary speech to the General Assembly of the United Nations declaring, ''We in no way aspire to be the bearer of ultimate truth.''[13] The Marxist promise had failed in astonishing ways. (Thus, in 1996, a 16-year-old Russian male had only a 54 percent chance of surviving to age 60; two percentage points less than had he been born a century earlier![14]) In the meantime, ethnic hostilities, which were in theory meant to disappear, seemed to rise on every hand. In 1992, Gorbachev spoke to us in Statuary Hall in the Capitol of the problems of Russians now outside Russia:

''One problem which is assuming an acute and at times dramatic character in Russia is that of ethnic enclaves which, thanks to the breakup of the formerly unified state organism are being violently separated from their accustomed motherland, and now find themselves on the other side of a national boundary. . . .

''The situation is aggravated by the paroxysms of extreme nationalism which have here and there generated direct discrimination against minorities. Sometimes this is carried to a point which resembles apartheid. In this situation, any incautious step by anyone, however well intended it might be, can be misinterpreted and used in a way contrary to what was anticipated.''[15]

''Any incautious step.'' As, for example, expanding NATO to the Soviet border of Kaliningrad.[16] Or the mayor of Moscow comparing the leader of Latvia to Pol Pot, as happened just last week.[17]

Also last week Charles Krauthammer, blunt as ever, asked in The Washington Post column: ''Is NATO expansion directed against Russia?'' ''Of course it is,'' he answered.[18]

If we don't see that, surely the Russians do. This is painfully clear in their National Security Blueprint issued by President Yeltsin on December 17, 1997. It is a 14,500 word assessment of their bleak situation and their only seeming option. ''The former defense system has been disrupted, and the creation of a new one is proceeding slowly. Long unprotected sections of the Russian Federation state border have appeared.'' What does remain and does work are the strategic nuclear forces. And so:

''Russia reserves the right to use all the forces and systems at its disposal, including nuclear weapons, if the unleashing of armed aggression results in a threat to the actual existence of the Russian Federation as an independent sovereign state.''[19]

Conspicuously, the Duma has yet to ratify the START II Treaty signed in 1991. In a careful argument against NATO expansion first published in The Los Angeles Times, Howard Baker, Sam Nunn, Brent Scowcroft and Alton Frye termed this a doctrine of ''inflexible response.''[20] A generation of arms negotiations, beginning under President Eisenhower, all directed against ''first use'' nuclear policies seems now to have been rejected.

A Newsday editorial of March 15 began with George Kennan's stark assessment: ''Expanding NATO would be the most fateful error of American policy in the entire post-cold-war era.''[21]

More recently Kennan has written in World Policy Journal:

''. . . what is at stake in this sad state of affairs is a problem of tragic and momentous importance; for the situation now prevailing stands firmly in the way of the creation in influential American opinion of any quiet thoughtful concepts of American policy and hence of any really useful and constructive employment of the great and unique potential weight of this country in world affairs. But the national political establishment, as now existing, has shown itself totally incapable even of understanding the true dimensions of this problem, and much less in tackling it effectively; and one cannot now look to it for anything more than what it is capable of giving.''[22]

Now is the time to look to the Senate. There will be a debate. Thanks to the insistence of Senators such as John Warner, Bob Smith, and Tom Harkin, there will be a debate. As of now there is not much doubt as to the outcome. This could change. Public opinion would seem to be changing. A recent Pew opinion survey found that approval for NATO expansion has dropped to 49 percent, with a large undecided element.[23]

But should the vote go as expected, may we at very least hope that the people and that the ''national political establishment,'' as Ambassador Kennan has it, be alert to the risk we will have taken? We might even change our mind one day. We might even recall that Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations recognizes ''the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations. . . .'' Which includes every nation in Eastern Europe. This is grounds on which we went to war with Iraq. It is the law of nations. Concerning which at the General Assembly in 1988, Gorbachev declared ''*Pacta Sunt Servanda*.''[24] Agreement must be kept. That is all President Truman intended at that ceremony in 1949. The law of the Charter must be enforced. Such ''idealism'' no longer resonates with Americans. But surely it is the great standard we have given the world. Russia included. It deserves our attention.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Charles J. Hanley, Flash! The Associated Press Covers the World (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1998).

[2] John Maynard Keynes, Essays in Persuasion (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1932), vii.

[3] David Skidmore, ''Inflation Disappears for Second Time in Three Months,'' The Associated Press, 14 April 1998, 12:09 EST.

[4] David E. Sanger, ''U.S. Treasury Chief Offers Plan to Avoid Crises Like Asia's,'' The New York Times, 15 April 1998, A15.

[5] Keynes, op. cit., vi.

[6] Daniel Patrick Moynihan, The Associated Press Annual Luncheon Address, 3 May 1976, 17.

[7] Gabriel Schoenfeld, ''Room at the Top,'' The Wall Street Journal, 15 April 1998, A20.

[8] Amos Perlmutter, ''Illusion of an Unending NATO Expansion,'' The Washington Times, 9 April 1998, A17.

[9] Resolution of Ratification, Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on Accession of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, Report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Exec. Rpt. 104–14, 6 March 1998, 40.

[10] ''Ministers Assert Peace is Sole Aim of Atlantic Pact,'' The Associated Press, 4 April 1949.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Roger Cohen, ''While Kohl Touts New Currency, Many Germans Cry: ''Not Again!'' International Herald Tribune, 19 September 1997, A1.

[13] Mikhail Gorbachev, ''U.S.S.R. Arms Reduction: Rivalry into Sensible Competition,'' Speech delivered before the United Nations on December 7, 1988; reprinted in translation in Vital Speeches of the Day, 55 (1 February 1989), 234.

[14] Murray Feshbach, ''Population and Health Issues in Russia and the Pundits,'' (Speech at the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars on 8 December 1997), Washington, D.C.

[15] Mikhail Gorbachev, Transcript of an Address to the Congress of the United States, 14 May 1992, 8–9.

[16] Note: There are a total of 89 administrative subdivisions of the Russian Federation.

They are as follows:

49 Oblasts: administrative subdivisions made up predominantly of Russians

21 Republics: national homelands of the major non-Russian minorities, including Tatarstan and Chechnya

6 Autonomous okrugs (districts): national homelands of smaller non-Russian minorities

10 Krays: mixed population of Russian and various non-Russian nationalities, between okrug and oblast

Moscow and St. Petersburg: federal cities

Jewish autonomous region: created by Stalin in the early 1930s, it was intended to be national homeland for the Soviet Jews.

[17] Charles Krauthammer, ''Good Geopolitics,'' The Washington Post, 17 April 1998, A23.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Russian National Security Blueprint, December 17, 1997, p. 19. (Trans. by FBIS Dec. 26, 1997, Doc. ID: FTS19971230000280[0]).

[20] Howard Baker, Jr., Alton Frye, Sam Nunn, and Brent Scowcroft, ''Will Expansion Undercut the Military?'' The Los Angeles Times, 26 March 1998, A11.

[21] ''Expanding NATO Would Be the Most Fateful Error of American Policy in the Entire Post-Cold-War Era,'' Editorial, Newsday, 15 March 1998, B1.

[22] George F. Kennan, ''Marooned in the Cold War,'' World Policy Journal XIV (Spring 1998): 107.

[23] Pew Charitable Trust Poll, 25–29 March 1998.

[24] Gorbachev, op. cit., 234.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Finally, just a few comments. Some attention was paid to that address. On just last Friday there was an article in USA Today in which it says:

At a speech in Dallas this week Senator MOYNIHAN raised eyebrows when he said that NATO expansion at a time of Russian weakness in conventional weapons and increased dependence on nuclear weapons could cause the United States and Russia ''to stumble into the catastrophe of nuclear war.''

Then this paragraph:

''That's not hyperbole,'' says Michael Mandelbaum of the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Affairs. ''If NATO continues to expand, as many envision to include the Baltic States on Russia's border—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia—we would be moving toward a hair-trigger nuclear balance of the kind we had in the 1950s and 1960s.''

David Broder had a column last Wednesday in the Washington Post in which he quotes Jack Matlock, who is the former Ambassador to Moscow, a wonderful diplomat, who says:

There is no question that our decision to take on new members now, when no country in Eastern Europe faces a security threat from the outside, will greatly complicate our efforts to see to it that the vast stocks of nuclear weapons now in Russia are never used against us or our allies.

And finally, just from this morning's Newsweek magazine, there is an article by Fareed Zakaria, who is the managing editor for Foreign Affairs who simply comments—this is my last remark

so Senator WELLSTONE can ask some questions—he asks, ''Can't Russia Join the Club, Too?'' But he makes one simple blunt assessment:

NATO could defend the Baltics by only one means, nuclear attacks.

Nuclear attack and nuclear response. We are right back to where we were in the 1950's, or we will be as we continue this. We have already signaled we are going to move into the Baltic States. I cannot imagine the thinking process that has led us to this point. I can only note that the persons who conceived this extraordinarily successful strategy in the 1940s look up today and say: Have you all gone mad? Do you realize what you are doing? Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent these documents be printed in the RECORD, and I yield the floor or yield to my colleague from Minnesota for any questions that he may have.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From USA Today, April 24, 1998]

UNLIKELY CAST GATHERS TO OPPOSE NATO GROWTH

(By Barbara Slavin)

WASHINGTON.—An unusual bipartisan coalition is launching an 11th-hour effort to block expansion of the NATO military alliance.

At a news conference Thursday, nine senators, anti-abortion activist Phyllis Schlafly and a business group led by the liberal Ben Cohen of Ben and Jerry's ice cream urged the Senate to stop NATO's growth.

Formal debate on whether to admit Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic resumes Monday. A vote could come as early as Wednesday.

The measure, a treaty modification, requires 67 votes, or two-thirds of the Senate. It does not go to the House. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was set up in 1949 to confront the Soviet Union in Europe. It now has 16 members.

Some opponents argue that including countries once part of the Soviet empire will cost U.S. taxpayers billion of dollars that could be better spent on social problems at home. Others say expansion would alienate Moscow, force the United States into dangerous military alliances and blur NATO's mandate.

President Clinton and congressional supporters say NATO should be open to all new free-market democracies in Europe.

At least 20 senators have moved from being in favor of the NATO expansion when Congress recessed three weeks ago to undecided when it returned this week, said Sen. Tom Harkin, D-Iowa. Bob Smith, R-N.H., says public support is waning as Americans learn more about what NATO expansion might entail.

Supporters say they will have the votes they need. They may have more trouble blocking amendments that would limit expenditures or require a three-year pause before any further growth.

''What's the urgency?'' Smith asked at the news conference. ''The greatest threat is a situation where Russia and the United States are not allies.''

Sen. Kent Conrad, D–N.D., said Russia's more than 7,000 tactical nuclear weapons—''loose nukes''—should be the focus of U.S. concern. Sen. John Ashcroft, R-Mo., worried that a new NATO would become a ''911 for disorders around the globe.''

At a speech in Dallas this week, Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, D-N.Y., raised eyebrows when he said that NATO expansion, at a time of Russian weakness in conventional weapons and increased dependence on nuclear weapons, could cause the United States and Russia to ''stumble into the catastrophe of nuclear war.''

''That's not hyperbole,'' said Michael Mandelbaum of the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies. If NATO continues to expand as many envision to include the Baltic states on Russia's border—Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia—''we would be moving toward a hair-trigger nuclear balance of the kind we had in the 1950s and '60s,'' he said.

The Clinton administration, which has made NATO expansion its top foreign policy priority, says expansion would solidify democratic gains in Central and Eastern Europe and decrease the likelihood of small-scale ethnic conflicts and of a wider war.

[From the Washington Post, April 22, 1998]

BRAVE NEW NATO

(By David S. Broder)

With their heads presumably cleared by two weeks at home, the members of the Senate have returned to the issue of NATO expansion. They tried but failed to focus on it in March. This time they vow to see it through to a vote. Let's hope they have their thinking caps on.

Before they went out for Easter, Sen. John Warner of Virginia, the Republicans' leading voice on national security issues, told me he could count no more than 15 other senators who shared his doubts about adding Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to the alliance. Only if it appears the potential opposition may approach the 34 votes needed to block this questionable action will President Clinton feel compelled to give the American people a clear explanation of the course to which he is committing this nation, something he has conspicuously failed to do so far.

Charles Krauthammer, whose column typically contains much good sense, attempted last week to fill in for Clinton by providing a rationale for expanding NATO more compelling than what he called the ''pablum'' and ''rubbish'' offered by administration spokesmen.

Cutting through all the State Department boilerplate about ''extending the borders of peace,'' friend Charles says NATO ''is expanding in the service of its historic and continuing mission: containing Russia.''

''It says to the world, and particularly to the Russians, that the future of Central Europe is settled,'' Krauthammer writes. ''The no man's land is no more. Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic are now securely part of the American-allied West. Finis. And if any Russians entertain other ideas, they can forget about it.''

You've got to admire that like-it-or-lump-it logic. But even though Krauthammer calls NATO expansion ''the easiest U.S. foreign policy call of the decade,'' he leaves one big question unanswered: If it's smart to move NATO's front line eastward with these countries, why not do a real job of containment and sign up all the countries in Russia's neighborhood?

Secretary of State Madeleine Albright might like the idea. Soon after the first three recruits were invited last year, she said, ''We must pledge that the first new members will not be the last and that no European democracy will be excluded because of where it sits on the map.''

Five other countries have been promised early consideration: Romania, Slovenia, Lativa, Estonia and Lithuania. Albania, Bulgaria, Macedonia and Slovakia won't be far behind. And why not Ukraine and other former Soviet republics struggling for democracy? That would be containment with a capital C.

Only two problems. Pull out a map and ask yourself how the United States and its allies would guarantee these new NATO members that an attack on their territory from any source would be dealt with exactly as if it were an attack on Paris, London or Chicago. That pledge has made NATO the most successful military alliance of this century. It should not be given lightly, especially if you agree with Krauthammer that Russia may no longer be communist but is still a major power that inevitably will seek to dominate its own region.

None of the current NATO countries envisages sending its ground troops to fight on this vastly enlarged frontier. The security guarantee will have to be underwritten by America's nuclear force—a prospect that assuredly will motivate Russia to maintain its own nuclear weapons, rather than join us in scaling them down.

More broadly, a policy of aggressive containment will inevitably be seen by Russians as threatening. Boris Yeltsin has gone along so far, grudgingly accepting a Clinton policy that effectively bars Russia from NATO membership but creates a fig leaf NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council, which Albright promises ''gives Russia no opportunity to dilute, delay or block NATO decisions.'' In his current weakness, Yeltsin has no alternative.

But Susan Eisenhower, granddaughter of the former president and a student of Russian foreign policy, has documented scores of statements by leading Russian figures, both democrats and hard-liners, expressing anger at NATO expansion. Even a moderate such as Grigory Yavlinsky has declared, ''It is absurd to believe in NATO's peaceful intentions.''

Jack Matlock, the former U.S. ambassador to Moscow, says, ''There is no question that our decision to take on new members now, when no country in Eastern Europe faces a security threat from the outside, will greatly complicate our efforts to see to it that the vast stocks of nuclear weapons now in Russia are never used against us or our allies.''

Think, senators; think. And force Clinton to address these issues.

[From Newsweek, May 4, 1998]

CAN'T RUSSIA JOIN THE CLUB, TOO?—IF THE NATO ALLIANCE IS ABOUT STRENGTHENING DEMOCRACY, THE TROUBLED NATION SHOULD GET ITS OWN INVITATION

(By Fareed Zakaria)

The expansion of NATO is a foregone conclusion. The Senate will soon vote overwhelmingly to extend membership in the alliance to Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic. But while they're at it, the senators might think about adding one more name to that list—Russia.

This is not nearly as preposterous as it sounds. Having succeeded in its original mission—to deter the Soviet Union—NATO is somewhat lost in this new era. Expansion, the Clinton administration has stressed, is an ongoing policy that could result in many new members. That will further change the essential nature of the alliance, moving it from a tight military camp to a larger crisis-solving and democracy-strengthening organization. In this new context, Russian participation becomes indispensable.

Few alliances survive victory. After having come together to defeat Napoleon, the Quadruple Alliance soon fell apart in the 1820s and 1830s. NATO has done better. It still exists, has a large bureaucracy, conducts military maneuvers and is used by the United States as its preferred military outfit when force is

required. But its core function—defending its members from Soviet attack—is dead; as dead as the Soviet Union.

The United States still has many problems dealing with Russia, but they stem from Russian weakness rather than strength. Russia's economy today is slightly more than half the size it was 15 years ago, and has declined for five straight years. Its military is in ruins, with salaries, food and medicine in scarce supply, let alone modern tanks and aircraft.

Additionally, Russia's new borders are farther away from those of NATO members—including the new countries of Central Europe—than they have been for 300 years. Yet NATO has responded to this precipitous decline in Russian power and its diminished imperial intentions by bulking up and getting closer. The administration has given a wink and a nod to the Baltic states, which want to be next in the club. Their membership would almost certainly end any pretense of credible security guarantees: NATO could defend the Baltics by only one means—nuclear attack.

All this is old thinking, we are told by the Clinton administration. The new NATO is meant to deal with the new world. Precisely because there are no longer actual threats to the security of Western Europe and other members, the alliance must deal with those threats that exist—whether in Bosnia or the Middle East—which require a new, expanded alliance. ''NATO must go out of area or out of business,'' says Sen. Richard Lugar. This turns NATO into a kind of off-the-shelf army that might be used when its members can agree. But as the war in Bosnia bloodily proved, NATO members can't really agree on much. Out of area—in Libya, Iran, Iraq, the peace process, China—the United States and Europe are out of sync.

Hence, when the United States wants to use military force, it will try to get NATO support. If not, it will go alone. And if it gets a few NATO countries and a few non-NATO ones to come along, it will construct a ''coalition of the willing.'' So how exactly is the new, improved NATO helping here? If global problem-solving is NATO's new mission, it can work only with the cooperation of other great powers—principally Russia, which straddles two continents and has the world's second largest nuclear arsenal and a veto in the Security Council. To try to construct an international security system and leave Russia out because it lost the cold war contradicts the most simple rule of strategy for the victorious. Written across the first page of Churchill's magnificent history of World War II is the four-line ''moral of the work,'' which reads: ''In War—Resolution; In Defeat—Defiance; In Victory—Magnanimity; In Peace—Goodwill.'' The last time a losing power was excluded from the new order was Germany in 1918, and things didn't turn out so well.

There is, finally, the moral argument. We are told that the countries of Central Europe deserve to be recognized as full-fledged members of the West, and their fledgling democracies supported and strengthened. But if one of NATO's new goals is to strengthen democracy, then surely its place lies with the most important democratic experiment taking place on the European continent—in Russia. The Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary are in no real danger of backsliding on democracy. What they need is access to West European markets. Membership in the European Union, not NATO, can alone solve that problem. But the fate of Russian democracy is in the balance, and the outcome will have enormous consequences for the democratic idea everywhere and for peace in Europe. Why not help where help is needed?

As for belonging to ''the West,'' Central Europe has many cultural affinities with Western Europe, but surely they are matched by those of Russia. Which has made a larger contribution to European culture: Hungary or the land of Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Pushkin, Prokofiev, Kandinsky and Shostakovich? Bringing Russia firmly into the West is a goal worthy of the United States—and its Senate.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Senator WELLSTONE is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I came to the floor because I had just come back and was in my office and I heard my colleague talk about the wisdom of George Kennan. I associate myself with his remarks. I have said on the floor before that my father was a Jewish immigrant who fled Russia. He had a chance to meet with George Kennan on a number of different occasions. He always marveled at Kennan's command of the language. My father also was always so respectful of his wisdom.

George Kennan has argued that this could, indeed, be a fateful decision. I want to, first of all, ask Senator MOYNIHAN whether or not he believes that we run the risk—I know he has talked about this—whether or not he believes that we run the risk of really poisoning relations with Russia and playing into the hands of the militaristic forces in Russia? Susan Eisenhower talks about a visit that she had with Gorbachev and that Gorbachev was deeply disturbed by NATO expansion. I quote what Gorbachev had to say to Susan Eisenhower. ''Russia has been swindled,'' he asserted, ''and it is feeding into the wild ideas of those who hold 'conspiracy' theories, that the West is intent not only on the Soviet Union's demise but also Russia's. NATO expansion has poisoned the atmosphere of trust.''

I have two questions for my colleague. Do you believe that that is, indeed, the mistake that Kennan is talking about?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Yes. Yes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Needlessly risking poisoning relations with Russia? And second, can my colleague discern what are the reasons for doing that as opposed to the expansion of the European Union? I am trying to find—I am puzzled by this. Why are we doing this at this time in the history of our country and the world?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I would like to respond first to the absolutely essential question Senator WELLSTONE has put, or so I judge, in the context of Mr. Gorbachev's response to Susan Eisenhower. That all takes place in the context of the reunification of Germany when the wall came down and western Germany moved into eastern Germany. There was a clear understanding that that is as far as NATO would go. That is why I believe the word ''swindled'' was used.

Now I would like to make a point which I know my friend would sympathize with, and I think his father might sympathize with, which is to say this: That the Russians have the right to claim that they freed their own country from the horrors of a decayed Marxist-Leninist dictatorship. It was not always such in Russia.

I have, Mr. President, a certain advantage which comes with age. There are not many others. But when I grew up in New York City, Alexander Kerensky would come around to speak to our high school classes from time to time.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Kerensky, the ''Social Democrat.''

Mr. MOYNIHAN. The Social Democrat. So I had the opportunity to learn early in life—which most people never seem to recall—there wasn't one Russian revolution, there were two. There was a democratic revolution, a provisional government came in, recognizable Social Democrats, as we say, and they were overthrown by the Bolsheviks. All right, now, in turn, the Bolsheviks have been overthrown. The Russians have a right to say, ''we are back on course.''

There was a rather striking meeting of Woodrow Wilson's Cabinet in Washington in the spring of 1917 after this first Russian revolution. I know my friend would be interested in this. On March 20, 1917, before the United States had entered the war, the cabinet was called together for a discussion on ''the question of war with Germany and the abandonment of the policy of neutrality'' as Secretary of State Robert Lansing wrote in a memorandum of the Cabinet meeting. They were very clear that war was coming with Germany and the President asked the cabinet if he showed call for a meeting of Congress to so declare. And then Lancing had this comment. He said:

> I said that the revolution in Russia, which appeared to be successful, had removed the one objection to affirming that the European war was a war between democracy and absolutism.

We welcomed the Mensheviks, the Social Democrats, and we said—I will say that once again. Here it is 1917, the United States is about to get into the First World War—and the Second World War is just an extension of the first—and the Secretary of State believed ''that the revolution in Russia, which appeared to be successful, had removed the one objection to affirming that the European war was a war between democracy and absolutism.''

Do we want to put that in jeopardy? Don't we want the Russians to be able to say, ''We are back where we were at the beginning of the century; we have a democratic tradition, not a perfect one, but we have one, we were moving there, and the Bolsheviks just stole it; we liberated Poland and we liberated the Baltic States that Stalin had seized; we have done things for which the world ought to sort of say thank you.''

I spent most of my adult life thinking would we go to war with the Soviet Union this week or next week. It is a bit late in life that that prospect declined and has gone away, until now.

Wouldn't the Senator agree that the Russian people and their leaders have something of which to be proud?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from New York that—and I appreciate his historical perspective, because this is going to be a very important debate; this is a very important debate. We are going to be making a decision on the floor of the U.S. Senate that is going to crucially define the quality or lack of quality of lives of people throughout the world, because what happens in Russia is key to what happens in Europe and key to what happens with our children and our grandchildren.

My colleague is absolutely right. Kerensky was a democrat, overturned and then the Bolsheviks came in, Lenin and the Bolsheviks.

I say to my colleague, my father, who was almost 50 when I was born, came to this country. He fled czarist Russia. He was born in the Ukraine, Odessa, trying to stay one step ahead of the pogroms, where basically soldiers would come in and destroy my dad's dad's business because he was Jewish. My dad fled the country at the age of 17 in 1914, 3 years before the revolution. Then he was going to go back. He was excited because it looked like the czar had been overthrown and there would be democracy. Then his parents wrote him and said, ''Don't come back, the Communists have taken over.'' My father never saw his family again.

When Sheila and I finally visited—I wish my dad could have gone back to Russia after the democracy forces were able to succeed—it was clear to me that all his family was murdered during the Stalin years.

What has happened is that finally what we have is no longer a Soviet Union. We have the democracy forces and, I say to my colleague, Senator MOYNIHAN, let's just talk about Dr. Arbatov, who was involved in the START I negotiations in Geneva and served as consultant through all the Russian-American arms control issues. You talked about your concern over the direction this takes us with the risk of nuclear war, including START II and the CFE treaties. Dr. Arbatov has said, and I will read the end of his quote:

> At best, NATO expansion to the east—
>
> Right up to the border—
>
> is regarded in Russia as a mistaken policy. At worst, it is regarded as the consummation of the ''grand design'' to encircle and isolate Russia, establishing strategic superiority and finally destroying Russia, ending once and for all Russia's role as a European power.

Let me finish with this quote. Dr. Arbatov, by the way, is a leader of the democracy forces. That is what he is about. The people whom I talked with in Russia, the people whom I believe the American citizens are most committed to are the democracy forces. They are deathly afraid of what is about to happen if we adopt this agreement.

Let me quote Dr. Arbatov again:

> NATO expansion will plant a permanent seed of mistrust between the United States and Russia. It will worsen everything from nuclear arms control to policies in Iraq and Iran. It will push Moscow into alliance with China and rogue regimes.

I say to my colleague, yes, I think this undercuts the democracy forces, and it also undercuts a people who are proud of overthrowing communism and are now trying to build a market economy and build a democracy and who had no inkling whatsoever that what we would now do is expand what is a military alliance eastern right up to their border and redivide Europe.

This is exactly the opposite of what they thought would happen. The European Union, that is where we should be using our leverage as a nation—expand the European Union. That is about markets, that is about democracy. But I fear that people in Russia feel betrayed by this, and I am even more frightened that the very forces that we do not want to see in power in a post-Yeltsin Russia—and there will be a post-Yeltsin Russia—will come into ascendancy as a result of this. This is a very, I think, serious mistake we are about to make.

I ask my colleague this question. One American scholar has defined NATO expansion as ''a bad idea whose time has come.''

Can my colleague explain to me why this is—I think it is a bad idea. Why has its time come? Why are we doing this? In other words, we know what the risk is. We know that this is a real risk for democracy in Russia. We know that this is a real risk for arms agreements. We know this is a real risk in perhaps setting off just the opposite of what all of us hope for, which is the use of nuclear weapons, the unthinkable. We know what the risks are—poisoning relations with Russia, instability in Europe. So the question is, why are we doing this? Why are we expanding a military alliance? Is there a military threat?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I would like to say here that we have an element of candor that is not always forthcoming in these matters. Ambassador Holbrooke said, what? Because Brussels won't expand the European Union, NATO expansion must fill a void. Is it filling a void because they cannot agree on a common agricultural policy in Europe? So filling a void to bring back the prospect of nuclear war, is that worth it? I know there are a lot of farmers in Poland. Well, there are a lot of farmers in Spain, too, and Ireland, too, and they got into the European Union and they have lived through it.

The Europeans owe us something. Half—half—the defense outlays of the United States for the last half century, Mr. President, have gone to protect Europe. I was there. I was called back in the Navy when the Korean War broke out for service in Europe in case that conflict became global. Oh, the ruin. But we, by God, were there, and the submarine pens the British had managed to get a few bombs through, just testing. We saved those people. And now because the common agricultural policy would be a little bit inconvenient for them, we are proposing to expand NATO as a surrogate. And may I make a point to my friend, I am sure he knows it, but not everybody does. We say we are expanding the borders of NATO toward Russia. My learned friend knows there is a Russian enclave on the Baltic Sea which is called Kaliningrad, named after one of the original members of the politburo—Stalingrad is gone, Leningrad is gone, Kaliningrad continues—sitting right next to Poland.

We are not getting close, Mr. President, to the borders of Russia. We are on the borders of Russia. There it is, that little yellow spot—yellow for Russia. It says ''Russia.''

Mr. WELLSTONE. Might I ask my colleague, what would be the reaction of people in our country if there was a Russian military alliance that came to the border of the United States?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Nova Scotia?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Nova Scotia.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Well, there would be a lot more people on the Senate floor this afternoon. But, I mean, I could not agree more. You heard George Kennan say, in fact, ''Is this the only thing our policymakers in Washington can think to do?''

Now, the creating of NATO was a big event. It was a proposal by Ernest Bevin, who understood these things in a way that not every American did. There is a nice story that I think Senator WELLSTONE will enjoy, and you, Mr. President.

As some people recall—I recall, but I was in the Navy. After V–E Day, the British held an election. They had not had one for 10 years. Suddenly, Churchill and all his Cabinet—out they go. And in comes the Labor Government. Big change. Clement Attlee is Prime Minister. And Ernest Bevin, the sometime head of the Transport and General Workers Union, becomes Foreign Secretary. So he goes off to Potsdam, which is just a suburb of Berlin. And there is Stalin and all his people. And Truman—I doubt whether Harry S. Truman ever met someone he knew to be a Communist until he got to Potsdam and was introduced to Stalin. They do not have many of them in Kansas City. We had lots of them on the west side of Manhattan, but that is another matter.

This story is apocryphal but true. Bevin comes back from Potsdam, and he is in on the floor of the House of Commons. And a friend comes up to him, a parliamentarian, and says, ''Ernie, what are those Soviets like?'' And he says, ''Well, you know, they're just like the bloody Communists.''

I mean, there are no shortage of Communists in the Transport and General Workers Union. He could spot their behavior and so forth. It was he who said we had to form a military alliance. The thing nobody in this world

wanted was more armies and navies, and so forth, but he knew. And our people responded.

Harry Truman, who did not know there was an atom bomb being built as Vice President, who had very little contact with any of this—he had been in Europe in World War I—supported it. God, there was a golden age.

Now, all we can do is expand NATO because the common agriculture policy is making it difficult in Brussels to include the Czech Republic and Poland. That is not the standards we set for ourselves when the cold war began.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to Senator MOYNIHAN, could I ask you one final question?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Sure.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleagues who are on the floor, I know other colleagues want to speak, and I am sensitive to your schedules. But I do think this is an important discussion and I never had the chance to do this in the 7 years I have been in the Senate.

I said I really believe that George Kennan has made enormous contributions to the world. I think he is as profound a thinker and as knowledgeable a person about Russia as there is, and I put my colleague, Senator MOYNIHAN, in the same tradition.

There are other points that I will make later on in the debate I have other than what I have made today. I find it interesting. There was a piece in the New York Times, front page story, about all the ways in which some of the bigger companies, military contractor companies have now poured money into lobbying on behalf of this.

That makes me nervous because I really do not want to see this become kind of a proliferation of weapons in some of the new member countries. And then what will be the Russians' response? I have concerns about that. Other Senators will talk about the cost, what will be the cost.

But we are talking, I say to Senator MOYNIHAN, about what I am most worried about, which I think it is a profound mistake, because I believe that, again, this needlessly risked poisoning relations with Russia in creating the very kind of instability we do not want to see. I think that we do not want to see the people who are prodemocracy forces undercut.

But my question is this. You can help me out. I come from a State—I will tell you this is probably maybe the most difficult for me. Actually, the welfare vote was the most difficult for me on political grounds, but this may be the second most difficult vote, because I have met with some wonderful people—Czech community, Bulgarian community, Polish community, we have big populations in Minnesota.

They have been wonderful supporters of me, I say to the Senator. They are really disappointed in me. And I wonder, what would you say to some pretty wonderful people in our country who feel so strongly that as a matter of kind of almost historical justice that these countries should have membership in NATO? How do you speak to their strongly held views, to how emotional—and I do not mean that in a negative way; I am not putting people down at all—they feel about this? How do you respond to them? What do you say based upon your knowledge, your experience in public service, your sense of history? Do you understand my question?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I understand your question perfectly, sir, because it is my question.

And I say this—and I would recommend to anyone who wishes to think about it—if you love Poland, if you think that solidarity was the first real assault on the Soviet system, if you think that Pope John Paul has meant more in advancing freedoms in this age than anybody you can think of, do not do this to Poland. See that Poland is in the European Union, give them a common market, give them the same currency that the Danes will have and the Spanish will have. Give them access to a global market they have never been allowed into. Give them a common agricultural policy that will give their farmers a living.

That is what they deserve. And that is what is being denied them by the bureaucracies, as bureaucracies will do. And what we do not want is—Poland has had enough in this 20th century. We do not want another period of hostilities that could lead not just to war but to annihilation.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleague.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I see my distinguished friend from Indiana is on the floor. I have to apologize. In the colloquy with Senator WELLSTONE, I did not realize he had characteristically quietly come aboard.

I yield the floor, and I look forward to his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for a very constructive and helpful colloquy. I enjoyed it.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LUGAR. I ask unanimous consent that Kevin Johnson, a fellow in my office, be permitted floor privileges for the duration of debate on the Protocols of Accession to the NATO Treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, the Senate has begun a historical debate over NATO's future, one that surely will reverberate for many years to come. I believe we have a historical window of opportunity to take steps which will secure European peace and stability and which will lock in the freedom and independence won in the revolutions of 1989 and the collapse of communism.

If the Senate ratifies enlargement, we will have set the foundation for decades of European peace and prosperity; but if we fail, historians may look back at the early post-cold-war period as a tragic loss of opportunities. The more distant we are from the days of the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of communism, the clearer it becomes that we have entered a new era. But dangers still abound in post-cold-war Europe. The revolutions of 1989 not only led to the collapse of communism but also to the end of the peace orders established after two world wars.

What is at stake here and now is order and stability in Europe as a whole. And that is why American interests are involved. Mr. President, NATO cannot by itself solve all of Europe's problems, but without a stable security framework, we run the risk that reform and democracy in Eastern Europe will not persist but will instead be undercut by destructive forces of nationalism and insecurity.

The failure of democracy in the east could not help but have a profound consequence for democracy in the continent's western half as well. If history teaches us anything, it is that the United States is always drawn into such European conflicts because our vital interests are ultimately engaged. Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic are democratic, free-market nations with professional militaries under civilian control. In addition to contributing to NATO's core mission of collective defense, they are ready and able to support American and allied interests beyond their borders as they have demonstrated in Desert Storm, in Haiti, and in Bosnia.

Accession of these three democracies to NATO will eliminate immoral and destabilizing dividing lines in Europe. I point out, Mr. President, those lines are there—not put there by us—and extend stability into a region long troubled by conflict.

A stable and peaceful Europe will benefit all of Europe, including Russia and non-NATO countries. Expanding peace and stability in Europe lessens the chance of the United States again being pulled into conflicts in the region. NATO enlargement provides an opportunity for the alliance to be proactive in shaping a stable and strategic landscape in Europe.

Mr. President, it has been argued that we are rushing into 1992 enlargement. I have advocated, among others, expanding the NATO alliance since 1992. I have had countless discussions on the subject with colleagues here in the Senate and in the administration since that time. I have traveled to Europe and to the former Soviet Union many times in recent years, and the issue of NATO enlargement has been one of the most debated and talked about issues throughout that period of time.

As an early advocate of enlargement, I do not agree that the Senate is rushing to expand NATO. Rather, I suggest that supporters and critics of enlargement have been engaged in a debate

and discussion of this topic for at least 6 years—hardly a hurried process. NATO enlargement has been endorsed by Congress each year since 1994. NATO enlargement was endorsed in the Contract With America as part of the 1996 Republican Presidential platform.

Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee held 12 hearings over the past 4 years to hear from nearly 50 supporters and opponents of the policy of enlargement. In fact, I held the first hearing on the subject as chairman of the Subcommittee on European Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee. Not only has the Foreign Relations Committee held hearings and studied the subject, but so has the Armed Services Committee, Intelligence Committee, and Budget and Appropriations Committees.

These committee hearings have thoroughly examined concerns about NATO expansion, including projected cost, how we deal with Russia, and the future mission of NATO. The committee's resolution addresses all of these points and was reported by a vote of 16–2. Our chairman, Senator HELMS, and distinguished ranking member, Senator BIDEN, have done an excellent job in constructing a very thoughtful and balanced resolution of ratification.

If Senate committee hearings and deliberations are not enough, Senators LOTT and DASCHLE organized a Senate NATO observer group, which had 28 members and met 17 times to study and discuss this important foreign policy initiative. NATO enlargement has received endorsements from every living U.S. Secretary of State, numerous former Secretaries of Defense and National Security Advisers, and more than 60 flag and general officers, including 5 distinguished former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

This has been a long, serious debate among Members of Congress, the administration, and our allies regarding the benefits and possible pitfalls of enlargement. There has been no rush to judgment. We are now entering the final stage of the process; namely, Senate debate and a vote on the merits of NATO enlargement. I have listened carefully to critics who suggest that there is no threat at the present time and thus we should not expand NATO now. They suggest there will be plenty of time to expand the alliance should a new enemy or threat appear on the horizon. I strongly disagree with that point of view. We have learned that the weapons used in Desert Storm were envisioned, planned, and produced in the 1970s. Thus, the systems which allowed us to triumph in the Persian Gulf are 20 to 25 years old.

The organization and infrastructure to meet future threats must have a similar root structure. We must begin to construct an alliance which can meet the future and undetermined threats. Our military experts and top strategic thinkers believe an alliance which includes Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic will be better able to meet those challenges.

What might those challenges be? Perhaps the emergence of a hostile regional power, a threat from the Middle East or from North Africa, a resurgent imperialist Russia, nationalist or religious instability, or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The systems needed to deter or defeat such future threats must begin to be constructed long before they can be expected to operate effectively. One cannot expect an alliance to be shelved during times of peace and simply dusted off when the threats emerge. The alliance must begin to lay the foundation which will prepare us to meet an uncertain future. In my mind, expanding the zone of peace and security in Europe and adding three new willing, enthusiastic members will contribute to that preparedness.

Four of our NATO allies—Canada, Denmark, Norway, and Germany—have already ratified the protocols of enlargement. It is time for the Senate to act and to show leadership on this issue.

NATO's open-door entrance policy established by article 10 of the Washington treaty—which should not be misunderstood as an open-ended policy—has given countries of Central and Eastern Europe the incentive to accelerate reforms, to settle disputes with neighbors, and to increase regional cooperation. They have done so magnificently.

To retract the open-door policy, as some have suggested, would risk undermining tremendous gains that have been made for peace throughout the region. The result of a ''closed-door'' policy would be the creation of new dividing lines across Europe. Those nations outside might become disillusioned and insecure and, thus, inclined to adopt the competitive and destabilizing security policies of Europe's past.

NATO's decision to enlarge in stages recognizes that all new democracies and applicants in Europe are not equally ready or willing to be security allies. Some states may never be ready. At the same time, NATO must not prejudge the future or draw new lines in Europe by pre-emptively excluding or setting time lines for future cooperation or membership.

The selection of future NATO members should depend on: (1) a determination by NATO members of their strategic interests; (2) NATO's perception of threats to security and stability; and (3) actions taken by prospective members to complete their democratic transitions and to harmonize their policies with NATO's political aims and security policies.

This would clarify the security expectations of non-NATO members. It would make clear that it is the intention of the United States that NATO remain a serious defensive military alliance and not slip into a loose collective security society. It suggests that enlargement will be a careful, deliberate process, with consideration of all security interests. Finally, it draws again on the principle of reciprocity, both to encourage prospective members to align themselves with NATO's values and policies and to signal that threats will be counterproductive.

Intellectually, I can understand the concern that we must not allow the NATO Alliance to collapse under the strains, produced by multitudes of new members. But, neither can we seek a quick, painless remedy for serious debate and oversight of American foreign policy through ''strategic pauses'' or ''NATO linkages''. The best way to ensure the continued vitality of NATO is for the United States to consider and debate the qualifications and potential ramifications of new members on a country-by-country or a stage-by-stage basis.

NATO's open-door policy has served the Alliance well for fifty years. The Senate has always and will retain its prerogatives and powers in the area of the North Atlantic Treaty and the Alliance. A two-thirds Senate majority is the best form of balance and oversight we can produce without treading on executive privilege.

In the weeks leading up to the Alliance's Madrid summit in July 1997, many of our current European allies pushed for a larger initial number of states to join NATO. The President decided to keep the initial round to three members. This was not a popular decision with some of our allies, who had championed the cause of Slovenia and Romania. And while neither the Administration nor the Senate can prevent other current members of the Alliance from promoting the membership of additional states, both have the ability to prevent the accession of other candidates—the Administration through its predominant voice in the North Atlantic Council and the Senate through its role in approving modifications to the North Atlantic Treaty.

Consequently, I do not believe a legislatively mandated pause is in the interest of this country, this institution, or the NATO Alliance.

Some propose that NATO enlargement be bound to the expansion of the European Union (EU). EU enlargement is highly desirable in its own right, but must not be a condition to NATO membership. It would restrict a trans-Atlantic Alliance led by the U.S. to the political exigencies of a strictly European organization.

I point out again, Mr. President, that NATO is the organization in which the United States is involved and in which we offer leadership, not the European union.

The transfer of security decision-making power to an institution which has been unable to develop a common security policy and failed to stop the fighting in the former Yugoslavia would not bode well for the future of European security. The EU's decision-making procedures are notorious for being cumbersome and slow. Moreover, the consensus-building process they

serve to tend to produce outcomes expressing the lowest common denominator. All of these traits are antithetical to the demands of a military alliance which places a premium on timely, decisive action rather than first meeting the test of political acceptability to a diverse relationship.

Finally, subordinating NATO to the EU in this manner would make the Alliance, not a cornerstone of European security, but an appendage. The role of the U.S., Canada, and Turkey, none of whom are members of the EU, would be significantly diminished in the enlargement process. This potential ''back-door'' approach to enlargement is fraught with dangers; I prefer the ''front-door'', the ''open-door''.

Critics assert that NATO enlargement repeats the mistake of the Versailles Treaty by mistreating Russia. One should be careful with historical analogies. NATO enlargement is not a punishment or isolation of Russia. During the period that NATO enlargement has proceeded, President Yeltsin was re-elected; reformers were elevated in government; President Yeltsin pledged to press for ratification of START II and then to pursue deeper nuclear arms reductions in START III; the Russian Duma approved the Chemical Weapons Convention; Russian troops continue their participation in Bosnia; the West has extended some $100 billion since 1991 to assist Russian democratic and economic reforms, and over $2 billion in weapons dismantlement and security.

NATOP members will continue to have both common and divergent interests with Russia, whether NATO enlarges or not. It is a mistake to view Russia solely as a reactive power and to blame its actions on Western behavior alone. There will be areas of collaboration and areas of discord in the relationship, and those distinctions will be determined by differences in geography, history, and economic standing, not by ideology as during the Cold War and not by NATO enlargement in the post-Cold War world. The only way to manage both areas of coincident and conflicting interests is by building bridges where possible and drawing lines where necessary.

Many reject NATO enlargement out of a desire to preserve a Russian sphere of influence. If Russia cannot accept the legitimate right of its neighbors to choose their security arrangements, a policy they embraced in the NATO-Russia Founding Act, then NATO's role in the region will prove even more important.

Some critics believe that NATO enlargement is somehow condemning the START II Treaty and cooperative U.S.-Russian nuclear dismantlement activities to the dustbin of history. I do not believe this is the case. Russia's recent ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention would indicate that the linkage between NATO enlargement and arms control is more political than strategic.

Many Russians, including liberal Duma members, simply do not like the START II Treaty. They believe the Russian side was out-negotiated by the Americans, and oppose it whether NATO expands or not.

What is at issue among Russian arms control specialists is whether the United States can be convinced to pay some additional price for mutual strategic nuclear arms control reductions that the Russians themselves will have to undertake with or without a treaty. Continued statements about the dire consequences that will accompany NATO enlargement become the means by which they hope to induce the U.S. to go to a START III agreement sooner rather than later.

Perceived START II inequities constitute by far the primary reason for the reluctance of many Duma members and defense specialists to ratify the START II Treaty, not continuing, deep-seated resentment of NATO enlargement. It is not simply the nationalists but the so-called liberals in the Russian foreign policy elite who believe that START II, as currently written, is not in Russia's national interest. The latter would also propose to substantially modify the START III elements of the Helsinki joint statement agreed to by Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin, arguing that the March 1997 START III principles do not go far enough to guarantee that Russia's smaller strategic forces of the future will be able to reliably deter the United States.

At the very time that prominent Russian ''arms controllers'' are publicly laying the blame for lack of Duma ratification of START II at the feet of an expanding NATO, they are privately probing to determine how far the United States would be willing to go in further lowering warhead ceilings through START III, realizing that Russia cannot realistically afford to maintain the proposed START II strategic force levels. They want to drive the warhead ceiling down to a figure that Russia can afford! They are urging the beginning of START III negotiations as soon as possible, in part, they say, to improve the prospects for Russian ratification of START II. They are arguing, in short, that the entire strategic arms control dialogue is foundering, not because of NATO enlargement, but because the U.S. insists on waiting for START II ratification before beginning formal negotiations on START III.

It is not so much NATO expansion that is eating away at the U.S.-Russia strategic relationship. Rather, it is Russian weakness and the desire of some Russians either to stop the strategic nuclear arms reduction process at START I levels, or to convince American statesmen and political leaders, in part through a ''guilt trip'' over NATO enlargement, that a better deal needs to be offered to the Russian side—either in order to secure ratification of the START II Treaty or to supersede it with a START III agreement.

There is nothing inherently inconsistent between a strong, healthy U.S.-Russian relationship and an expanding NATO. Too many Americans critics of NATO enlargement who posit this as an either/or choice fail to understand the nature of the debate within the Russian Federation.

NUNN-LUGAR

In recent trips to Russia and the former Soviet Union it has been clear to me that NATO enlargement is unlikely to have a negative impact on our broad and deep cooperation with the Russian government to reduce the threat from weapons of mass destruction. My colleagues have expressed their concern that our successful cooperative dismantlement and destruction programs may falter as NATO enlarges.

For the past year or two, while NATO issues were being addressed by senior diplomats, Nunn-Lugar activities continued along their steady path, undisrupted. The programs are proceeding well, with no signs of NATO enlargement hindering or damaging our ongoing destruction and dismantlement efforts.

To date, the Nunn-Lugar program has deactivated 4,700 nuclear warheads, destroyed 255 ICBMs, eliminated 252 ICBM launchers, destroyed 37 bombers, eliminated 95 SLBMs, destroyed 80 SLBM launchers, and sealed 114 nuclear test tunnels. These numbers will continue to climb as we expand our cooperative efforts with Russia.

Our cooperative programs with Russia on these issues have not slowed down; rather they have made remarkable gains in recent months. Recently, the Russians have indicated their willingness to move forward on a range of new projects. Nunn-Lugar will support the elimination of over 20 Russian SS–18 ICBMs each year. At 10 warheads apiece, this removes one of the most feared threats to U.S. strategic forces.

Nunn-Lugar will support the elimination of over 10 missile submarines per year at three Russian shipyards. Dismantlement projects will include DELTAs and ultimately TYPHOONs, the workhorses and mainstays of the Russian submarine forces. Moscow has also proposed Nunn-Lugar support for transforming the fissile material from dismantled Russian warheads into non-weapons-usable hockey puck shapes for storage at the Mayak fissile material storage facility. This project would provide unprecedented conformation that the Russians are dismantling nuclear warheads, and will speed the safe and secure storage of weapons-usable material.

Ukraine has been similarly expansive in identifying new areas of cooperation. The Ukrainian government has requested Nunn-Lugar assistance in eliminating SS–24s and associated silos to meet its requirements by 2000. Kiev has also asked for Nunn-Lugar assistance in destroying 44 bombers, as well as over 1,000 advanced air-launch cruise missiles.

With these major advances in our cooperative destruction and dismantlement programs under Nunn-Lugar, it is difficult to find evidence to support the claim that NATO enlargement is interfering with the larger problem of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Just the opposite, as NATO enlargement has progressed, so have our joint efforts with Russia and other states of the former Soviet Union to deal with the threat of weapons of mass destruction.

Therefore I conclude that NATO enlargement and deeper NATO-Russian relations both have immense value for the United States and Europe if they are pursued properly. They are complementary and reinforcing objectives. The best outcome for the United States and Europe is for both tracks to succeed. A zero-sum debate about them, therefore, misses the point.

The coming votes of European parliaments and the U.S. Senate on NATO enlargement will not simply be decisions over whether to add a few members to a military alliance. These votes will become a statement on the roles of the United States and the countries of Western Europe in the world. The U.S. vote on enlargement will be seen as a sign of whether America intends to maintain its international leadership role, or whether, after the end of the Cold War, the United States intends to retreat and relinquish its status as the world leader.

It is my hope that America will maintain its position and engagement in the world's arena. We should ratify NATO enlargement and expand the zone of peace and security which has served Western Europe so well for the last fifty years to the central and eastern portions of this important continent.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, Ronald Reagan once remarked that:

> They say the world has become too complex for simple answers. They are wrong. There are no easy answers, but there are simple answers.

Mr. President, with the end of the Cold War and the dissolution of the Soviet empire, we must face the challenge of maintaining a zone of stability in Central Europe while preserving the freedom and independence of these democratic states. Enlarging NATO to include Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic is not an easy answer, but it is a simple answer. Most importantly, it is a simple answer that is in the best interest of the United States.

This is not the first time that the Senate has considered the merits of NATO enlargement. NATO added new members on three other occasions, bringing Germany, Greece, Turkey, and Spain into the fold. With each addition, the military capability of NATO increased, and the stability of Europe was enhanced. I am confident that the inclusion of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic in NATO will have the same effect.

This round of NATO expansion, however, is significant in that these are the first candidates for NATO membership to be considered that were part of the Soviet bloc. Nearly a decade after the fall of the Berlin Wall, we have a chance to right the historical wrong of Yalta, and firmly anchor Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic in the West. While the accession of these three nations to full NATO membership should not be supported for moral reasons alone, our moral obligation to these countries should not be ignored. We must look at NATO expansion not just as a way to make up for past mistakes, but as a chance to secure the gains of freedom and democracy and ensure that they will never again be encroached.

NATO expansion offers the United States a remarkable opportunity to be proactive in shaping the strategic landscape of Europe. That this opportunity is a result of peace, and not the spoils of war, is a tribute to the effectiveness of NATO over nearly 50 years. It is not a responsibility that we should take lightly; it is not a responsibility that we can shirk.

NATO'S MISSION

The Senate does not have merely the obligation to determine whether Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic should be admitted to NATO, but to safeguard the integrity of the organization they would be joining. NATO has been a successful military alliance with a clearly defined mission: protecting the territorial integrity of its members, defending them from external aggression and preventing the domination of Europe by any single power. NATO's mission remains just as valid today as it was at its inception. I am convinced that a NATO which includes Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic will be a stronger, more viable institution as long as NATO retains its essential character throughout this transition.

I share the concerns of some of my colleagues that unless we are vigilant, NATO may evolve into a UN-style peacekeeping force. However, it is important to underscore that the expansion of NATO to include Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic will inhibit—not promote—this objectionable outcome. The prospective members are eager to join NATO to receive the same strong security guarantee that NATO members have traditionally enjoyed. They understand what it means to be invaded and occupied, and do not want NATO's ability to carry out its mission to be diluted or compromised. They will be on our side in the internal debate in the North Atlantic Council over NATO's strategic concept in the 21st century.

RUSSIA

Mr. President, others have argued that the inclusion of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic in NATO will destabilize Russia and endanger our efforts to build a constructive relationship with that important nation. I do not believe this is the case. The Russian legislature is refusing to ratify START II. Russia is forging closer ties to Iraq and Iran and undermining US policy in the Middle East whenever possible. Moscow is trying to disrupt US-backed plans to move Caspian Sea oil through an Azerbaijani-Georgian pipeline to the Black Sea. But there is no evidence that any of these actions is linked to NATO expansion. Indeed, Russia was pursing these policies long before the expansion of NATO was seriously contemplated. NATO expansion may be a convenient excuse for Russia's stance on foreign policy issues that run counter to US interests, but it is not the cause.

I have no doubt that Russia, if given the choice, would like to maintain a ''sphere of influence'' in Central Europe, or barring that, a buffer zone. But this is 1998, not 1948, and Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic have the right and the ability to reject the former, and the United States has a vital interest in denying the latter. As former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger noted.

Basing European and Atlantic security on a no man's land between Germany and Russia runs counter to historical experience. A greater security dilemma would be created by ceding to our own fears about antagonizing Russia than proceeding with enlargement.

Furthermore, appeasing the Russian extremists who object to NATO expansion would only serve to undermine the very democratic forces that we're trying to protect. I see no evidence of a brewing nationalist backlash that critics keep warning us about. The Russian people are concerned about securing jobs, protecting their pensions, and preserving their personal security. Opinion polls show that Russian voters don't care one way or another about NATO expansion. As one expert witness, Mr. Dimitri Simes, before the Foreign Relations Committee remarked, the Russian leadership: engaged in terrible atrocities in Chechnya against [. . .] many Russian civilians. They are not paying wages and pensions at a time when people can easily observe the huge mansions of the new elite [. . .]. None of this moves Russian politics in a nationalist or reactionary direction. But somehow an obstruction like NATO enlargement is supposed to have a mystical, destructive impact on Russian politics. It is very difficult for me to believe.

EUROPEAN UNION

Mr. President, we should not let our fears of Russia's response stall NATO expansion; nor should we let protectionist elements of the European Union have the same effect. Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic are established democracies with free market economies. They have resolved all territorial conflicts with their neighbors. Their

militaries are firmly under civilian control and they have pledged to meet all the responsibilities of NATO membership. These countries want to be engaged in Europe; they are willing to fully participate in the defense of Europe and have pledged to do their fair share. There is no need to wait until the European Union accepts Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic before we permit them to achieve full membership in NATO.

Right now, three of our current European allies are not members of the European Union: Norway, Iceland, and Turkey. There is no reason to raise the bar for the admission of new members.

MANDATED PAUSE

The accession of Poland, Hungary, and Czech Republic to full NATO membership must be regarded as the first—not the only—round of expansion. A mandated pause would create a new dividing line in Europe and send a signal to the Central European countries who were not included in the first round that enlargement has not just stalled, but has stopped. Many of these countries are making positive changes toward democracy and free markets with the view of joining NATO. It would be destructive to remove that goal.

RESOLUTION OF RATIFICATION

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I raised a number of concerns about the Administration's proposal to expand NATO and I am pleased that these have been addressed in the Resolution of Ratification. This Resolution of Ratification underscores that NATO's central mission remains the territorial defense of its members and that NATO command, structures, force goals, and defense planning must reflect that fact. It confirms that Russia will not have a voice or a veto on NATO decision-making and that the Permanent Joint Council will be a mechanism for explaining NATO policy, not creating it. It also ensures that there will be a clear, equitable distribution of the financial costs of expansion. American taxpayers should not pay the costs of modernizing the forces of our current allies, because they have failed to live up to their previous commitments. Nor should our taxpayers pay more if any of our European allies refuse to pay their fair share for the costs of bringing in new members.

MINNESOTA

Some of my colleagues have stated that the American people have not been informed about the issues surrounding NATO expansion. Well, I can categorically state that is not the case in Minnesota. Minnesotans have participated in an ongoing dialogue on the merits of expanding NATO at every level—from the Minnesota legislature, to academic symposia, to town hall meetings. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of three Minnesotans who have worked diligently for the inclusion of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic in NATO: Mr. John Radzilowski, Mr. Lazlo Fulop, and Ms. Paulette Will. They made an extraordinary effort to make sure that their fellow Minnesotans had the opportunity to become well-informed about the issues surrounding NATO expansion.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY JOHN RADZILOWSKI IN FAVOR OF A RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO SUPPORT THE ADMISSION OF POLAND, HUNGARY, AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION (HF 2417)

BEFORE THE MINNESOTA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE, JANUARY 21, 1998, REP. MICHAEL JAROS, CHAIR

(John Radzilowski is president of Polish American Cultural Institute of Minnesota. He is a historian, and a freelance writer and editor, currently in the final stages of his Ph.D. candidacy. He is the author of three books, the co-author of four others, as well as many articles, reviews, and stories. He has written on topics such as Minnesota history, east European history, immigration, and American ethnic groups)

Mr. RADZILOWSKI: I would like to thank the committee for providing me the opportunity to speak today and I am very pleased to be able to speak in favor of the resolution supporting NATO membership for Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. As a Polish American who grew up in Minnesota, I am especially proud to see the legislature considering this vital issue. Since the beginning of American history, the interests and values of the Polish and American peoples have coincided. During our war for independence, Americans were aided by many Polish patriots. Kazimierz Pulaski founded the U.S. Calvary and died fighting the British at Savannah. Tadeusz Kościuszko, a close friend of Thomas Jefferson, played a key role in the American victory at Saratoga, and designed the fortress of West Point (which later became our military academy). Kościuszko was also a fierce of foe of slavery and on hearing that Congress had awarded him a plantation for his services, he ordered Jefferson to free its slaves, sell the plantation, and use the money to educate freed blacks. Poland's 1791 Constitution was based on the U.S. Constitution, and was only the second democratic constitution in the world.

Although Poland lost her fight for independence, Pols kept their dream alive. When they could not win their own freedom, Pols battled for the independence of oppressed peoples around the world, becoming known as the scourge of tyrants. Fleeing political oppression and economic hardship, Poles found a haven here in America. Today, there are about 10 million Polish Americans, while Minnesota boasts about a quarter million Polish Americans, making us the state's sixth largest ethnic or racial group. [According to the 1990 U.S. Census.] Polish Americans have distinguished themselves in America's service. According to the 1990 U.S. Census, Polish Americans have the highest per capita percentage of veterans in their population than any of the other ethnic and racial groups the government keeps track of.

After World War I, Poland regained her independence, thanks in part to the efforts of U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, who is still considered a hero in Poland today. Following the shameful Munich Pact of 1938, in which an independent Czechoslovakia was turned over to Hitler, Poland refused to give in to German threats and was attacked in September 1939 and defeated by Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Soviet Union after a month of desperate fighting. Many Poles escaped to the West, where they helped make up the fourth largest Allied force in the fight against Nazism. On many occasions Polish and American troops fought side by side. Polish fighters escorted American bombers on raids deep into Germany. Polish destroyers watched over merchant convoys in U-Boat infested waters. In Italy, the Polish victory at Monte Cassino allowed the Americans to break out of the Anzio beachhead and capture Rome. On August 19, 1944, soldiers of the Polish 1st Armored Division linked up with Gen. George Patton's 90th Infantry Division near the French town of Falaise to close the trap on 60,000 Nazi troops, destroying the bulk of the German army in the West.

World War II cost the lives of some 6 million Polish citizens (a number divided about evenly between Christians and Jews), as well as incalculable losses of property and cultural and artistic treasures. Despite the terrible cost, and despite fighting for the winning side, Poland did not regain her freedom. Her struggle against tyranny was forgotten. Instead, Poland, like her neighbors Hungary and Czechoslovakia, became a satellite of the Soviet Union, a nation that was responsible for the deaths of almost 1 million Poles. Yet, Soviet communism proved a failure in Poland, and the people did everything they could to undermine a system that became increasingly corrupt, unworkable, and morally bankrupt. Given this history, it is no surprise that the unraveling of the Communist system in Europe began in Poland. Although we did not know it at the time, the election of Pope John Paul II and the formation of the Solidarity independent trade union in Poland spelled the beginning of the end for the Cold War. The momentum that began in Poland was furthered by the people in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. The rest of story is, as they say, history.

After breaking with the communist past, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic began an effort to re-enter the family of democratic nations from which they had been unnaturally separated in 1945. They transformed their economies from state-run command systems, to free, open markets. They reformed their political systems, reintroducing real democracy, a free press, and civilian control of the military. These changes have taken root and borne fruit—there have been a series of free and fair elections, and the economies of all three nations are doing well. Poland, for example, has the fastest-growing economy in Europe. Each of these three nations has taken the initiative and solved its outstanding border disputes and tensions. In short, Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic have met the objectives we in the West set for them as conditions for NATO membership.

NATO enlargement will expand the borders of peace and security. It will spread more evenly the burdens of defense within the alliance. It will add to the ranks of our allies. It will encourage those who want to reject politics based on hatred, division, and spheres of influence. As Czech president Vaclav Havel put it, NATO ''is first and foremost an instrument of democracy intended to defend mutually held and created political and spiritual values.'' It is not an alliance aimed at an enemy, but ''a guarantor of Euro-American civilization and thus a pillar of global security.'' [New York Times, May 13, 1997.]

The consequences of the U.S. Senate not ratifying NATO expansion would be serious indeed. Hardline nationalists in Bosnia, Belarus, Serbia, and elsewhere would be encouraged, while friends of democracy and

free markets would be disheartened. Furthermore, U.S. interests would be severally harmed. We depend on stability in the heart of Europe. An expanded NATO is the best guarantor of that security. With NATO membership for the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland, no dictator will ever again dream of a central European empire based on force and violence. We only need to remember the price the U.S. paid in two major European wars and the protracted commitments of the Cold War to understand how important this is.

For Minnesotans, east-central Europe is of increasing importance. The three NATO candidates have some of Europe's fastest growing economies and many Minnesota companies are doing good business in Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic. The list of major companies with interests in these three countries reads like a who's who of corporate Minnesota: Cargill, 3M, Honeywell, Pillsbury, Land O'Lakes, NRG. We can add to this many medium and smaller companies, especially in the high technology area (many of which were started by recent immigrants). Ask the officials of these companies what NATO enlargement means for them.

In just two weekends this summer we collected some 1,400 signatures of Minnesotans from all over the state on a petition in support of NATO membership for Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. This was a grassroots effort conducted by volunteers with little or no political experience. Since then, there has been a flood of letter writing, faxing, and calling to our U.S. Senators. One senator supports NATO expansion, while the other is officially undecided. The debate continues. Thus, it is important that the state legislature make its voice heard on this important issue, to tell the U.S. Senate that NATO expansion is good for global security, good for America, and good for Minnesota. I thank Rep. Jaros, and other state legislators who have helped on this issue, for their good work, and I urge members of this body to support the resolution.

NATO membership is the final step in the return of Poland and its neighbors to their place as our allies. As President Clinton recently noted, Poland is not a new ally for America, but an old friend returning home.

STATEMENT BY LASZLO G. FULOP, IN SUPPORT OF WHY HUNGARY SHOULD BECOME A NATO MEMBER.

BEFORE THE MINNESOTA SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND VETERANS

Mr. FULOP. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear in front of your committee and speak in support of Hungary's—along with Poland's and the Czech Republic's—admission to NATO.

Let me introduce myself: Laszlo G. Fulop, architect and planner of Minneapolis, MN., representing the Minnesota Hungarians.

The question many of you have in mind is, Why should Hungary become a NATO member? Before responding to this question let me make a few brief remarks, that are pertinent to this issue.

Hungary has existed in Europe for over 1100 years, and of those over 1000 was oriented to Western Europe. In the course of this orientation she found herself in situations where she fought for and defended the Christian culture of Western Europe, often just by blocking great expansionist endeavors from the East.

Hungary also had a 200+ year interest in the United States. Many Hungarians fought in the American War of Independence. Indeed a Hungarian, Colonel Michael Kovats serving under the famous Polish General Pulaski, organized the first US Cavalry, while fighting for American independence. Later, when the Hungarians fought for their freedom with the Hapsburg empire in 1848-49 and declared their independence, the new Hungarian Constitution was modeled after the American Constitution of 1787. By the way, the Hapsburg forces were able to put down that valiant revolution, only because they asked for Russian help. A Russian army of 175,000 together with the Hapsburg armies eventually subdued the Hungarians fight for freedom. Unfortunately this intrusion was not an isolated occasion.

Until just 9 years ago East and part of Central Europe was relegated to the Soviet Sphere of interest and even the US conducted her relationship with the region through Moscow. Since the defeat of Communism in 1989–90 the Czechs, Poles, Hungarians, regaining their independence, had to overcome great difficulties in their efforts to reestablish democracy.

The dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, initiated by Hungarian Prime Minister Antall in 1990, along with the absence of existing security guarantees has left a strategic vacuum in the region. This effectively dissolved a bipolar world order, and also changed the situation of European security. The threat of nuclear war was replaced by much more limited in scope, yet expanded in types of threats. Aggression in Yugoslavia that went on unchecked for too long has shown just one major cause why this vacuum has to be filled.

The practical view of this membership: what's good in it for me and what's in it for you? Let's look at a few areas:

Security

The Enlargement means expanded security for Europe, and for the individual countries. It means ensuring common interests, common values. NATO was never an aggressive organization, but was an effective deterrent of active war. NATO always professed to protect the ''status quo''. In this case NATO's Enlargement simply means the ''eastward expansion of the region of security and stability.''

Hungary values its security, exactly because it had been threatened so often during her history.

Also a new security system seems to be evolving in Europe that is based on cooperation and partnership and these are driven by democracies in Western Europe. In orienting herself to the West, it will be imperative for Hungary (and to Poland and the Czech Republic) to participate in the economic, political and security aspects of this newly evolving mechanism. This will require modernization in more fronts, including security.

European stability is in the interest of the United States, as well, as NATO has been one of the major guardians of that. Today, it is still viewed in that role, and its enlargement will simply expand the security enjoyed by the current NATO countries, to establish conditions for peaceful, and democratic development in the new member countries. This enlargement is not viewed as pushing the military line established during the Cold War further east, but to expand the state of stability. A war in the area would cost the US a great deal more both in political efforts and in military spending than the costs associated with the NATO Enlargement. These countries will mean a net gain for NATO and the United States.

Developing democracies

Hungary also intends to become member of the EU, but, as NATO has become more than just a military organization, HU views NATO as complimenting her integration into the ranks of western democracies.

These three countries mean market, strong sources of educated manpower, and devoted allies to the West in political as well as on economical turf.

The association with NATO provides a vision that can galvanize people in these three countries (and hopefully later with others) to achieve higher levels of co-operation in areas of common concern and shared destiny. Collectively these people will have a greater power to integrate their future within this alliance. This is perhaps truer today than it ever was before, and the recognition is becoming more pervasive than before. Partially, the margin of vote (85.5%) in Hungary attested to this recognition.

The threat of a large scale military conflict is currently not real, however, smaller scale conflicts can occur. Their potential can never be ignored. For Hungary the upgrading of military will be a costly affair, but it is estimated to cost less over the same period than as if she had to provide for her total defense alone.

Since the reestablishment of democratic governmental forms in Hungary, the military is under civilian control.

Nature of concerns

We are aware that some people are concerned about this step of NATO and has urged a wide ranging discussion on this topic. The main concern seems to be that this expansion will ''. . . bring the Russians to question the entire post-Cold War settlement, and galvanize resistance in the Duma . . .''. It, however, appears that Russia's benefits from the enhanced security adjacent to her borders are being recognized. Serious attempts are being made to re-focus Russia's main goals for the 21st century to the economic development front, [see recommendations prepared by the prestigious Foreign and Defense Policy Council which in its 1997 report came out and said: ''Russia should not busy itself with the blocking of enlargement but adjust itself within a short time to the new situation as effectively as possible.'' Further, ''(if) Russia does not want to completely withdraw from it (i.e. the Central European region) economically, it must adjust itself to the present economic and political conditions for the sake of its own interests.]

Additionally, NATO and Russia has worked out a unique cooperative deal that did more for enhancing Russia's diplomatic position in Europe than she could have hoped for without the enlargement-issue being pursued. We also heard from an authentic and very reliable source that the NATO Enlargement issue is on the low end of concerns of Russian citizen on a Moscow street. On the other hand, even the customarily reserved Encyclopedia Britannica in ''The role of NATO'' brands those trying to do away with NATO as ''neo-isolationists''.

Finally, we also see this world as becoming more and more globalized. Minnesota firms are doing business in Europe, and increasingly in the Central European countries, as well. The University of Minnesota has several student exchange agreements with other countries including the Central European countries. We believe the enlargement of NATO and the attendant security will be but one step to insure increased cooperation, and better understanding of people in an atmosphere of enhanced security and stability.

These are only a sampling of reasons why this action should be supported. Indeed, President Clinton should be commended for seeking solutions in an atmosphere conducive to stability in Central Europe, and anchor security in this area while there are problems in the Middle East. This creates a safer environment for all of us.

Therefore, we urge you to pass a supporting resolution to this most important foreign policy consideration and express your support to the United States Senate. Thank you for allowing me to talk on this issue.

STATEMENT OF PAULETTE WILL IN FAVOR OF A RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO SUPPORT THE ADMISSION OF POLAND, HUNGARY, AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION (HF 2417)

MINNESOTA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE, JANUARY 21, 1998, REP. MICHAEL JAROS, CHAIR

Ms. WILL: Chairman Jaros and Members of the Committee, My name is Paulette Will, I am President of the Minnesota Czechoslovak Center and a partner in Bohemian Traders, a Minnesota-based company importing leather bags from the Czech Republic.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my support for the Czech Republic's entry into NATO along with Hungary and Poland. The Czech Republic is, as you probably know, a very young country. On January 1, 1993 Czechoslovakia, founded in 1918, ceased to exist and the Czech Republic and Slovakia became independent nations as a result of an agreement by their respective governments the previous year. Before World War II Czechoslovakia had a flourishing economy surpassed only by France and Switzerland. Since 1938 the history of the region includes occupation by the Nazis, loss of religious and personal freedoms in the 1968 Prague Spring Soviet crackdown, countless personal losses in terms of families being torn apart from Czechs seeking freedom from an oppressive regime and just this year both the Czech Republic and Poland were struck by catastrophic rains and floods. Today the Czech Republic has a population of 10.3 million people. The country is strategically located in the center of Europe and as such is in an ideal position for trade and investment. Geographically, Prague is located to the west of Vienna, Austria.

According to the last Federal census in 1990 almost 100,000 people in Minnesota are of 50% or more Czech descent (87,748 Czech and 11,466 Czechoslovak) 238,039 are of Polish descent and 12,349 are of Hungarian descent. Minnesotans of Czech heritage are dispersed throughout the state with significant concentrations in LeSuer (New Prague & Montgomery), Rice, Steele, McCleod, Jackson, Pine, Polk, Pope, Renville and St. Louis counties. Many German-Bohemians settled in Minnesota as well, mostly in the New Ulm area.

Recently, the Czech Ambassador to the United States, Alexandr Vondra journeyed here in Minnesota. He said that NATO membership would be the fulfillment of the ''century's goal of the Czech state''. Here in the center of the United States, Minnesota's business community is significantly invested in the Czech Republic. NRG, a subsidiary of NSP is the 5th largest investor in the Czech Republic where they are building an electric power generating plant in Kladno. Other Minnesota corporations with substantial business interests in the Czech Republic include: 3–M, the Carlson Companies, Ecolab, Honeywell, H.B. Fuller, Land O'Lakes, Midwest Imports, Pillsbury, Radisson Hotels, Toro, Thermo-King and many smaller companies such as mine. In the past eight years all of Minnesota's major educational institutions have had Czech students studying here and returning to work in law firms, private industry and the media as many Americans have lived and settled in the Czech Republic.

But something curious is happening in the United States. It's called isolationism. David Gergen said in a U.S. News and World Report article, October 27, 1997 ''Americans from boardrooms to college classrooms are embracing the rest of the world as never before. Business people and students are heading overseas . . . while our political leadership is staying at home. U.S. companies have increased their exports by 40%, many now earning more than half of the revenue overseas . . . Not long ago, our public leaders personally knew the chancellor of Germany and the prime minister of Japan at least as well as the President did. In 1995, some 200 members of the German Parliament came to Washington, not one member of Congress visited Bonn. The National Security Caucus Foundation in Washington reports that one third of today's Senate and House members do not even have passports. Some American political leaders are signaling that it is time to disengage from world affairs.'' This attitude has serious long term implications, not least for Americans peace, security and economic stability. For, like it or not, we are a major player on the world stage and we are inevitably called upon to defend freedom. No one wants to see Central Europe remain isolated between the East and West. Central Europe's security and economic interests are Europe, Canada, America and Minnesota's security and economic interests. NATO ratification is a simple vote to help guarantee civil and safe societies.

A few days ago, on January 18, NATO peacekeeper troops surrounded key buildings in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina just hours after a deeply divided Parliament elected a moderate Prime Minister for the Bosnic Serb Republic. NATO peacekeepers also circled a ministry building in the eastern town of Bijeljina. The Bosnia Serb conflict has cost billions compared to the estimates for NATO expansion. The lesson to be learned is simple; pay now or pay later.

So, here in Central United States, I trust that the Minnesota House and Senate will each enact resolutions joining other State Legislatures around our country urging the United States Senate to ratify the expansion of NATO to include the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland.

Mr. GRAMS. In conclusion, Mr. President, this Resolution of Ratification provides the Senate with a historic opportunity to shape the strategic landscape of Europe.

At the end of the Cold War, there was a lot of discussion about the ''peace dividend''—the financial savings which would accrue from the end of the superpower rivalry between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. Well, the expansion of NATO reflects the true ''peace dividend''—the extension of a zone of security to codify the gains of freedom and democracy for three more nations and ensure that they will never again be encroached.

Mr. President, the United States has a national security interest in assuring the stability of Central Europe. I am convinced that the best way to do that is to enlarge NATO to include Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic.

As Czech President Vaclav Havel, a man who I respect and admire, has warned, ''If the West does not stabilize the East the East will destabilize the West.'' Mr. President, we have an obligation to our troops stationed in Europe and to future generations of Americans to do everything in our power to make sure it is the West which stabilizes the East and war will never again be precipitated by a power vacuum in Central Europe.

Mr. President, I will cast my vote in favor of expanding NATO to include Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, recognizing that this is one of the most important votes that I will take in the Senate. I urge my colleagues to do the same. I yield the floor.

Mr. KYL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for allowing me about 20 seconds. May I also say to the Senator from Minnesota, who has just spoken, and the Senator from Indiana that I subscribe to their remarks and appreciate the strength of their statements.

Mr. President, the United States Senate today has the rare opportunity to right a historical wrong. In the years immediately following World War II, Europe was forcibly divided. As the United States helped to rebuild the nations of Western Europe, the nations of Central and Eastern Europe were subjugated under the heavy hand of Soviet domination. To counter this Soviet expansion into Europe, the United States and its Western European allies forged the most effective defense alliance in modern history, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The military and political strength of this alliance made it the guarantor of an unprecedented period of peace in Western Europe and contributed significantly to the eventual demise of the Soviet Union.

Today, the nations of Central and Eastern Europe are free, and three of them—Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic—are seeking to take advantage of an opportunity denied them following World War II, the opportunity to join NATO, an alliance described by Harvard Professor Samuel Huntington as ''the security organization of Western civilization [whose] primary purpose [in the post-Cold War world] is to defend and preserve that civilization.'' It is my hope that the United States Senate will grant them this opportunity—an opportunity that these nations deserve and have earned.

In the years following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, these three nations have demonstrated a commitment to the Western ideals embodied by the NATO alliance. Their dogged pursuit of democratic institutions, free market economies, and human freedom will serve to remind the existing members of NATO what it means to be a part of the Western world. Indeed, their dedication to these ideals is all the more zealous because they know first hand what it is like to suffer under a regime that denies its citizens basic human freedom.

The enlargement of the NATO alliance to include Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic serves America's national interests. The essence of the U.S. national interest in the world is promoting the security, well-being, and expansion of the community of nations that respect their citizens' democratic rights. Although this is a moral policy, it is not an entirely altruistic one. The freedom, prosperity, and security of Americans—our standard of living and

our domestic civil liberties—all are enhanced and bolstered when this community of free nations grows bigger and stronger, especially when it does so in Europe, where our closest allies and our most profound interests are concentrated.

The enlargement of NATO will also send a clear message to any power who may wish to interfere with the ongoing process of democratization in Europe: you will not succeed, so do not even try.

I know that the enlargement of NATO will not be free. Clearly, additional financial resources will be required on the part of all NATO members—old and new alike. These new costs must be shared equitably by all allies. Although enlargement will ultimately require an increased financial commitment by the United States, I believe that the substantial dividends that will accrue to the U.S. from enlargement justify our strong support for this endeavor.

I urge my colleagues to support the admission of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to NATO, so that, as Secretary of State Madeleine Albright recently noted, ''three nations who have long been our allies in spirit will become our allies in fact.'' It is the right thing to do, and it serves our national interest.

AMENDMENT NO. 2310

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I call up an amendment which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) proposes an amendment numbered 2310.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

In paragraph (1) of section 3, after ''(1) THE STRATEGIC CONCEPT OF NATO.—'' insert the following:

(A) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES TOWARD THE STRATEGIC CONCEPT OF NATO.—The Senate understands that the initial adaptation of NATO's strategy for the post-Cold War environment is contained in the Strategic Concept of NATO (as defined in (1)(E)), and that its core concepts remain relevant today as the North Atlantic Alliance approaches the 21st century. The Senate understands that the policy of the United States toward the revised Strategic Concept shall reflect that fact and shall be based upon the following principles:

(i) FIRST AND FOREMOST A MILITARY ALLIANCE.—NATO is first and foremost a military alliance. NATO's success in securing peace is predicated on its military strength and strategic unity.

(ii) PRINCIPAL FOUNDATION FOR DEFENSE OF SECURITY INTERESTS OF NATO MEMBERS.—NATO serves as the principal foundation for collectively defending the security interests of its members against external threats.

(iii) PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES VITAL NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS.—Strong United States leadership of NATO promotes and protects United States vital national security interests.

(iv) UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP ROLE.—The United States maintains its leadership role of NATO through the stationing of United States combat forces in Europe, providing military commanders for key NATO commands, and through the presence of United States nuclear forces on the territory of Europe.

(v) COMMON THREATS.—NATO members will face common threats to their security in the post-Cold War environment, including—

(I) the potential for the re-emergence of a hegamonic power confronting Europe;

(II) rogue states and non-state actors possessing nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons and the means to deliver these weapons by ballistic or cruise missiles, or other unconventional delivery means;

(III) threats of a wider nature, including the disruption of the flow of vital resources, and other possible transnational threats; and

(IV) conflict in the North Atlantic area stemming from ethnic and religious enmity, the revival of historic disputes or the actions of undemocratic leaders.

(vi) CORE MISSION OF NATO.—Defense planning will reaffirm a commitment by NATO members to a credible capability for collective self-defense, which remains the core mission of NATO. All NATO members will contribute to this core mission.

(vii) CAPACITY TO RESPOND TO COMMON THREATS.—NATO's continued success requires a credible military capability to deter and respond to common threats. Building on its core capabilities for collective self-defense of its members, NATO will ensure that its military force structure, defense planning, command structures, and force goals promote NATO's capacity to project power when the security of a NATO member is threatened, and provide a basis for ad hoc coalitions of willing partners among NATO members. This will require that NATO members possess national military capabilities to rapidly deploy forces over long distances, sustain operations for extended periods of time, and operate jointly with the United States in high intensity conflicts.

(viii) INTEGRATED MILITARY STRUCTURE.—The Integrated Military Structure of NATO underpins NATO's effectiveness as a military alliance by embedding NATO members in a process of cooperative defense planning and ensuring unity of command.

(ix) NUCLEAR POSTURE.—Nuclear weapons will continue to make an essential contribution to deterring aggression, especially aggression by potential adversaries armed with nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons. A credible NATO nuclear deterrent posture requires the stationing of United States nuclear forces in Europe, which provides an essential political and military link between Europe and North America, and the widespread participation of NATO members in nuclear roles. In addition, the NATO deterrent posture will continue to ensure uncertainty in the mind of any potential aggressor about the nature of the response by NATO members to military aggression.

(x) BURDENSHARING.—The responsibility and financial burden of defending the democracies of Europe will be more equitably shared in a manner in which specific obligations and force goals are met by NATO members.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I, again, thank the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise to support the resolution calling upon the Senate to advise and consent to the ratification of the Protocols of the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

This is an important debate, an important week for this Chamber, for this country, for our alliance with our friends in Europe and, indeed, for global security. I appreciate very much the quality of the debate and the thoughtfulness of it as it has proceeded this afternoon. I must say that I am honored to be part of this debate and grateful to my constituents in Connecticut for giving me the chance to do so.

It is a debate that looks backward and forward, and its significance goes in both directions.

Looking backward in our history and in the history of Europe, it could well be said that the enlargement of NATO to now encompass these first three countries that lived under Soviet domination is a ratification of the end of the cold war. It is a validation that we have learned the lessons of that war.

Looking forward, it is, in my opinion, and respectfully, directly at odds with those who oppose expansion and spoke earlier this afternoon, it is the best step that we can take to protect and sustain the peace and freedom that now has broken out across the European Continent. So I appreciate very much the opportunity to participate in this debate.

Mr. President, there are three principles, three values, three ideas, three purposes that I want to speak about this afternoon in supporting NATO enlargement. They are freedom, collective defense and the promotion of peace. Each of those three, I think, speaks powerfully on behalf of the need to enlarge NATO, on the wisdom of that move.

I want to speak particularly about freedom, because that principle may be lost in the strategic discussions and in the practical and tactical concerns that people in the circle may have about the effect of NATO enlargement.

Freedom is at the heart of what it means to be an American. Freedom is at the heart of the American experience, and it is at the center of NATO and the NATO experience. The quest for freedom is what drove the founders of our country here, and they, in turn, were motivated by their faith, by their own quest for personal freedom and by the understanding their faith gave them that they expressed at the very outset of the Declaration of Independence, that all of us are created equal and we are blessed with certain rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—not by any assemblage of our fellow human beings, legislators, lawyers, philosophers, but we are endowed with those rights to freedom by our Creator. Freedom, the pulsating, motivating principle of the American experience, expressed in the declaration, fought for throughout our history, fought for particularly in this century in two great and terrible wars in Europe.

After the second of those, when another threat arose to freedom in Europe from Soviet communism, the leaders of the Western European countries and the leader of the United States at that time, President Harry Truman, saw the need to come together in a military alliance, NATO, to protect what had been won, the freedom that had been won during the Second World War and to try to roll back the advance of tyranny and communism that had begun to occur in Europe under Soviet domination.

That is what NATO is all about. Yes, I understand it is a military alliance, but it is a military alliance in defense of a principle, and that principle is freedom, individual human dignity and worth, as expressed in our Declaration, as I described a moment ago.

Political freedom, religious freedom, the right to express oneself, the right to pursue one's own economic well-being without being dictated to by a central government—that is what NATO is about, a military alliance in defense of a principle. And that is what the cold war was about, not just a clash of blocs or power groupings; it was a great clash of ideas.

Freedom against tyranny, the right of the individual against the right of the state to dictate to the individual; state-controlled economy against market economies. And freedom won, individual dignity won, market economies won. It is a remarkable story whose heroes are numberless, the soldiers in NATO who stood guard over those decades of the cold war, the proud and effective leaders of the Western democracies, the people who understood what was at risk and stood side by side in defense of these principles.

In 1989, the Berlin Wall fell. The Soviet Union began to collapse, and the countries that lived under its domination, not just the people of Russia, among whom there are so many heroes who brought this about, but the people in the constituent countries of the former Soviet Union who had lived under tyranny, whose national identities had been temporarily erased, at least from public expression, certainly not from within their own conscience, whose right to worship as they wished had been suppressed and stifled, whose drive to better themselves by working to build a better life for their family, to profit, to achieve success was undermined, was crushed by the power of the bloated bureaucratic Communist state.

Those people who were suddenly freed, freed by the collapse of the Soviet Union, understood what the cold war was about, understood it was about freedom and understood what NATO is about. That is why they have come to us to ask for inclusion.

After all those years of living in effective slavery, they have turned to us and said, ''By the grace of God and good leadership and faith, now we have the opportunity to express our national will, our individual selves to be free, to prosper,'' and they have turned to NATO and not to the European Union, as some of my colleagues would urge them to do, because they understand what the past was about and what the future is going to be about.

Yes, NATO is a military alliance, but it is a military alliance in defense of a principle, which is freedom, and freedom and security precede commerce.

Of course, inclusion in the European Union is important. But these countries now knocking at the door of the family of freedom, asking to become members of our community of freedom, they understand the significance of NATO.

(Mr. GRAMS assumed the Chair.)

And for us, who for years during the cold war would speak out across the Iron Curtain that dropped in the middle of Europe and say to the people in the suppressed countries—we used to call them the people of the captive nations; they were captives —''Rise up. Be strong. Have faith. A day will come when the Soviet Union will collapse or be defeated. You will have your opportunity to be free and we will welcome you into the community of free nations.''

That is what they are asking. Will we now turn our backs on them and the principle, the idea, the value of freedom that motivated us throughout the cold war and motivates them today? I hope not. I do not think so. I do not believe we will.

Mr. President, collective defense is the second reason why we ought to expand the NATO alliance to embrace these three nations and keep the door open for others as they meet the tests, the standards.

NATO, from the outset, was a military alliance to provide for the collective defense, to protect member nations from attack from an outside enemy. It was started quite clearly as a defensive alliance against Soviet aggression. We had hundreds of thousands of troops in Europe ourselves to protect our allies and ultimately ourselves from that danger.

Now, times have changed. Fortunately, the threat of aggression from the East is not there. Some say that an alliance, a military alliance can only last as long as the threat that engendered it. Now that that threat is gone, some say NATO really ultimately will dissipate.

Well, would that it were so that there were not threats in the world that should tie the member nations and those who choose to be added to NATO together in common defense. My colleagues have mentioned them. I will only repeat them very briefly. Today, the threats may be more from the south of NATO than from the east, from weapons of mass destruction, from terrorism, from threats via ballistic missiles.

We may well—hopefully soon—work with our allies in NATO to form a regional missile defense to protect member nations from the threats posed by the high-tech war that we and our allies face.

So I would say, unfortunately, though security is greater than it was on the European Continent during the cold war, there is still much to worry about. A strong NATO, working together, surely can provide a better defense against those common enemies than nations alone.

In fact, Mr. President, though the NATO treaty, as originally stated—article V—talked about each member being obliged to defend and protect member states who might be attacked, it talked about focus on conflict within the area that is NATO. Clearly in our times some of those threats may come from outside—threats to security of the member nations.

It was not so many years ago—it was 1990 and 1991—when Saddam Hussein drove his Iraqi Army into Kuwait, threatening not just the independence of that small country, but the energy supply on which not only we but our European allies and others depend. The gulf war, Operation Desert Storm, was not explicitly a NATO action, but it was surely NATO in the experience that we had together within NATO. That was not only the place on which the defense and counteroffensive against Saddam could be fashioned and formed, but it was where over those many decades we had learned to work so well together.

So, in fact, I view the enlargement of NATO in our time, the post-cold war time, as the best step that the United States can take to bring others to share our burden of world leadership. We say repeatedly we are not going to be the policemen of the world, but the fact is that we are the world's only remaining global superpower, and responsibility and interests come with that.

Our alliance in NATO is a place in which we can find allies to share the burden when a threat affects the security of the United States and other member nations of the NATO alliance and organization. The three nations that seek accession to NATO, Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic, have already helped us in Bosnia and elsewhere. Some helped during the gulf war. They add 200,000 troops to the NATO forces on the European Continent, providing hope that less will be asked of the United States, or at least we will only be asked in a more proportionate way when these three nations and perhaps others in the future are added.

The third reason why I support this resolution so strongly, Mr. President, is the promotion of peace. That is to remember that NATO from the outset was never just a defensive alliance. It was always an organization which was aimed at promoting peace among its members, not just to bring its members together in alliance to protect them against outside threats. But acknowledging the war-torn history of Europe, feeling still the pain, the sting, the horror of the two World Wars that preceded it, NATO was formed to create an organization in which common interests could be stressed, yes, through

military alliance, but through the sharing of opportunities and challenges. It has worked magnificently in that regard, and it will work even better in this post-cold war period to bring nations formerly under Soviet domination in Central and Eastern Europe within that zone of peace, within that community of which peace will be promoted and conflict will be avoided. That is the record of the now almost five decades of NATO in terms of the amity, the civility, the cordiality of the relations among previous enemies, now members, of NATO, and it will continue to play that role as we expand NATO to other countries on the European Continent. The fact is that it has already begun to happen in anticipation of this effort to accede to NATO membership of the three we are focused on today. And other nations hoping for NATO membership have begun to resolve long-standing conflicts.

The conflict between the Hungarians and the Romanians comes to mind. That is the drive—the momentum will be on the side of conflict resolution among the member states of NATO and those who choose to become members in promoting peace on the European continent and again learning the lessons of the war-torn history of Europe.

Mr. President, a final word about Russia. It is from within Russia that the Soviet Union and communism that I have spoken of and the denial of freedom began. It is from within Russia under the historic progressive leadership of Mikhail Gorbachev and from within the hearty and heroic band who resisted tyranny even as it began to rear its head again after the collapse of the Berlin Wall. It is from within Russia that this historic change began.

It began, as I said earlier, and occurred because of the steadfastness, the sense of purpose, the heroism of people in the NATO alliance and Western Europe and the United States, and it began after a long period of suffering by those who lived within Russia and within the member states of the former Soviet Union under Soviet domination.

It has to be a central tenet of priority of our foreign and defense policy to develop good relations with Russia. We have worked mightily at that. But I must say, as I hear some of those who oppose expansion, enlargement of NATO, who are prepared to blame enlargement of NATO on anything that goes wrong in Russia, I simply cannot accept that prediction. Those who foresee the most dire consequences of NATO enlargement, including, as some have suggested here, the heightened possibility of nuclear war—I simply do not see it. These arguments in some ways seem more psychoanalytical than geopolitical, more psychological than strategic.

Yes, I know that Russia has struggled and has much work to do. I simply echo and embrace by association the comments of the Senator from Indiana, Mr. LUGAR, on this course. The fact is that Russia has come some distance in spite of the challenges it has faced. It has sustained a democratically elected government. It has fought off attempts to create denials of freedom within the country. If there is a threat to the continued movement forward of freedom within Russia, if there is a threat that will somehow raise the possibility of nuclear conflict with Russia, it is not the enlargement of NATO.

I must say, as I speak to members of the Russian Government and private citizens, including businesspeople and think-tank people, I know there are some in the political community who are opposed to the enlargement of NATO, but honestly I do not find it to be the priority of concern that some on this floor have suggested.

The fact is, as the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. GRAMS, said, every poll I have seen taken in Russia shows that the people list NATO enlargement far down in their itemization of concerns they have about Western behavior. Think about how we and our people would feel if we were in Russia. What would be more important to us—that NATO is about to accept Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic into this alliance or that I am not getting my paycheck for working at the shipyard, or I am not getting my pensioners' check as a retired person, or my children's education is not as good as it used to be? Those are the things that the Russians are focused on. Those are the threats to stability if it exists within the Soviet Union. Those constitute the ground in which a more aggressive and warlike leadership might—I hope never will—but might arise again in Russia, not NATO enlargement.

It simply, respectfully, does not make sense to me that that is the case. I have said before we have worked hard at building good relations with Russia. The Founding Act creates an institutionalized relationship between Russia and NATO that some feel actually goes too far. I think it is appropriately balanced.

The relationship between President Clinton, President Yeltsin, Vice President GORE, former Prime Minister Chernomyrdin, and presumably the new Prime Minister Kiriyenko, is very strong. If we have had a shortcoming in our policy, in our post-cold war reaction to Russia that may have squandered an opportunity, which is a phrase that one of those who opposed NATO enlargement spoke about earlier, it is not to enlarge NATO, it is that we did not rush in early enough and broadly enough to help the Russians build their economy in the period after the Berlin Wall fell.

There were some great voices at that time—late President Nixon, most prominently at that point, speaking to the historic opportunity we had. The truth is what we delivered was timid, was weak, was insufficient. If we squandered an opportunity, it was at that moment when, as some said, we might well in our own self-interest have adopted the equivalent of a Marshall Plan for Russia, encouraging and creating incentives for American businesses to go over and invest there and create opportunity. Not enough of that has happened. Very little of that has happened. It is in that neglect that we planted the seeds that might—again we hope and pray never will—grow into a less democratic, more aggressive Russian, but not NATO, enlargement.

Let us come back to this. So much of the opposition to this enlargement is based on the effect it will have on Russia. That is what I said earlier, and I say respectfully, this becomes an argument more in psychoanalysis than in geopolitics or reality. NATO is a defensive alliance. NATO has no hostile intent on Russia. Does Russia fear military aggression from Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland? Of course not. So why do we yield to what we see or fear may be the opposition within Russia to the enlargement of NATO? When we do that, when we yield, we do something far more damaging. That is, we forget the principle I spoke about at the beginning, which is freedom. We forget what Winston Churchill said about that Iron Curtain falling in the middle of Europe. We forget what Harry Truman spoke to us when he joined in the creation of NATO, as he watched the Soviet threat in Europe against freedom. We forget what President Kennedy did at the Berlin Wall in the confrontation of Berlin in the 1960s. We forget what President Reagan said about the evil empire. Why was it evil? Because it denied its people freedom. And we forget we fought that cold war over an arbitrary, dictatorial, unnatural division in Europe which denied the principle of freedom, the line Stalin forced in Europe.

So will we now, because of our fear—strange for a victor, the world's global superpower, to have such fear—will we now redraw that line by shutting people in Central and Eastern Europe out of the community of free nations? I don't believe we will. I am confident that more than the necessary number of our colleagues here in the Senate will see the historic opportunity we have to validate the end of the cold war, to uphold the principle on which it was at fault, and to create the conditions for peace and security in Europe among the member nations of NATO as those members expand and together between them, in a free, secure, and strong Russia.

Mr. President, I close with words of one of the heroes of the century and certainly the heroes of the post-cold-war period, Vaclav Havel, who wrote almost a year ago in the New York Times, May 13, 1997:

> The [NATO] alliance should urgently remind itself that it is first and foremost an instrument of democracy, intended to defend mutually held and created political and spiritual values. It must see itself not as a pact of nations against a more or less obvious enemy, but as a guarantor of Euro-American civilization and, thus, as a pillar of global security.

That is what this debate is about. I look forward to the dialog as it continues this week. It is a critically important debate, and I hope that we will join it directly and not hesitate to speak forcefully but, of course, respectfully to one another. That much is at stake here.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. ASHCROFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The distinguished Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I am happy to have this opportunity to rise and discuss some of the ramifications of the proposed expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. A number of issues have received attention, and it is appropriate that we focus on those issues and give them very, very close scrutiny. The cost of enlargement, for instance, deserves our attention; the political and strategic benefits or deficits that of new NATO members deserves our attention; and finally, the effect of NATO expansion on the relationship of the United States with the Soviet Union deserve the Senate's full attention.

But while all these issues are important, I think in some respects they divert inquiry into a fundamental issue regarding NATO's future, and that is, ''What is the purpose of the organization?'' Is the purpose of the organization being altered inappropriately? Is it being transitioned away from that for which it was initially called into existence?

The expansion of NATO and the question about whether it should or should not be expanded is significant. But defining the purpose of the organization is even more significant.

I just might, in an aside here, mention that I am not sure we can redefine NATO. One of the most serious questions I raise is, Is it possible for NATO to be redefined without the redefinition being subject to the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate? If a treaty, once it is enacted and ratified by the United States, could then be changed without the U.S. Senate again offering its advice and consent, we would never need but to enter into one or two treaties, and then, subsequently, administrations could transfer, transition, enlarge, subtract, or shrink the treaty in accordance with the particular foreign policy strategy of the moment. A treaty's purpose might be distorted from defense to trade, or otherwise changed, if it is possible to change a treaty without being subject again to the Senate' advice and consent.

Now, we obviously find ourselves, with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, looking at a treaty designed to protect the member states from a hostile foreign invasion. The Soviet Union no longer exists. There are nations that were a part of the Soviet Union that now exist, but we find ourselves with a significantly different configuration of forces and challenges to the United States. Challenges to the member states of NATO are different than they were when the treaty was called into existence in 1949.

So I think it is important now for the U.S. Senate—which is, if you will, the quality control organization as it relates to U.S. treaties—to ensure that U.S. treaty commitments are not expanded inappropriately and the American people are not subjected to obligations that have not been approved through the proper constitutional processes. The U.S. Senate has a role of assessing the quality of treaties as they proceed through the Senate before the Senate's imprimatur of approval is given.

Here we stand at this moment in time debating perhaps the most successful collective defense organization in the history of the world, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO still stands, although the specific threat for which it was created has disappeared for the time being. We have to ask ourselves at this juncture, ''What is the purpose of the treaty?'' Would some try to change the purpose of the treaty? Is it appropriate or possible to change the treaty, without amending the treaty, just by beginning to lean everyone in one direction, to turn the treaty to one side or another, or begin to assert that there are new things to be considered because the treaty is evolving?

I have to say to you, Mr. President, I don't believe in treaty evolution anymore than I believe in the evolution of the Constitution. If you could just evolve treaties, as I said, U.S. treaty commitments would seldom have to be brought before the Senate. In this case, NATO would be evolving and going on its way, entangling this country with potentially serious obligations which place in jeopardy the lives and fortunes of those who serve in our armed forces and those who support the military. I think we have to be very careful that we don't allow treaties to simply evolve.

It is interesting to me that as we work to address where NATO is and the purpose of the organization, that we be clear about what it is supposed to do. What is interesting to me is that there is a group of individuals who now say that NATO is totally different than the organization created in 1949.

I want to call attention to this idea that NATO, which was once designed to protect individuals in the North Atlantic area, is now, according to a number of people, becoming an organization with a global scope. Expanding the scope of NATO has serious ramifications: if the responsibility of NATO is no longer confined to specific territory, but now is global in nature, the kinds of required military devices, the kinds of technology, the kinds of cooperation, and the expenses are going to be massively different.

Here is what the immediate past U.S. Secretary of Defense, William Perry, said in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee on the 19th day of March of this year:

The original mission of NATO—deterring an attack from the Soviet Union—is obviously no longer relevant.

Well, I would say the Soviet Union might be reconstituted, or there certainly might be a threat, but we will give him that much.

The original geographical area of NATO responsibility is no longer sufficient'', Mr. Perry continues.

Sufficient for what? It is sufficient for the people who live in that area. NATO helps secure the homes and livelihoods of people in the North Atlantic area.

Mr. Perry states, The original military structure of NATO is no longer appropriate.

We are going from a military alliance to something else.

He says:

The new missions—

I am taken aback. ''New missions''? How can a treaty organization ratified by the U.S. Senate, in place for 50 years, all of a sudden have new missions, new purposes?

Mr. Perry continues, ''The new missions of NATO should be preventive defense—creating the conditions for peace in Europe.''

Mr. Perry refers to Europe—not NATO member nations. There are a number of nonmember nations in the European area. All of a sudden, we are expanding beyond the concept of a group of individual countries who have agreed to defend themselves to the projection of a peace guarantee on an entire continent.

Mr. Perry continues, ''The geographical area of NATO interests should be anywhere in the world * * *''

Mr. President, that is a substantial change. That is a significant departure. This is not the traditional understanding of NATO. This is not in the language of the original treaty. This is an effort to make NATO a worldwide organization. ''* * * anywhere in the world where aggression can threaten the security of NATO members.''

I wish to emphasize that we need to be very careful about anybody who threatens the security of NATO members. But what does this administration mean when it makes statements endorsing a global NATO? We don't have to rely on the former U.S. Secretary of Defense for guidance on that question. We can go to the current Secretary of State. According to the Washington Post, Secretary Albright ''also has urged that an expanding national North Atlantic Treaty Organization must extend its geographic reach beyond the European continent and evolve into a 'force for peace from the Middle East to Central Africa.' ''

I think it is only fair that we go beyond focusing on three new members in Eastern Europe. If a new mission is really what we are talking about, if this is what the intention is, the change here is far more than adding three new countries. The transformation is a shift from the defense of territory—specified and outlined with

clear boundaries—to an organization whose impact will be worldwide. According to the Secretary of State NATO should be a ''* * * force for peace from the Middle East to central Africa.''

If what the Senate is really considering here is the transformation of NATO's mission, then I think it requires us to ask, ''Is this what was intended when this NATO agreement came into existence? Was it designed to have this kind of elasticity? Was it designed to evolve, as an ameba does, changing shape with different circumstances to fill any void? Not according to the folks who presided in the U.S. Senate in 1949 when this great treaty organization was ratified.

Listen to the words of Senator Tom Connally, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the time: ''Let us not forget that this treaty is limited in scope. Its main purpose is to maintain the peace and security of the North Atlantic area. We do not propose to stretch its terms to cover the entire globe.''

It is interesting to consider these comments by Senators from the past. ''We do not propose to stretch its terms to cover the entire globe'', stated Senator Connally. His statement offers a striking contrast to the language of a globalist NATO offered by officials from this administration. This administration is now supporting the expansion of NATO to three new members, but is also presiding over an incredibly significant transition in the scope and shape of the organization itself.

In NATO, the United States was making a calibrated commitment. We joined NATO and considered the possible deployment of U.S. forces with the utmost caution. In 1949, our Congress was not about to deploy U.S. forces willy-nilly around the world. The collective defense mission of NATO was defined explicitly in article V, and I quote: ''The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them''—of the parties, of the member nations—''in Europe or North America, shall be considered an attack against them all * * *''

Collective defense was meant to respond to an attack on the United States or another NATO ally. This was an attack on the member nations in Europe within their borders. The allies would then take such action, according to article V, as each ''deems necessary'' to restore the peace for those member nations.

The geographic scope of the article V commitment was defined explicitly in article VI to make sure there was not any confusion. In article VI, we made it clear. It said the United States would defend the territory—territory of NATO members—not the interests, not the commercial transactions, but the territory of the NATO members.

The geographical scope of Article 6 included the Mediterranean Sea and the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer.

Article V says if you are attacked, you are to respond to the attack. Article VI has the sort of precision of a real estate transaction, specifically stating where the territory was and how it was to be defended.

Article IV of the treaty is seen by some now as an escape hatch for expansion of NATO's mission. Article IV of the treaty states: ''The parties will consult together whenever in the opinion of any of them the territorial integrity, political independence, or security of any of the parties is threatened.'' Terms like ''territorial integrity'' and ''political independence'' and ''security'' flow from and reinforce NATO's collective defense mission.

As I will argue in more detail, undergirding NATO's collective defense mission was the purpose of article IV. Article IV was not a loophole for any military operation the North Atlantic Council could dream up.

One of the things I think the Senate should consider carefully is the expansion of NATO, not just by membership but by mission—from the defense of territory to the defense of interests, which is the direction in which things are pointed. If we go from defending territory to defending interests and following those interests, as Secretary Perry indicated and Secretary Albright has indicated, to remote locations on the globe, that threatens some of the very essential purposes of NATO. If you squander defense resources or if your forces are so thinly deployed, it can be very damaging and undermining to the capacity to respond to a real security threat.

It would be terrible to think that we would have our forces so far-flung that we could not respond to a real security threat. I have to say this: Right now the administration is so willing to deploy U.S. troops and so unwilling to provide resources for the military that we are stretching our resources very thin. If we want to put ourselves in real jeopardy by stretching them thinner, we should change the mission of NATO so that we become an international policing organization effectively answering 911 calls anywhere around the world. Secretary Perry says anywhere around the globe. Secretary Albright says in the Middle East and throughout central Africa.

The United States is extending defense commitments to these three new potential NATO countries while slashing its defense resources—a 27-percent cut in defense spending over the last 8 years. We need to be very careful. If your defense spending is falling and your defense deployments are rising, you have very low resources to meet high commitments, placing yourself in serious jeopardy.

Most Americans have agreed we have to have an ability to fight at least in two regions. If we cannot fight in two regions, and if we get into any kind of a struggle somewhere, it is an invitation for an aggressor somewhere else to start something. I mean, after all, if we were involved in the Middle East and we only had a capacity to defend one area, that would be the only area we could defend. It would invite rogue regimes, dictators, to be involved somewhere else pretty quickly. North Korea might decide to send its people over the border en masse. So the United States has to sustain the capacity to fight in two regions.

John Hillen writes in the National Review that we are losing that kind of capacity.

> In 1998, almost all the active Army's heavy-tank and armored-cavalry units outside of Korea and Bosnia would have to go to the Persian Gulf in order to equal the fighting power of America's VII Corps in 1991. And the VII Corps was only one of three American corps engaged in Desert Storm. In other words, it would take all the fighting materiel we have to make up one of the three corps that were fighting in Desert Storm. Given the fact that we have the commitments we have in both Korea and Bosnia, we have to be careful we don't hollow out the force. And expanding the mission, broadening the range of deployments, expanding NATO from the defense of territory to the defense of interests could further hollow out our armed forces.

Here's how NATO expansion will increase U.S. security commitments.

> Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic comprise 301,000 square miles of new NATO territory and 2,612 miles of new NATO frontier to which the collective defense commitment is extended.
>
> Total national defense spending fell by 27 percent over the last 8 years.

If we are going to be a part of defending this new territory, I wonder about whether we can do it with a plummeting rate of investment in national defense.

> Outside normal training and alliance commitments, the Army conducted 10 ''operational events'' between 1960–91, and 26 since 1991.

There you have it. We are sending our troops all over the world, and you wonder if we can do that without hollowing out the force when we have a 27 percent drop in our funding.

> The Marine Corps conducted 15 ''contingency operations'' between '82 and '89, and 62 since the fall of the Berlin Wall.

We are sending our people all over the place and we are not funding them the way we really should.

> According to the Army Chief of Staff Dennis Reimer, the Army reduced manpower by 36 percent while increasing the number of deployed operations by 300 percent.

Can you forever shrink your resource base and increase your deployment?

President Reagan's Deputy Undersecretary of Defense states:

> Like Gulliver's enfeeblement by the Lilliputians, [the U.S.] will be tied down in so many parts of the world for so long that it will be hard-pressed to respond to the major threats against which only overwhelming force would prove effective.

I think the point I want to make here is we have to be very careful in expanding the mission, changing the mission of NATO from a defense-of-territory to a defense-of-interest mission, projecting deployments in central Africa and

a wide variety of other places, as Secretary Perry indicated, around the globe. Are we making sure we have the necessary defense resources in the event there is a real security challenge? If we are stamping out brushfires on the other side of the world, can we defend ourselves against a firefight in our own backyard?

These are the kinds of things that I think are important. I don't think this administration has made very serious strategic assessments about NATO expansion. ''We must pledge that the first new members will not be the last,'' according to Secretary Albright, ''and that no European democracy will be excluded because of where it sits on the map.'' In other words, come one, come all. We are not going to make strategic judgments. In the real world, real soldiers die defending real borders.

I intend to ask the Senate to make a clear statement on the mission of NATO, a mission that is a defense of territory, not just a defense of interests. I know that Senator ROBERTS of Kansas and Senator WARNER of Virginia have expressed their interest in this respect. We need to pass an amendment that will make sure that the Senate will not be endorsing what I call ''treaty creep,'' where we just allow a creeping mission to get us to the place where we are no longer able to sustain those things which ought to be sustained.

It is with that in mind that I will be offering an amendment which would be added to the resolution of ratification. I hope that Members of the Senate will take into account the importance of understanding that we cannot dilute the capacity of the United States to defend its own freedom and to fulfill its collective defense commitment in NATO by making the breadth of this treaty so broad that it becomes a second United Nations, except this time with a standing army. NATO should not become an organization whose forces can be deployed and put at risk inappropriately and unduly in a wide variety of settings not defined by the territory of the members of the North Atlantic area.

It is with that in mind that I look forward to submitting the amendment and defending the opportunity to place in the resolution of ratification clear language which will define and reassert the only valid definition of NATO, its original purpose, which was the defense of territory, political independence, and security of member states in that particular organization.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the matter of NATO expansion is perhaps the single most important foreign policy or defense issue to come before Congress this year. Because of the complexity of the issues involved, the importance of this decision, and its implications for our relationship with Russia, I have not rushed to judgment on this subject. Today, however, I would like to explain why after careful consideration, I have decided to support NATO expansion.

The past half-century has shown the cardinal importance of American engagement in European affairs. Throughout the Cold War, our involvement in Europe, principally through NATO, helped provide a crucial framework of peace and stability in which the countries of Europe have been able to develop—giving them breathing room in which to leave behind wartime devastation and grow into prosperous trading partners and allies. Today, of course, the Cold War has ended. The importance of U.S. involvement in Europe, however, has not.

With the end of the continent's artificial division along the inter-German frontier into hostile ideological blocks, the meaning of ''Europe'' has changed and its role in the world has evolved. If they are to have relevance in this new post-Cold War era, institutions built around Europe's previous divisions must also evolve, or else face creeping irrelevance. NATO may not be important to the world in precisely the way it used to be—as a breakwater against Soviet expansionism—but the cooperative security arrangements it embodies remain vital to European stability and to world peace.

Mr. President, NATO stands without peer in modern times as an institution capable of effective, coordinated international action in times of crisis. More important still, however, is the Alliance's much more quiet, everyday role as the ultimate underwriter of European peace, providing a supportive framework within which allied democracies can successfully consolidate themselves after difficult periods of transition and become valuable friends and partners in the best sense of these words. NATO expansion to incorporate the newly-liberated countries of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic will help ensure that the Alliance remains an important guarantor of continental peace and stability in the years to come—and that America continues to play an engaged and productive role in European security.

I do not mean to suggest that NATO expansion has no costs, or that I am entirely sanguine about its potential implications.

I have been extremely concerned both about the anticipated financial costs of NATO expansion and about its potential impact upon U.S.-Russian relations.

With regard to the costs of NATO to the American taxpayer, I have discussed my concerns with both Secretary of Defense Bill Cohen and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. In particular, I have been very concerned about the great variation in cost estimates given during the last year or so, estimates that have ranged from a total of $35 billion, or even more, over the next 10 years to a total cost of a relatively small $1.5 billion, with the United States share of that $1.5 billion being approximately $400 million.

As both Secretary Cohen and Secretary Albright have pointed out to me, the highest estimates anticipated expanding NATO to four countries, rather than three, and were not based on information now available about the condition of Eastern Europe's military infrastructure. I am thus greatly encouraged by NATO's most up-to-date financial estimates which were based upon an intensive country-by-country survey of the Polish, Czech and Hungarian defense establishments.

This latest study, the methodology of which has been endorsed by the General Accounting Office as well as by the Department of Defense, indicates that the likely costs of NATO expansion are much lower than had been previously estimated.

Mr. President, this study does not pull the wool over anyone's eyes. The shrinkage of the official cost estimates since early 1997, in fact, represents movement along a learning curve, and the pleasant surprise of discovering, after much analysis, that Eastern European militaries are in much better shape than previously thought is largely responsible for much of the change in the estimate.

There will certainly be costs to military modernization in Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, but most of these expenses will be borne by the new member countries themselves. Of the remainder, we will share the burden with our present NATO allies through our proportional contributions to the NATO common fund. All told, these expenses will not be significant compared to the benefits we will all reap from ensuring NATO's continuing role in securing European peace and security and stability.

With respect to U.S.-Russian relations, I have also been encouraged by the progress of our extensive Partnership for Peace Program with Moscow and of our mutual efforts to ensure that Russia's decaying strategic nuclear infrastructure remains secure against terrorism, theft and accident. Today, Russian and NATO diplomats sit together to discuss mutual concerns on a permanent joint council convened for this purpose. U.S. nuclear experts work very closely with Russian authorities in protecting the security of Russia's nuclear establishment.

Significantly, these crucial cooperative efforts with Russia have continued and even accelerated as NATO expansion has become more imminent. Most recently, the Russian Government announced in mid-April that it will push very hard to persuade the Duma to ratify START II strategic arms reduction agreement with the United States. These are not the hallmarks of a government preparing for a ''new cold war'' if Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic join our alliance. To the contrary, U.S.-Russian relations have been growing warmer, even as NATO has been preparing to expand.

I look forward, in fact, to seeing Eastern Europe develop a whole new continuum of productive relationships with the United States and the West, links that range from formal NATO military ties to expanded Partnership for Peace relations, to ever more important economic and cultural ties.

The Europe of the 21st century will not be one of haves and have-nots when it comes to transnational ties. Rather, it will be a Europe bound together in a mutually reinforcing web of different but complementary relationships stretching across the entire spectrum of public affairs. This is a Europe to which we should look forward with eager anticipation, and it is one in the creation of which NATO expansion to Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic can play an important role.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that after careful consideration and much deliberation I shall cast my vote in favor of NATO expansion. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The Senator from New Mexico.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Bill Monahan, a fellow in my office, be allowed the privilege of the floor during the consideration of this NATO enlargement resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to express serious concerns about this proposal to enlarge NATO. The question of whether we admit Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to NATO needs to be judged in the overall context of our security needs in this post-cold war period. Today's security environment is uncertain and vastly different from the climate of the cold war for which the NATO alliance was created. New threats dominate our national security agenda. The new threats are well known to all of us. They are the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism and regional instability created by rogue states in the Middle East or northeast Asia, the specter of accidental nuclear launch and other high priority military threats. Those are the immediate security concerns which we have.

Yet, when I look at the national security threats that we have, it does not strike me that enlarging NATO is likely to help us meet those threats. An important distinction was made by Dr. Kissinger, a former Secretary of State and National Security Adviser, between the role of a military alliance and a collective security system. Dr. Kissinger—who, by the way, is a supporter of NATO enlargement—stressed that NATO is a military alliance which is established for the purpose of defending a specified area. In contrast, a collective security system or agreement is formed in response to aggression on a case-by-case basis. It does not maintain forces of its own and it is not restricted to defending a particular geographical area.

We need to ask ourselves which of these two types of organizations enhances our security more: Expanding a military alliance that was formed to defend the territory of its members against a Soviet threat that no longer exists—that is one option which is the one before us, unfortunately—or, on the contrary, pursuing collective security arrangements designed to meet today's threats.

I am concerned that this near-sighted emphasis on NATO enlargement may increase rather than decrease our threat to security interest in Europe. At best, NATO enlargement is a distraction in that it diverts our attention from other higher priority concerns and alternative solutions, and, at worst, it could undermine our ability to address these more immediate priority military threats and perhaps reduce the cohesiveness of the NATO alliance upon which we have depended.

Which one it results in will largely depend on how we address the long-term risks of NATO enlargement, how this open-ended process becomes limited, and what its impact is upon the cooperative efforts between the U.S. and Russia to enhance our security mutually, the security of the U.S. and of Russia, in the spirit of partnership.

If we proceed with NATO enlargement, we must ensure that we do not erode our ability to meet our highest priority security concerns or preclude alternative collective security arrangements that may more effectively address these concerns.

Mr. President, I am considering introducing several amendments to the Senate resolution on the protocols regarding the accession of Poland and Hungary and the Czech Republic. These amendments are intended to safeguard against some of the potential long-term risks associated with NATO enlargement.

First, let me express support for Senator WARNER's amendment to establish a 3-year moratorium on further rounds of NATO enlargement. I am an original cosponsor of that amendment. NATO membership for Poland and Hungary and the Czech Republic cannot be separated from the larger issue of the administration's seemingly open-door policy for enlarging NATO.

According to the administration, any state of Central or Eastern Europe that meets certain democratic criteria is a potential candidate for NATO membership. Altogether there are nearly a dozen countries that are or may be candidates for NATO membership in the coming years. Included in that group are the three Baltic States, Slovenia, Romania, Albania, Bulgaria, Slovakia and Macedonia.

I support the goal of integrating Central and Eastern Europe into a united and democratic Europe free of the divisive legacy of the cold war. But the question is, how do we achieve that goal? In this regard I have some serious concerns about the administration's open-door policy on enlarging NATO.

There are some fundamental questions that remain unanswered. We do not know whether these three candidate countries, the three we are considering in this resolution, are militarily and economically prepared to contribute to NATO's common defense.

As several of the speakers this afternoon have mentioned, cost estimates for enlargement vary widely. The burdensharing arrangements within NATO are still unresolved. NATO itself is still revising its post-cold war strategic mission.

At a minimum, I believe we in the Senate, if we proceed with expanding the Atlantic alliance, it is in America's and NATO's interest to take the time to fully assess the effects, both the costs and the benefits, of this round of expansion. A 3-year pause, as suggested in Senator WARNER's amendment, would give alliance members a reasonable time to do this. If things go according to NATO's plan, then alliance members, both the new ones and the old ones, will have updated NATO's strategic military mission well within that time frame. A pause would allow cost-sharing arrangements to be reached and payments to be received.

Let me turn to a few other issues that I intend to deal with by proposed amendment, Mr. President.

Currently, the NATO resolution contains language intended to require the President to consult the Senate prior to consenting to invite any additional states to join NATO. I commend the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for including that provision. It ensures that the Senate will be a partner in any decision to invite a state to begin accession talks with NATO.

We should have had such a provision in place before we got to this situation with Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. But I intend to introduce an amendment that I believe complements and strengthens the provision that is now coming to the Senate floor. This amendment would require the President to report to Congress on the qualifications of any country being considered for NATO membership prior to the United States consenting to invite that country to begin accession talks with NATO as was done with Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic in Madrid last year.

The amendment further specifies the kind of detailed information to be provided, including each potential candidate's military preparedness to join NATO, the costs and burdensharing arrangements for integrating each potential candidate into NATO, and the impact that admitting each potential candidate would have on NATO's cohesiveness and other priority U.S. security concerns.

The second issue that I believe needs to be addressed by amendment relates to the strategic mission of NATO. Right now we in the Senate are being called upon to sign up to a policy of enlarging the alliance without a clear,

coherent explanation of how expansion of NATO will serve NATO's strategic interests. I am concerned because NATO itself does not seem to have an agreed upon strategic military mission.

For several months now, NATO members have been engaged in updating the alliance strategic concept. The current concept, which was last revised in 1991, is outdated, and all agree on that. It fails to take account of such critical events as the collapse of the Soviet Union, NATO'S peacekeeping operations in Bosnia, or more recently the special relationships that NATO has established with Russia and the Ukraine.

NATO is currently debating administration proposals to expand the alliance's military charter to include operations in the Middle East and North Africa, a subject of considerable controversy for existing and prospective members alike. The alliance will also be reviewing its critically important nuclear policies. The updated strategic concept will not be completed by the time the Senate is expected to vote on this round of enlargement.

My amendment would withhold inviting additional countries other than Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic for NATO membership until after NATO has approved a revised strategic concept. This is simply a matter of setting our priorities. NATO members need to decide on the alliance's mission before any new candidates are asked to join. Future candidates need to know what obligations they would be undertaking in seeking NATO membership.

This should not cause a delay for anyone. The expectation is that this revised strategic concept will be completed this summer.

Once a revised Strategic Concept is agreed, existing and prospective NATO members will be able to judge for themselves whether further expansion will in the long-run strengthen—or undermine—NATO's effectiveness in fulfilling its mission.

The third issue that I believe needs to be addressed before we conclude action on this proposed ratification of this treaty relates to the critical question of NATO membership for the Baltic States. The administration has repeatedly welcomed the aspiration of the Baltic States—Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia—to join NATO, most recently in signing a charter of partnership with those states this past January.

At the same time the administration tells us that this charter is neither a precommitment by the United States to NATO membership for the Baltic States, nor is it a backdoor U.S. security commitment to those states. I believe it is critical that we be clear on the Senate's understanding of the Baltic Charter for the record. I am considering an amendment stating that the Baltic Charter neither precommits the United States to Baltic membership in NATO nor provides those states with U.S. security commitments.

In addition, the NATO resolution must also be clear that it is essential for the administration to consult with the Senate well in advance of any vote in the North Atlantic Council to invite a Baltic state to begin accession talks with NATO.

Our military commitments must be tailored to our national security priorities. An open-door policy for enlarging NATO will mean further expanding U.S. security commitments. At the heart of NATO is the mutual commitment under article V of the North Atlantic Treaty to the common defense of all NATO members in the case of attack. Since the end of the cold war, even as our armed forces have been reduced by a third, our security commitments have extended to Bosnia and Iraq and Northeast Asia and other hot spots around the globe.

As we consider setting an open-ended course for expanding our military commitments, we must keep in mind that our defense resources are limited. I question whether we are prepared to allocate limited defense resources to ever-expanding NATO military commitments ahead of our other defense priorities, priorities such as force modernization, readiness, or investment in research and development needed to preserve our technological edge.

I am particularly concerned about U.S. and NATO preparedness to meet these article V commitments if the Baltic States are invited to join NATO.

If the United States and its allies are not prepared to meet our article V commitments to the common defense of all NATO members, then expansion could create alliance-threatening divisions within NATO.

Mr. President, I do not propose to preclude the possibility of Baltic membership in NATO sometime in the future. But any invitation to the Baltic States would be a serious step that should first be thoroughly considered with the Senate's participation. In any case, Senate consent to ratification of the current protocols for Poland and Hungary and the Czech Republic should in no way be interpreted as a preapproval of the Baltic States candidacy for NATO membership.

One final issue I want to raise today concerns continued U.S. support for the enhancement of NATO's Partnership for Peace initiative. Some have argued that if the Senate does not go along with NATO enlargement, the countries of Central and Eastern Europe will be abandoned in ''strategic ambiguity,'' exiled to a no-man's-land between NATO and Russia. I do not accept this view. An alternative already exists in NATO's Partnership for Peace initiative. In this initiative, there are 28 partner countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, including Russia, associating themselves with NATO. This initiative is an essential element to current and future peace and security in Europe extending to central Asia.

Experts on both sides of this NATO enlargement issue agree on the need for a strong Partnership for Peace. Former Secretary of Defense Bill Perry, an advocate of NATO enlargement, testified before the Armed Services Committee on this very need to ensure that the Partnership for Peace initiative is not undermined in the process of expanding the alliance. He stated, ''The Partnership for Peace should receive attention comparable to that accorded to enlargement. The experience of PFP membership should closely resemble the experience of NATO partnership.''

So the amendment that I intend to offer on this issue would be a declaration of support for the Partnership for Peace intended to place the NATO resolution in an important context; that is, the complementary effectiveness of the Partnership for Peace initiative.

This amendment would declare that PFP is both an essential and enduring complement to the NATO alliance in maintaining and enhancing regional security. It would also endorse NATO efforts to enhance PFP, to strengthen its political consultative mechanism through the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, to expand the operational role of the PFP, and to provide for increased participation of Partner countries in decision-making and planning within PFP. Many of these objectives are the same ones voiced in favor of NATO enlargement.

I am concerned about contentions that the whole purpose of PFP is to prepare Partner countries for future NATO membership. For a significant number of PFP Partners, that simply isn't their primary purpose in participating. It is essential that PFP continue to be valued as an independent component of the European security system and not be reduced or constrained to being a prelude to NATO membership. Accordingly, my amendment would also clarify that PFP membership does not in any way prejudice a country's application or consideration for admission to the NATO alliance.

I would note that, in contrast to NATO enlargement, Russian reaction to PFP is increasingly positive. While it has been a PFP Partner since the initiative began in 1994, Russia is now completing its first-ever Individual Partnership Plan, detailing the specific activities in which it intends to participate over the next few years. These include eleven PFP exercises, including one on its own territory.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to consider carefully the long-term risks associated with NATO enlargement. The Senate must be an active partner in any future decision to invite further rounds of candidates for NATO membership.

In the meantime, we need to focus our efforts on meeting our top military security priorities. We must ensure that NATO enlargement does not undermine our ability to address our most pressing security concerns. But I believe we should reserve higher priority for our cooperative efforts with

Russia to eliminate strategic nuclear weapons under START I, to secure Duma ratification of START II, and to advance discussions on further reductions of nuclear weapons under a START III framework. The cooperation between the national laboratories in my state of New Mexico and their counterparts in Russia remains critically important to the pressing problem of nonproliferation. In addition, the United States needs to engage Russia in a dialogue on additional joint steps beyond START to reduce the nuclear threat.

In summary, our primary security goal must be to promote a safe and stable security environment for the United States, our NATO allies, and the countries of Eastern and Central Europe, including Russia. No further enlargement of NATO should be considered unless and until it can be clearly demonstrated that such a step serves this goal. We need to proceed cautiously, with clear priorities and thorough consideration of all options—whether NATO, the Partnership for Peace, or other security arrangements—for promoting the security and safety of the North Atlantic area as a whole.

Mr. WARNER. Would the Senator take a brief question?

Mr. BINGAMAN. I am happy to respond.

Mr. WARNER. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator. He has worked from the beginning with Senator SMITH, myself, and others as we began to examine the very serious questions.

The Senator raised an issue that caused me great concern, and that is the nuclear aspect and how in his State so much valuable work is now being done and has always been done on this question.

My understanding, having met with a number of Members of the Russian Duma—and I believe the Senator was present at the time that Members of the Duma came informally before the Armed Services Committee—there is a considerable doubt as to whether or not they will ratify the current arms control arrangements because of the question of NATO enlargement.

Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me respond to my friend from Virginia by saying that is my understanding. I have yet to speak to any high official in the Russian Government who felt this would be helpful, that us going ahead with this resolution particularly at this time would be helpful in bringing Russia along to ratify START II or to take any other actions that would be helpful in reducing the nuclear threat.

Mr. WARNER. In response, I say to my good friend, I talked with a number of Members of the Duma. I accompanied the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Cohen, to Russia in the January timeframe, where we sat down in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow and listened to the protests of about half a dozen Members of the Duma for the better part of 2 hours. There was absolutely no equivocation on their part that they felt that the future ratification by the Russian Duma of the current arms control arrangement now pending is in great doubt.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank my friend from Virginia for his leadership on this important issue. As I indicated earlier, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the amendment that he is offering and hope we can gain the support of colleagues on that as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Thank you, Mr. President.

I might add to the comments of the distinguished Senator from Virginia in the discussion of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that we had had some testimony along the same lines in the strategic subcommittee. General Xavier indicated he felt, likewise, that the Duma would be less inclined to provide—they believe that if, in fact, NATO expansion were to continue, this could very well jeopardize the START II talks.

I think it is also important to note—and I know the distinguished Senator made many visits to Russia, as I have in the past few years—the worst part of this, I don't sense anger on the part of some of our Russian colleagues, but I do sense frustration, especially those who want to see Russia move to a democracy and stay there. Small ''d'' democrats in Russia really believe—and I think they are correct—that this is not going to help their cause.

President Yeltsin has been steadfast and brave and courageous as he has tried to move, despite great odds and a lot of problems, especially inflation, to try to move Russia to the West and to democracy and to a good free market.

I think this is going to hurt it, and I think hurt it needlessly, because there is absolutely, in this Senator's opinion, no urgency whatever to make this decision, which is the part I just cannot understand—why there is this sense of urgency.

Only 2 short years ago, reading a quote from the President of the United States—actually 4 years ago, in which he gave a compelling reason not to have NATO expansion, and yet now it has all changed, and it didn't change that quickly.

Mr. WARNER. If my colleague would allow me, first I wish to thank the Senator. He has been an absolute leader on this issue from the very beginning, and at the beginning there were fewer than there are now. We are fortunate there is a growing number beginning to look at it from the perspective that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire and I have had for some period of time.

Just today, I was privileged to have lunch with the mayor of St. Petersburg, Russia. I was on his right, and to my immediate right was the deputy chief of mission here of the Russian Embassy. Now, never should the United States allow Russia to veto any of our foreign policy. We always must do those things that are in our strategic interest.

But I join the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire in his view that there is no rush to do this. It is a window of opportunity that Russia has seized upon to try to solidify their movement toward a solid democracy, try to solidify their struggle in the free market system of the world, at the same time they are dealing with tremendous political instability at home both in elective office and indeed in law enforcement. Both of these persons told me, formally in the discussion over luncheon not over 2 hours ago, it is of grave concern to them individually, of the timing of this move.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I thank my colleague for those remarks.

I just say to Senator WARNER, on January 10, 1994, along the same vein, President Clinton himself made the following statement, only 4 years ago:

> Why should we now draw a new line through Europe just a little further east? Why should we now do something which could foreclose the best possible future for Europe? The best possible future would be a democratic Russia committed to the security of all of its European neighbors. The best possible future would be a democratic Ukraine, a democratic government in every one of the Newly Independent States of the former Soviet Union, all committed to market cooperation, to common security and to democratic ideals. We should not foreclose that possibility.

That was the President of the United States, Bill Clinton, on January 10, 1994. I simply say to my colleagues, what has changed? What has changed?

Mr. BIDEN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Yes.

Mr. BIDEN. What does that quote have to do with anything? What does it have to do with anything relating to whether or not we should expand NATO? How is it inconsistent with expansion of NATO?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I think it has a lot ''to do with anything.'' The President made these statements at the NATO headquarters in Brussels, Belgium, and his point is that drawing a new line through Europe a little further east might jeopardize the relationship between the Russians and the United States and bringing the Russians into the democracy, into the West as a democratic nation. The Senator doesn't believe that is relevant to this?

Mr. BIDEN. With all due respect, the President never spoke of that in the context of drawing any new lines; he spoke in the context of being democratic nations.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I'm reading the President's quote. ''The

best possible future would be a democratic Russia committed to the security of all of its European neighbors. We should not foreclose it.'' That was the time he followed in President Bush's footsteps of supporting the Partnership for Peace, which I also support. Now something has intervened—perhaps the election of 1996—that caused him now to change his mind, and suddenly now there is this urgent need to have these three nations become part of NATO.

Mr. BIDEN. I don't want to take the Senator's time. He was kind enough to yield for a question. If he would like to, I could continue this. Otherwise, I will let him finish his statement and I will respond and point out why, in my view, there is not the least bit of inconsistency between wanting to see Russia as a democratic nation and expanding NATO.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Let me say, when I came into the room and prior to coming into the Chamber, I listened to some of the debate of my colleagues on the other side of this issue. Very interesting. I thought for a moment that I was in a time warp, that I was back in the 1950s and was somehow privy to the debate here. I heard terms like ''cold war.'' I heard terms like ''evil empire,'' ''Iron Curtain,'' and Stalin was mentioned, as was Yalta and the Soviet Union.

Unless I am missing something—and I try to pay pretty close attention to current events—I don't see that same situation in the world today. I think Stalin is gone. It is my understanding that he is. The Iron Curtain is no longer there, which Churchill talked about. Yalta divided up Europe, unfortunately, and now we have these nations who have sought and got a well-deserved freedom. Now the Senate is considering whether to add these three nations—Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic—to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. That is the issue before us. The question is whether that is necessary or not in considering the situation right now in the world.

I just say to my colleagues, what is the threat today to those three nations or any other nation that may be coming into NATO in the future? What is the specific threat? Is there still a cold war? Is there still an Iron Curtain? Is there a massive Soviet army poised at the ready on the borders of Poland or on the borders of Germany or on the borders of Hungary or Romania or the Czech Republic? I don't see any. Is Russia now an absolute to become a democratic nation, never to be a threat to the United States? No, absolutely not. That is the point of the discussion. What is the best way to try to bring that nation into the democratic fold, not to turn to the East, not to turn to Red China, not to turn to Iran and other nations that could very well be a serious threat to the United States before the end of the 21st century?

But a few weeks ago when this matter first came up, it seemed to be a foregone conclusion that we were going to run this thing through with no debate, essentially. Everybody was feel-good, emotional. These nations had ''earned it.'' They are free and now they have earned the right to fall under the umbrella of NATO—25 percent of which is funded by the United States, I might add—and earned the right to become members of NATO. Then, after several of us had written a letter to the leaders and requested some time—we had a little difficulty getting it, but we did get the time to have a good debate, and I appreciate the fact that both Senator DASCHLE and Senator LOTT responded to that request. However, unfortunately, there is still other information that is out there that we would like to have. For example, the NATO report, which is not due until perhaps late next month or early in June; it would be nice to have that. We don't have that. Again, we are now trapped in this urgency—this urgency. There is this huge threat looming out there to these three countries. Yet, I have not heard anybody tell me what that threat is. I would be happy to yield to anybody on the floor now or later who would be willing to stand up and tell me what the threat is to Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. Where is the threat that forces us to immediately, this week, vote on NATO expansion?

Frankly, a growing number of us have come to the realization that expanding NATO is unwise. At worst it is unwise and unnecessary at best. It is time for a little thought. Some tried to get this thing to go through without any thought. I think that was the goal initially, to run this thing through before we had much time to think about it, analyze the thoughts, and before we had time to realize that there wasn't any threat, that this was emotional, feel-good politics. That is what this is.

If NATO enlargement made sense, it would have gained strength as the debate began, not lost strength. It is losing strength. There are more Members now than there were several weeks ago who are opposed to NATO expansion. The more it was discussed, the more opposition there was. My suspicion has been that many of those clamoring for that speedy vote did so out of fear that the case for enlargement may not just bear the scrutiny that is deserves—and it does deserve a lot of scrutiny for a number of reasons, which we will be getting into, costs among others. But in discussions with constituents over the recess and colleagues over the past several weeks, my suspicion has been confirmed. When asked careful questions, the American people have serious reservations. I think initially—and I was one of them—when it first came up, the emotional response was, wow, they have gotten their freedom finally. We spent trillions to help them win it—trillions. We sacrificed American lives, millions of Americans in uniform, to help defeat the ''evil empire'' that Ronald Reagan spoke about. And it worked. But the question really is whether or not the so-called NATO umbrella makes sense right now. Now what are the people saying?

Hot off the presses is a poll from Opinion Research of Princeton, a nationwide poll, just completed today. They ask the following question to people across the country: ''Congress is currently debating expanding the NATO military alliance to include Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary. Estimates of the cost to U.S. taxpayers from the first phase of expansion range from $400 million to $19 billion. Do you oppose or favor expanding NATO? Answer: Favor, 32 percent; opposed, 56 percent.''

By almost a 2-to-1 margin, when you indicate that we do not have a handle on the cost, people are opposed.

These are facts. This is information that deserves to be part of the debate. This decision should not be based on polls. I will be the first one to agree with that. We should not be making a decision as important as the expansion of NATO based on polls. But it shows that when the American people understand and get information, they react accordingly. I think many members had the feeling that the American people were overwhelming in their support of this because it is an emotional feel-good thing to do. These nations suffered immensely under communism for a long, long time. And they earned their freedom.

The question is: How do we preserve and continue to protect that freedom? The question is, Mr. President, do we look back at the last 50 years, or do we look ahead at the next 50 years in terms of protecting that freedom? Because that is the question we are talking about here today. We are not talking about Stalin and the evil empire and the cold war. We are talking about the next 50 years, and hopefully the next 150 or 250 years. That is what we are talking about.

The best way to preserve and protect and defend these nations and their way of life is to have a Western Russia, a Russia that has moved into the West, a democratic Russia, and we ought to be doing everything in our power to see to it that that happens, and anything we do in any way to hinder that is a serious mistake, a mistake that we are going to pay for dearly down the road. It is a very shortsighted, a very, very shortsighted decision.

With or without NATO, the United States can come to the defense of any European nation next week, tomorrow, next year, or 5 years from now. Should Europe ever be threatened by Russia, or by anybody else, we can expand NATO. We can do it quickly.

But there is a lot to lose and very little to gain by expanding NATO now. We basically say to Russia: Don't worry about it. Don't worry about NATO expansion. It is OK. It is a defensive alliance. But it does not matter what we say. It matters what the Russians think. They have stated clearly

and officially they oppose expansion. It has been said by others on the floor, and I agree that we should not set our foreign policy based on what the Russians say, I will be the first to admit that, but we ought to realize there is a lot going on inside Russia and there is no threat to these nations from Russia.

So why not leave the window open a little bit longer? What is the urgency? What is the threat? Let me keep asking that question. Somebody rise on the Senate floor sometime during this debate, if not now, and tell me what the threat is. Tell me what the urgency is. There is no urgency. There is no threat. It is an emotional feel-good thing to do. They earned it. They are free. Let us put them under the umbrella of NATO and protect them. From what? We are still going to go to their defense if anything threatens them. Every person in the Senate knows it. The most important requirement for the Poles, the Czechs, and the Hungarians as far as their security is concerned is that America and Russia remain friends. That is the protection these nations need—that Russia and America become friends and remain friends. That is the issue here.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to observe that the American taxpayers, since 1992, have contributed $2.6 billion in the spirit of that friendship to help Russia dismantle its weapons systems. And here this comes along and takes a red-hot poker and jams it right in their ribs.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. It sure does. The Senator knows that. He knows the Senator has worked on this issue tirelessly in the Armed Forces Committee and has visited Russia to see this.

I don't think anybody could deny that in the very near future Russia is going to be one of the, if not the, strongest nations in that region of the world. The question is, Whose side is it going to be on? Is it going to be on the Iranians' side? Is it going to be an alliance with the Chinese Communists? Or is it going to be on our side? If it is on our side, why will the Poles care, or the Czechs, or the Hungarians, or anybody else? The point is they wouldn't.

What we ought to be doing again is keeping the window open, using the advantages that we have to draw that out, to draw them this way. Senator WARNER has mentioned how they have reached out to do that. We are taking down tremendous numbers of weapons that have been aimed at the United States for decades.

But extending an alliance, which during the cold war the Soviet Union considered hostile, the countries that she doesn't threaten is basically kicking this former giant, like the Senator from Virginia said, poking them in the ribs. That is exactly what we are doing. God knows. I have stood on this floor many times and in the House Chamber before that and extolled the virtues of the United States against the cold war Soviet Union and voted trillions to defeat it. But let's not walk away from the victory. Let's not walk away from the victory. History shows that it is unwise to treat nations like that, and it is highly dangerous for countries in the middle, because these are the countries that are going to suffer if there is a confrontation that takes place between the United States and Russia again. It is the nations in the middle in Eastern Europe that are going to get the squeeze. That is where it is going to be fought. Those are the people who are going to suffer.

We are talking about costs. The cost was in that poll question. I am not sure what we are paying for it. Maybe someone else does. You have estimates as high as $125 billion, some $250 billion. It is not the issue of cost per se. It is that nobody knows what the facts are. Nobody knows what we are dealing with. That is why there is this uncertainty.

What if there is a threat and these nations were actually threatened? The question of cost would be irrelevant—I think. I think we would go to the defense of France, a current NATO member, and I would assume if these nations become members we would go to their defense if there was a threat. It would be irrelevant now as it was in the cold war, because we made the commitment if one is attacked, we are all attacked and we are going to do our part. But unfortunately, our part becomes the dominant part in NATO, and as current members shrink back from responsibility, this will increase our responsibility or our burden. There is no foreseeable conventional threat to any country in Europe, and no credible analysis disputes this. I challenge anyone to give me an analysis that shows how any nation in Europe today has a conventional threat. Is there a Russian army, a strong Russian army that has threatened France, Hungary, or the Czech Republic, or England, or anybody else? Where is it? If it isn't, then what is the urgency? What is the threat?

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Certainly I will.

Mr. BIDEN. If there isn't a threat, what is the need for NATO?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. That is a good question.

Mr. BIDEN. I think what is really at the heart of this is what was said, if I am not mistaken, in a sort of dress rehearsal of this debate—the Senator from Virginia and I appeared before a group of Connecticut voters who were down here at the request of one of our colleagues, Senator DODD. He may remember my saying the real debate on the floor is going to be whether there should be NATO.

The only thing I would like to state now, before I make my opening statement—in the context of a question so the floor hasn't been yielded to me; ordinarily I would not put it in the context of a question—is that isn't the real debate here, if there is no strategic rationale for expanding, if there is discussion questioning the strategic doctrine of NATO as it exists now, as Senator BINGAMAN said, and if there is no threat at all, as my friend from New Hampshire says, the real question is—this is a veiled way of us saying: Should we have NATO at all? If there is no threat to France, no threat to Germany, no threat to Poland, then obviously don't expand but also don't have NATO. If there is a threat at all to Germany or to France or the other 15 nations, or 13 nations, then there is clearly a threat to Poland or to the Czech Republic.

You cannot have both. This call of no threat either present or anticipated, indicating there is no need to expand, I think, leads one to the conclusion that if they take that view, there should not be NATO. So I don't know why you don't just stand up and say why don't we just eliminate NATO because there we are spending, for assets devoted to NATO, counting our national budget, over $100 billion a year.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire because this is the type of debate the Senate should participate in and it is a good one. I will respond directly. The United States of America had to rescue Europe in 1917 and 1918. How well I remember; my father served as a doctor in the front lines of those battles. The United States came to the rescue again in World War II, and that is clearly in the minds of all of us. We have not had to respond with significant force in these 50 years for the very purpose that NATO has served as a collective defense, and to deter—to discourage, to put it in a layman's term—an attack on any of its members.

Second, the United States is there because we need, as a nation, a presence in Europe, and that presence of leadership, both in a military form of NATO and an economic and every other way, gives us the justification for a strong voice of leadership in Europe—NATO. So it has served a purpose and will continue to serve a purpose if we do not dilute it, as the Senator from New Hampshire has ably said.

Mr. BIDEN. Will the Senator allow me 2 minutes to respond to that?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Go ahead.

Mr. BIDEN. I think the Senator has just made an overwhelming case why the Poles think it is so important. The Senator just points out, World War I, World War II—by the way, for those wars to get to France they had to roll over Poland first on the way. Then the reason why there was no war, as the Senator points out, after World War II—a cold war, not a hot war—is we had NATO. And the nations that we extended the umbrella of NATO to were kept free from fear of attack. Guess

what. Poland was occupied during that whole period.

Now Poland is no longer occupied, and they are worried that the world may have the same kind of amnesia that it had in 1917, and 1916, and 1915—and 1938 and 1939 and 1940. They are kind of worried because they figured it out, if you are under this umbrella, it dissuades anyone from invading you.

So if it is a rationale to keep Germany in NATO, and NATO protects Germany because that gives it that added security, you can kind of understand why the Poles think it also makes sense for them, since they have been the doormat to Western Europe.

There is much more to say about this. I will not go on. But the point is that NATO membership significantly reduces the prospect that anyone now or in the future would conclude that you are a worthy target of their aggression. That is the point the Senator is making. And the clear notion is that if in fact Poland were part of this alliance, to take one country, they would not have to wonder any longer whether or not they would have to wait for the Brits to do something—as occurred in World War II. They would not have to wonder if Russia or anyone else understood that Poland was no longer the doormat of Europe.

If all goes well, as I anticipate, and I vote with my taxpayers' pocketbook to try to promote democracy in Russia—if all goes well, then in fact there is not any greater need in Russia for Poland to be a member of NATO than for Germany to be a member of NATO. There may be no need for NATO. Or it may be that Russia is part of NATO. But we are in a position, as the Washington Post says:

> American interest in expansion lies in reducing unpredictability and instability in an arc that has generated the century's major wars.

One of the things, as the Post and many others have tried to point out, and as I have tried to point out on the floor before, part of Russia's necessary post-cold war evolution, mental evolution, if you will, is to understand and consider the novel notion that its neighbors have a right to whatever national orientation they want. Most other democracies in the world have figured that out. Most other nations have figured that out. And if you are not going to—the current likelihood that there is little danger that is posed for these three countries or any other part of Europe, it seems to me, again to paraphrase the Post, ''makes it smart and a cheap buy for the extra security now, in case things don't go the right way.''

But the bottom line is this: If, in fact, there is a rationale for us to continue to be a member of NATO, and I believe there is, and to continue to make commitments to the likes of Germany and other allies—if there is a rationale for expanding NATO on the Soviet Union's border bringing in Turkey not too many years ago, there is a rationale to bring Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary under that umbrella.

I will conclude—and I thank my colleague for allowing me to respond—but I conclude by suggesting to you that the way to the greatest certainty that Russia continues along its democratic trek and nonimperialistic instinct is to have these nations within NATO, forever removing the realistic possibility that they are part of the hegemony of the former Soviet Union or Russia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I thank my colleague for his comments. I in no way object or feel interrupted. I think this is a good way to debate the issue. It is much better than a series of monologues, I think, in regard to this issue.

I would just say to my colleague, though, I am trying to accomplish, I think, the same thing that he is, which is that Poland or any other country not be a doormat for anyone else ever again. I think that really goes to the heart of the debate here; what is the best way to accomplish that?

My point is—and I am a supporter of NATO, always was and still am—but I believe that what we have here is a window of opportunity that allows us to try to pull the Russians to us. If the Russians right now were threatening Poland, I would say it is urgent—or were even talking about threatening Poland—it is urgent to move forward on this. We would still go to their defense, in my opinion, anyway. But that is an academic argument.

Mr. BIDEN. But we never did. We never did. Twice before we didn't, not until after the fact, not until after they were no longer an independent nation. We never did.

I believe—I hope we would, too. But understand it from their perspective. We never did.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. It is still going to take a commitment, whether you are in NATO or not, it is still going to take a commitment to defend Poland, period. You have to have a will to do that, whether you are in NATO or not.

The point here is we have an opportunity, where the Russians have reached out to us ever so slightly, but as the Senator from Virginia has talked about in strategic weapons reduction, in trying to look at what Yeltsin has gone through, the market reforms—1000 percent inflation a few years ago down now to 8 percent. They have worked hard to try to make this thing work with a lot of strong leadership.

I don't think this is the way to encourage them to continue to do that. This Senator, I guess much like Nixon going to China, is hardly one who has been soft on the Russians or the Soviet Union over the past several years of my public life, and certainly I have been in as strong opposition to them as anyone else. But also a strategist has to look at the real world, and I don't think we ought to be looking at just simple, cheap analogies here. We ought to be looking at the real world, and the real world is today, not what it was yesterday. Yesterday the real world was Stalin, was the cold war, was the ''evil empire,'' was expansionist tendencies, and was the NATO which came forth to block all of that.

Today, we don't know what the future will bring; therefore, we do need NATO. But the question is, ''Do we need NATO expansion?''; not, ''Do we need NATO?'' Those are two different issues. Do we need NATO? Yes. Do we need NATO expansion in order to make this transition? I don't believe that we do. I think that is really the crux of this issue. There is no urgency.

Again, what is the urgency? I say with the greatest respect to my colleague. What is the urgency? What now is the threat that is perceived, that you perceive to be, that makes this necessary to do today or tomorrow rather than to give the Russians some more time to make these reforms work, to perhaps get the START II agreement that the Senator from Virginia was talking about? What is the urgency? That is really the thrust of my involvement here.

I will be happy to yield for a comment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I can make a historical observation. You raise the passions by saying we didn't come to the defense of Poland. It was September of 1939 when Hitler directed his forces across the border with an element of surprise with the panzer divisions and went against the Polish cavalry, in large measure, with lances. If you have never seen the footage of that battle, it is extraordinary.

Mr. BIDEN. I have.

Mr. WARNER. Subsequently, Stalin and Hitler partitioned and cruelly crucified the Polish people. But at that time, I say to my good friend from Delaware, the United States was holding its maneuvers with dump trucks acting as tanks and with wooden rifles or broomsticks. We were not the superpower, nor the military strength, as we are today.

I say to the Senator and my good friend, don't try to raise the passions that this country turned its back on Poland then and would now do so. The keyword that the Senator from New Hampshire used is ''instability.'' And where is that instability? It is not in Poland, it is not in Hungary, it is not in the Czech Republic, but with the Russian nation struggling to work with democracy and an economic free-market system and the problems at home of the succession of Yeltsin. That is the instability. And, I might add, if we are going to use the military argument, the Red Army barely put down a minor revolution in Chechnya, which it had to fight for over a year, using every piece of modern equipment that they have, and barely did they subdue that small segment of the former Soviet Union.

Mr. BIDEN. Let me respond, if I may, to the question of urgency and the process to clarify the issue of going to Poland's defense.

My point about going to Poland's defense did not relate to whether Americans were courageous, were good, were bad, or kept or didn't keep a commitment. It was a statement of fact.

My friend talks about the real world. The real world, that was 1939. We got in the war on December 7, 1941. In the meantime, nothing happened. We were a major power. My colleague points out that we weren't militarily prepared. By our own choice, we weren't militarily prepared. But other nations that were allegedly militarily prepared were powers on the continent. They also did nothing, and they watched.

All I am pointing out to you is, from a Pole's standpoint, it is of little consequence to tell them, ''Don't worry, if you're ever threatened, we'll be there, we'll be there.'' That would be like saying to most Poles, ''The check's in the mail.''

They look at history, like other nations have looked at history, and they know what has happened to them, and they know the powers who had power did not respond when power was available and they were in trouble. I think it is unrealistic to think that we should expect the Poles to assume that, especially with some of the comments made by my colleagues on the floor in this debate over the last couple weeks about whether or not it is in our vital interest that Poland be free. That question was raised on the floor, and it is raised constantly in the minds of those who deal with the issue of European security.

So, from the Polish standpoint, there is a clear, clear reason for them to know and understand that there is a big difference between being part of an alliance where the sacred word and trust of a nation is committed in advance and being left to the vagaries of rationalization on the part of a country after the fact to justify why they did or did not go to the aid of a country in question. It is a big difference. If it is not a big difference, then why do we have any treaties at all?

With regard to the real world—let's look at the real world. The real world is, as my friend from Virginia has pointed out, that we have committed over $2 billion dealing with arms control agreements and providing American dollars to allow them to keep a commitment that they made with regard to arms control treaties.

All of the Western European nations, the United States included, have contributed over $100 billion to Russia since the wall has come down and the empire has broken up. We, along with our other NATO allies, have taken the unprecedented step, accused by many on the right of having yielded our sovereignty to Russia by doing the NATO-Russian accords where they have full transparency within NATO.

We have and continue to seek ways in which to restore—''restore'' is the wrong word; there never was a democracy—seek to provide the circumstances where democracy can flourish in a market economy with American tax dollars and German tax dollars and French tax dollars. So there is no reason—no reason—whatsoever for the Russians—no real world reason for the Russians to conclude that they are viewed as the enemy, the enemy by us. Any indirect comparison to the Weimar Republic is bizarre. We were exacting reparations from them; we are sending dollars, we are sending deutsche marks, we are sending francs, we are sending pounds to Russia, maybe not as much as we should, in the minds of some of us, but we are.

With regard to the urgency, the worst time in the world to have to enlarge an alliance is at the moment of threat, because then it leads the other country in question to conclude that if they do not act out what we fear they will do before the alliance is reached, they will be in a weaker position.

I respectfully suggest that urgency isn't the question. The question relates to, Is this the time and the moment, 9 years after the wall has come down—almost 9 years now after the wall has come down—to end once and for all the artificial boundaries and the ability of any nation, including Russia, to suggest that individual nations within Central and Eastern Europe do not have the ability to choose their own natural and national alliances?

That is the urgency. The urgency is, the opportunity is here. It is the cheapest way to do it. It did not come as a consequence of any fad. It was debated and reflected among the NATO nations, not a decision made alone by the United States of America.

Fifteen other European nations thought it was in their interest and the interest of the West, did not feel that it would increase their jeopardy and offend the Russians to do this, and unanimously all voted to take in these three nations. The only debate related to whether we should take in three or five. That was the debate among our NATO allies.

So let me conclude—and I thank my colleague again for yielding this time—the urgency is that this is the most propitious time to end—to end—the artificial division of Europe and the implicit recognition that any country in Europe, including Russia, has the right to some buffer zone or has the right to impact upon the national decisions of a neighbor in that neighbor's determination to enter into a defensive alliance they view in their national interest—and I emphasize the word ''defensive.''

I yield the floor and thank my colleague.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Let me say to my colleague, I posed the question to you about urgency, and you answered it. And I commend you for that. I do not agree with your assessment of urgency.

I think that, to me, ''urgency'' would be a military urgency, a perceived threat. It is not an urgent matter to make this decision today or tomorrow or within the next few months. It might be a matter that could, in your opinion, enhance the situation to prevent an emergency or an urgency, but I do not see it as that right now.

You mentioned—the Senator from——

Mr. BIDEN. Will the Senator yield for one point?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Yes.

Mr. BIDEN. I ask, would the Senator not acknowledge when we expanded to bring in Greece and Turkey, expanded to bring in Spain, there was also no emergency?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Correct.

Mr. BIDEN. No more urgent than now.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. There was a Soviet Union then.

Mr. BIDEN. A Soviet Union, but there was no specific threat that I am aware—specific change.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. The specific threat was the specific threat of the Soviet Union that was still there.

Mr. BIDEN. I see. I am trying to define—I mean, I am trying to get a clearer picture of what the Senator means by ''urgent.'' He is not suggesting it requires there be a Russian division breathing down the throat, making threats to come across the line, merely that there was this power, this entity, that existed that, if it chose to exercise its military strength, was a real threat.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Clearly, yes. It clearly had the capability to send an army into Western Europe if it so chose, if we had not stood up to stop it.

I think the issue, though, of dividing lines—I believe the Senator used the term ''dividing line'' or ''artificial lines'' or ''demarcations in Europe,'' saying, ''See, I think it's the opposite.'' I think by doing this, we are creating artificial lines in Europe, and we are picking winners and losers. These three—why these three nations and not six, seven, eight others?

And I think we are going to have a permanent sense of disruptions, if you will, now in Europe over the next several years as this debate comes up over and over and over again as to who is next and who would be the next country to go in.

As far as going back to 1939 and what happened—we have 100,000 troops in Europe today. If we had 100,000 troops in 1939, Hitler may not have come into Poland with his panzer divisions. I think that is a very important point here. It is not that we are sitting there in a sterile vacuum in Europe with nothing there. We have NATO now. We have armed forces there. And, again, my objective here is to see to it that we create an environment that, hopefully, will see a peaceful relationship between the United States and Russia which will enhance the protection of these very nations that we talk about.

Mr. BIDEN. Will the Senator yield on the point of 100,000 troops?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Yes.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I think again we should focus on what my colleague from New Hampshire said about the real world. I think that is a legitimate point to make.

The real world several years ago was, we had 338,000 American troops in Europe. Today we have 100,000. That should make it awfully clear to Russia that ours is not an aggressive posture. The expansion of NATO is not for purposes of encircling and/or crushing Russia. The real world is, all indicia out there that are available for the Russians to look at—I understand the psychology, but the real world is, there is no threat, this is a defensive alliance.

With regard to drawing lines—I do not suggest in any way, in mentioning what I am about to say, that my friend from New Hampshire in any way wishes to ratify Yalta, but the practical fact of the matter is, Yalta was a deal made out of at the time, viewed by that President at the time, a necessary requirement to basically say, ''Hey, look. Hey, look, you've got this sphere of influence. This is the line drawn in Europe.'' At the time, there was not this anticipation there was going to be this carnage that would result, there would be this overwhelming suppression that would result. ''But here is the deal. Here is the line we are going to draw you. You have this buffer zone.'' That is what it was all about.

To say now that these nations cannot come in is to ratify in a different way but the same line. Why? ''You can't come in because the successor to the Soviet Union—Russia—does not want you in.'' So when I say ''redrawing the lines,'' I say, to say they cannot come in ratifies the old line drawn after World War II.

And when you erase that line, it is, in my view—and I respect the Senator from New Hampshire and all those who oppose expansion, but I argue it does not send a line closer to the Soviet Union for purposes of encircling; it says that there is no automatic line either of us, East or West—Russia-the United States, Russia-Germany, Russia-anyone else—is going to say, ipso facto, that no nation can make its own choice as to wherein they wish to have their alliance reside. That is what it says. That is what it says.

So, therefore, when I say ''redrawing a line''—excuse me, ''erasing a line,'' the line I am talking about erasing is Yalta. And separate and apart from the physical occupation of those countries, at its root it was an admission and an acknowledgment of a sphere of influence of one country over—over—the fate of other countries in Central and Eastern Europe on the grounds that to do otherwise would put them in jeopardy, they had a right to at least indirectly control the national decisions of those nations relative to where they viewed their security to lie, in what alliance, if any.

So to not extend, in fact, in my view, is a bold confirmation that that sphere of influence still remains. And that is a tragic historic mistake, in my view.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I really would take issue with the comparison between the situation today we are talking about with the expansion of NATO and Yalta. We had a ground war, a terrible war that impacted almost every nation in Europe, Western and Eastern, that was costly, and at the end of it, with two sides converging, the Americans and the Russians converging on Europe, basically, I believe in a horrible mistake—I think the Senator would probably agree—the politicians sat down and carved up Europe and therein caused the problem that we faced. And from that came NATO and the cold war and everything else.

This is not what we are talking about today. This is Russia today. This is a country that has had its ears pinned back pretty well as far as its conventional forces. It still has a ton of nuclear material and certainly nuclear weapons, tons of it, literally, that we are interested in working with them to get rid of.

But I do not know what message it sends, not only to the American taxpayers but also to the Russians themselves, to say, on one hand, as the Senator is saying, that we would provide moneys to this empire, former evil empire, to take down their strategic systems—and we are doing that with Nunn-Lugar and other funds—and, on the other hand, spend as much as $250 billion to bring nations into an alliance to defend ourselves against that very same nation. Now, there is an inconsistency there somewhere, that sooner or later somebody will figure out that it doesn't make sense. I think we have to understand that.

I say to my colleague from Delaware, I am about to wrap up. I know the Senator has a statement. I have been on the floor quite some time and I will yield in a moment.

We are creating insiders and outsiders here. In my humble opinion, what we are going to do if we act on this this week is say to three nations, ''You guys are winners; we are picking you.'' You talk about Yalta; if there is a comparison, that is it. They picked winners and losers at Yalta. We are picking winners and losers. You three nations, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, you are the good guys. You get the protection of NATO.

Tomorrow, next year, or 3 years from now, depending on how this is resolved on the expansion vote here, depending on what amendments may pass, we will see this revisited again with other countries—whether it be Romania or some other country down the line, Slovenia, and on and on, Latvian countries. We will see this come up again and again. The same issue is going to have to be argued again and again and the same hard feelings.

Again, going back to the position of the point of urgency, I just don't see what the urgency is to do that and to continue that kind of dialog and that kind of agitation. Basically, it is a permanent agitation that will go on for years and years and years. If at any time the Russians, the nationalists in Russia, the Zhirinovskys of the world were to assume power or even to look like they were going to assume power, we do what we have to do.

Adding these three insiders creates more outsiders. That is the issue. This is a perpetual anguish that will be taken up year after year after year here on the Senate floor and will be debated nationally, and all the difficulties—and I think if the Senator would talk to some of the arms control people in the current administration, he might be surprised at some of the information they might give you on the QT as to how they feel about NATO expansion and what it might do to the strategic arms talks. I have talked to some of them, and it is interesting what they have to say. This will be disruptive for the alliance as a whole, and as member nations are encouraged or compelled to take sides, it will cause stress in the whole alliance.

The end of the cold war, NATO faces internal issues, serious ones about its means and its end, whether Bosnia-type missions are appropriate. Is a Bosnia mission appropriate for NATO? Do we know that? We couldn't find unity in the Persian Gulf war when we had the threat from Saddam Hussein. We could not get unity. We saw evidence in the Libyan situation where the French Government refused to allow our aircraft to fly over their country. We have not had a big, rosy picture of unity even among NATO nations at all times, although the alliance has worked well on the whole. There are a lot of issues that need to be desperately looked at regarding the current NATO before we start exacerbating the problem by adding new nations.

Enlargement, in my opinion, is a token, well intended, but a token and unimagined distraction from real problems. That is my concern. I get a little tired of the old cold-war dividing line reference and how we left the countries out in the cold and somehow we owe them.

A lot of Americans died, a lot of Americans put on uniforms, a lot of taxpayers ponied up to the tune of trillions and trillions of dollars to help them get that freedom. They earned it. I am glad they have it. Not letting them in NATO is not going to do one thing to harm it at all. It may enhance it. In fact, in my humble opinion it will enhance it because we will draw the Russians, I believe, out toward the West and not to the East, which I believe in the long run protects their freedoms.

In conclusion, this should not be a sentimental decision about our historic relationship with Europe. It ought to be a hard-nosed decision about extending a military guarantee to a precise piece of territory under current strategic circumstances.

I think, again, it is about the next 50 years, not the last 50.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Before the Senator leaves the floor, let me thank him again for allowing me to engage and be engaged while he spoke.

Before he leaves the floor, I indicated to Senator WARNER, and at least in an informal way I invite the Senator—it requires no invitation—I invite the Senator from New Hampshire, maybe we can work out a time tomorrow where those interested in the cost issue would be here to debate.

The cost of $250 billion for expansion of NATO is bizarre, in my humble opinion. I will lay it out in detail why it is tomorrow. All of NATO combined, including our national budget now, doesn't cost but half that, less than half of that. How adding three nations would more than increase over 200 percent over the cost—I guess I assume the Senator is talking over a 10-year period—but essentially increase by 50 percent the costs of NATO is beyond me.

I think it may be orderly and useful to our colleagues and to the public if those of us who, as the Senator from New Hampshire does, have spent a lot of time researching the detail related to the cost in trying to decipher and explain the reasons for the inconsistent numbers. The inconsistent numbers relate to what we talk about as the unified budget, the national budget, and so on, what we allocate as part of our—for example, we spend a lot of money, $300 billion a year, roughly, for defense. Is that all accountable to NATO? Do we say that the United States is spending $300 billion a year on NATO? What portion of that is the consequence of us belonging to NATO? When we build a runway and so on, is it because of NATO?

The NATO budget and the cost relating to expansion I think are very, very important and warrant a very focused and coherent presentation by each of us.

I will be here tomorrow prepared to do my best to outline in detail why we are talking more on the order of $40 million a year rather than $200 billion, and I will lay out my reasons. Hopefully, Senator WARNER and Senator SMITH and others will come and lay out in detail why they believe rather than picking an estimate that has been set out by someone, explain how they arrive at those numbers.

I must say, if you tell my constituency to keep NATO—forget expanding, if you told them to keep NATO—it was going to cost them $250 billion, I imagine the referendum in my State would go through like a hot knife through butter. They would say get out. Obviously, if you set a number where the costs could be from $40 million to $150 billion, as I think the Princeton Survey was, although I may have heard it incorrectly, that came hot off the press, obviously a majority of the people would say, ''I am not for that. You mean to tell me I'm signing on for 150 billion bucks?''

I will be here tomorrow, and it might be useful to pick a time when we can be here, all of us interested in the cost, to debate it in some detail.

In the meantime, I will take this opportunity to make a broader statement and I will respond to some of the things said today.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIDEN. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Your colleague has said he would have a formal estimate of costs for Senator WARNER and that will arrive in a time we can do that kind of debate.

Mr. BIDEN. It will arrive in the form of the Senator from Delaware. We do have a formal estimate of the cost, and the chairman of the full committee was, I think, being his usual diplomatic self in saying that. Maybe it is best that we debate this in a coherent way and a very specific way. So that is why he asked the Senator to submit in writing, if I am not mistaken—Senator WARNER submit in writing; I was not here at the time—his questions and the basis of his analysis of the cost and he would come back with a formal response.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Yes.

Mr. BIDEN. Maybe we could all try to work out a time through our offices if they are listening, although I'm not sure when I speak my office listens, but if they are listening, maybe the other offices might see if we can coordinate a time on the floor tomorrow where we could enlighten one another and enlighten the country about the cost of the matter.

Mr. President, as the Senate begins reconsideration of the resolution of ratification for enlargement—and I and others who are for or against expansion all agree on one thing: I strongly believe it was a mistake, for whatever scheduling reasons, to have brought this up, then delayed it, put other things before it, and then brought it back up. So my hope is—and those who support expansion and those who oppose it have all communicated to their respective leaders that we hope nothing will intervene during the consideration of this debate so that we can give it the time and attention and detail that the public is entitled to.

The truth of the matter is, all those folks sitting back behind the bar, back there on both sides, they, along with me and a number of others, have already devoted hundreds of hours to this. This is not a new deal. This is not something that all of a sudden we woke up one morning and said, you know, I feel like expansion today, let's expand, and here we go, let's go through it. This has been a long, serious debate, which has taken place within NATO among the military types and the political types. It has taken place within the national governments of each of the other NATO nations. It has taken place within this country, within the administration.

There was a NATO observers group that, in my 25 years in the Senate, was granted unprecedented access to the decisionmaking process. There were 28 of us, the bulk of whom participated, while the decision to invite, if to invite, and who to invite, to join NATO was being made. We went to Europe on several occasions. I bet there were at least a half dozen trips of the NATO advisers to Europe to meet with the military in each of the existing NATO countries and all of the aspirant countries.

I myself spent time with my colleague, Dr. Haltzel, next to me here at the moment. We went to Russia, we went to Poland, we went to the Czech Republic, and to Hungary, and to Slovenia, and we met with all of the relevant parties—every leader of every major faction within the political spectrum in Russia today. We had long, private, and sometimes contentious, but always frank meetings. We met with military personnel. We met with the Polish Chief of Staff of the military. We met with the Defense Minister, the Prime Minister, and every major player. We did the same in each of the countries in question. We have hosted the NAC. I was at a meeting with Senator ROTH—I am the cochair and he is the chair of the NATO observer group—where there was so much brass in the room, I thought the floor was going to crack. If I am not mistaken—and I may be mistaken—I think the person comparable to our chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was present for every one of the nations in question, every one of them. I am serious. We debated and we argued and we discussed. It was open and frank. There is nothing new about this, and there is nothing quick about it.

The wall went down almost 9 years ago. The Soviet Union crumbled. It ended its existence. That was not yesterday, but a long while ago, in political terms. No one rushed out to judgment. The other thing I should point out is that we, under Secretary Perry, the predecessor to Senator Nunn, sent out a group of what he called the Perry principles, the requirements that each—I said Senator Nunn, who was our colleague who I wish was still here; he has a different view from me on this. Senator Cohen is the Secretary of Defense. I know it, Bill, if you are listening, I know it is Senator Cohen. But the truth of the matter is that Secretary Perry set out some criteria that were minimum requirements for any aspirant country to have to meet. By the way, just setting out criteria has fundamentally changed the dynamic and the picture in Central and Eastern Europe, without even joining NATO.

If I told my colleagues in 1992 that I believed by the year 1998 that we would have a circumstance where there was an accommodation to the Hungarian minority in Romania or that any border disputes or claims were settled by

Eastern European countries—and I could name them—and a whole range of other things, that there would be total civilian control of the military in Poland, et cetera, I think they would have thought that probably wasn't going to happen. But because we said to all nations who wish to be part of NATO, hey, look, there are certain basic drop-dead requirements to even be considered, democracies who lack imperial designs, abide by certain rules, and here are the minimum rules even to get in the game, and we laid them out—I might note, parenthetically, that I attended a conference with some leading Chinese Government folks—not dissidents—and we get the same kind of arguments with regard to China. If you want China to continue its market programs and market economies, you have to go easy on them. You have to back up and you have to slow up.

The question I raised there was, hey, wait a minute, if in fact you want to be part of the civilized world and seek civilized behavior and civilized treatment, when you sign an agreement and make a deal, should we not hold you to that deal? There are certain minimum requirements to be able to establish your bona fides as even an aspirant democracy or a market economy.

In the case of Russia, can anybody in Russia say now, next year, or could they say yesterday that the minimum requirement for a peaceful democracy is, by the way, my neighbor has a right to choose, assuming it is nonthreatening to me, whatever alliance they wish. It is called their national sovereignty. We relinquish any claim to hegemony. It seems to me to be a minimum nonstarter if you fail to do that, a minimum requirement, a nonstarter, if you fail to do that. How have we threatened Russia? I am the author of the act that became the Freedom Support Act under President Bush. What have we done to threaten Russia? The irony is how the tables are turned here.

In the early 1970's, some of my conservative colleagues would look at me as if I were an apologist for the Soviet Union. And here I am now saying expand NATO to include these three nations, assuming they meet the criteria, and extend beyond what we already have, a hand of friendship and help to Russia. They are not inconsistent. As a matter of fact, in my humble opinion, if you would like to diminish the drive toward democratization in Russia, if you would like to diminish the prospects of an emerging market economy in Russia, let the browns and the reds, let the nationalists within Russia crow about how their unsatisfactory response to expansion in NATO was the reason why the United States did not go along and vote to expand NATO. If you want to give antidemocratic forces in Russia a boost, that is a good one. That is the one to do.

That is not the intention of any of my colleagues. This is a legitimate, honest, and open debate. I am not questioning the motives of any man or woman in this body. Not a one of us desire anything other than security in Europe and a democratic Russia. That is a universe that all of us can agree on in this body.

I think we kind of have it backwards, because, as I said earlier, I think what is strung throughout this, as Senator WARNER and Senator SMITH of New Hampshire—I do not want to put words in their mouths. So I will say they did not take strong exception to my saying what this is really about is whether or not there should be a NATO; not whether or not to expand NATO but whether or not there should be a NATO. That is a legitimate debate. We have not addressed that in 50 years. For 50 years, we have said this is a good thing. The world has changed, as they point out. It is legitimate to debate whether or not we should even have NATO. But let's not confuse expanding to include these three countries with whether or not there should even be a NATO. If it is about NATO and its existence, let's debate it. Because, as I said, I constantly hear, What is the threat? My response is, If you don't think there is any threat now or in the future, why NATO? Why not save a lot more money? Why not bring all 100,000 folks home? Let's do that. Some would say, yes, let's do that. But I think it is real important we get our facts straight. After a tremendous amount of study and discussion by more than 70 Senators and 4 different committees, and the Senate NATO observer group, before we began the debate, we began on the floor last month to focus attention on whether we were going to vote up or down for or against expansion.

So I welcome this climactic debate. As with many momentous decisions, there are legitimate questions to be asked, and it is always easier to criticize than create. But, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues not to fall into the trap of failing to see the forest for the trees. Let's step back a little bit and take a look at the big picture.

By enlarging NATO membership to include Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, we will merely be catching up with reality. For centuries, these three countries have been part of the West. Four decades of Communist oppression and isolation was the historical aberration that has been all but corrected culturally and economically. Prague, Budapest, and Warsaw are now every bit as European as Madrid, Paris, and Berlin. It would be, in my view, indeed, perverse to recreate Stalin's immoral and artificial dividing line through the heart of Europe. Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic belong in NATO, and in the European Union. They will soon join these organizations.

I would parenthetically note, if you were a Russian and you had the choice of having other European nations near you join NATO, or join the EU, I suspect they would view their economic interests as the most negatively impacted upon by the EU being enlarged and them not being a part of it.

What are we talking about? We talk about how we are offending the Europeans or expanding the EU. We are offending Russia to expand the European Union. Great. Great. You are sitting in Russia. Hey, good idea. I now have bilateral relationships that work pretty well with Poland and with Hungary and with these other countries. But I will tell you, they are now going to join the EU, and we don't get a piece of the action.

Look, you cannot have it both ways. If this is about Russian pride, Russians feeling they are not part of the West, Russians not being involved in a way that they see their future in the West, then how does isolating them economically in the same way it is isolating them militarily, how does that convince any Russian leader? ''They won't let me sell my widgets in Paris. But they say I am part of the West. They are welcoming me. I need to sell my widgets so I can employ my people.''

The same polls we hear bandied about—the last poll I recall being conducted in Russia, the Russian people didn't even raise NATO on the scale of concern. Zero. Literally zero, of little or no concern to them.

So it would be perverse if we were to say that, ''Hey, by the way, you can't join NATO until you are part of the EU.'' As if Russian is going to say, ''Oh, that's a good idea. I really want Poland in the EU and a member of NATO. That will make me feel a lot better.''

It is kind of hard to get a handle on this. But let me just read this poll: 53 percent say Poland—this is in Russia, a Gallup poll, March 14 of this year—53 percent say Poland should be allowed to join NATO.

Did you hear what I just said? Fifty-three percent say Poland should be allowed to join NATO; 57 percent say the Czech Republic should be allowed to join NATO; 54 percent say Hungary should be allowed to join NATO, and 25 percent had no view on the matter. Threat? That is one of the reasons I think, by the way, that the Russian people think that, No. 1. This is conjecture on my part; no poll says this. I cannot cite any evidence of this. But I think they are like the American people. They are pretty smart, intuitively pretty smart. They know if Poland is part of NATO that any of the harebrained schemes any of their leaders may have in the future about sending their boys to Poland will be eliminated. I think they are pretty smart. They kind of have us figured out.

If, in fact, national Poland is a part of NATO, they realize their political leadership in the future, as well as what is already done now, will have to finally shed 500 years, from czar through commissar, of a notion that somehow in American terms there is a manifest destiny for Russia to control Poland or any other place west of their boundaries.

Don't you kind of find it fascinating that a majority of the Russian people say these countries should be able to join? We talk about this like it is a vacuum, where we are operating in a vacuum. How about all those European countries, our allies? I am not suggesting we should take a different kind of poll; that is, the more nations that agree, the better it is. But in counter to the argument that you know the best way to bring Russia around permanently is not to have NATO expanded. But the countries who are most threatened by Russia over the years, don't you kind of find it fascinating they think expansion is a good idea? We hardly agree with the French on anything. We can't even agree with them on Coca-Cola. We hardly have similar values. We hardly agree on any foreign policy national matter, except NATO. They think it is a good idea. The Brits think it is a good idea. The Danes and Spaniards think it is a good idea. The Italians and Greeks think it is a good idea. It is the only thing the Greeks and Turks agree on.

Those who argue for expansion sometimes exaggerate the benefits that flow from this picture. I assure you that those who argue against expansion vastly exaggerate it and the potential damage that can be done to the emergence of a democracy in Russia.

I ask my colleagues: What are we worried about? Are we worried about Russia? Of course, in public most Russian politicians will grouse about NATO enlargement. Public pronouncements cost them nothing. But from my many conversations with Russian politicians, both here and in Moscow, I can tell you that not one—not one, I repeat, not one—think that the entry of Poland and Hungary and the Czech Republic into NATO will constitute a military threat to Russia, including a long private luncheon with Chernomyrdin not too long ago—2 weeks, 3 weeks ago, whenever he was here last.

Now, it would be my opponents, the opponents of enlargement in this country, who will cite a range of issues on which Russia and the United States have different policies and then point the wagging finger at NATO enlargement as the universal culprit. One size fits all. Secretary Albright used an apt metaphor when she labeled NATO enlargement as the opponents' ''El Nino.'' They blame it for everything wrong in the United States-Russian relationship.

But even a superficial familiarity with the recent history of our relationship gives the lie to such illogic. Russian Communists and ultranationalists were against ratifying START II before NATO enlargement was even a gleam in the eyes of Lech Walesa and Havel, let alone U.S. policy. Why were Russian Communists and ultranationalists against it? I'll tell you why. Because American arms control negotiators did a heck of a job, and Russia knew it.

That does not mean that ratifying START II isn't in Russia's self-interest. It is. But it will take some hard swallowing for them to take that step. It's all part of Russia coming to terms with the end of an empire. And this difficult psychological adjustment lies at the root of the Russian rhetoric against NATO enlargement. But I repeat, when you get down to brass tacks in discussions with Russian leaders, absolutely none of them think that their country's security will be threatened by Polish, Czech, or Hungarian troops being part of NATO—none.

Why should they worry? Do my colleagues really believe NATO is anything but a defensive alliance? Surely they don't want to validate crude Russian cold war stereotypes of NATO as a rapacious aggressor just waiting to invade Mother Russia. We all know that NATO never had a plan to invade Russia. Do you know what? The Russians know it, too. How do I know that? They know it because thanks to the NATO-Russia Founding Act, which was signed in Paris last May, Russians have a permanent physical presence at NATO headquarters in Brussels and at SHAPE headquarters in Mons, Belgium. They take part in all discussions with NATO members, and they see for themselves that NATO has no hostile intentions.

If they don't believe my analysis, let me quote from an article by the Defense Minister of the Russian Federation in the spring of 1999 edition of the NATO Review. The very fact that the Russian Defense Minister is now contributing, I might add, to the NATO Review, I believe says something in itself, as does the title of his article: ''We Are Not Adversaries, We Are Partners.''

Although the Russian Defense Minister repeats the obligatory negative attitude toward NATO expansion, the vast majority of his article stresses the positive. In particular, he declares:

> Today it is an established fact that Russia and NATO no longer regard each other as adversaries. * * * Moreover, a partnership in maintaining peace and security on the continent has begun to take shape in our relations. The NATO-Russia Founding Act is an example of this.

It doesn't sound to me like a guy who thinks that expansion jeopardizes the security interest of his country. So let's give the Russians a little credit for being intelligent, thinking people who are not captives of outdated, ideological propaganda. From the Gallup Poll I read you, clearly the Russian people are not. And, obviously, the Russian military is not either.

If some of my colleagues still don't believe me, I direct their attention to the balance sheet of recent Russian international behavior. On the negative side, from America's point of view, is their unwillingness to follow our lead on inspections of suspected Iraqi military sites, weapons sites.

Does anyone really think this had anything whatsoever to do with NATO enlargement? Russia has two centuries worth of involvement in the Middle East, has had Iraq as a major client for decades, has a foreign minister who specializes in that area and has had a lengthy personal friendship with Saddam Hussein. It is nothing to do with NATO.

I may be wrong, but I doubt that when Mr. Primakov and Saddam Hussein get together, they talk about the evils of the enlargement of NATO.

And, I might add parenthetically, if the reason why the Russians didn't go along with our plan—someone explain to me, my ancestors, the French, how did they arrive at that? Was their decision to side with Russia relative to inspectors because of NATO enlargement? I think it was. I think it was. It is bizarre—I am only joking. I don't think it was.

So, you can't have it both ways. It is often cited: You know, they were with us in the gulf war. France was with us in the gulf war. It was a different circumstance. A country had been invaded. They are not with us now, nor is France with us this time.

How about Iran, another irritant in our relationship with Russia? Russia's involvement with Persia is even older than that with the Arab world. We certainly must and do oppose Russian investment in Iran and arms shipments and technology transfers to that country. But, again, their policies are grounded on historic geopolitics on their southern flank, economic distress, and lax controls—not on NATO expansion.

Or let me frame the issue another way. I ask the critics of NATO enlargement, if NATO rejects enlargement, rebuffs Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, who have met NATO's rigid membership qualifications, is anyone going to be prepared to come to the floor here—the staffs of the opponents are listening here—is anyone going to come to the floor and say, if we reject NATO expansion, and we do it on the floor in the next week or so, that out of heartfelt gratitude you are going to see Russia break off relations with Iran, break off relations with Iraq—which is what we wish them to do—and immediately ratify the START agreement? What do you think?

If Senator ROTH and I lose on this one, I'm willing to bet you a year's salary, and that is all I have is my salary. It's plenty, but that's all I have. I am willing to bet you a year's salary—that's a joke. I'm not allowed to bet on the floor. I don't really mean it. I'll get letters saying BIDEN is gambling with his salary. But I will bet you anything that I'm allowed to bet that circumstances, in terms of the ties with Iran and Iraq, will increase, not diminish; that there will be less prospect for future arms control because the nationalists will have prevailed and they will triumph, and they will trumpet their triumph. So, look, if NATO expansion is the reason these bad things are happening to the extent they are happening, then obviously, if it's defeated, a lot of good things are going to happen. Don't hold your breath.

Let's turn to the other side of the ledger and go back for a minute to arms control. What is Russia's recent record? I keep hearing from my friend from Virginia: You know it's going to be the end of arms control. Everything is going to come to a screeching halt because this occurred, because we voted to expand —so on and so forth. Let's look at the record. Much as opponents of NATO enlargement would like to forget, the facts are that within the past year the state Duma and Federation Council have ratified two critically important international treaties. One is the Flank Document to the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe. As the Presiding Officer and all my colleagues know, that is the treaty that talks about how much materiel, armored personnel carriers, et cetera, weapons, heavy weapons that each side could have and where they could have them.

We just modified that agreement. They ratified it—an arms control agreement.

With regard to the Chemical Weapons Convention, I was told once we passed it here, that would be the end of it in the Duma. If I am not mistaken, it was almost the very day we were in either Paris or Spain where the President and the 15 other NATO heads of state were inviting—inviting—these three additional countries to join that by an overwhelming vote, their version of our Senate and House, the Duma, went ahead and overwhelmingly ratified a very controversial arms control agreement requiring them to destroy thousands of tons of chemical weapons.

Even now, the Yeltsin government has pledged to push for ratification of START II. Russia is well ahead of schedule in its destruction obligations under START I, and the Russians continue to work with us in implementing the vitally important Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program. That doesn't sound like a country that is so blinded by hatred for NATO enlargement that it is opting out of international arms control agreements.

How about cooperation in conventional weapons? I might add, Chernomyrdin, when he met with us here, predicted by the end of summer, he was confident that they would ratify the START II treaty. But how about conventional weapons? Russia and the United States and 28 other countries signed the CFE Treaty and, as a consequence, destroyed more than 53,000 pieces of heavy equipment in this decade. And the process continues.

Does that sound like a country that is opting out, figuring there is a threat and they are going to stop and start to rebuild? Not only not rebuild it, they are continuing to meet their obligations under the CFE Treaty and destroying military equipment.

Let me say that again. More than 53,000 tanks, armored personnel carriers, artillery pieces and helicopters, and guess what, NATO enlargement hasn't stopped this remarkable process on multilateral disarmament, and it won't stop it after Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic finally join the alliance.

Finally, NATO enlargement has not prevented Russian forces from serving side by side with U.S. forces under NATO command in Bosnia. In my last of several trips to Bosnia, I was standing at what we call Camp McGovern. I was standing out in the field talking to an American one-star general. A Russian colonel who looked every bit like the guy who fought Sylvester Stallone in Rocky IV, whatever that was, ramrod straight, 6 foot 3, wearing a Russian uniform, comes up, seeks to interrupt, salutes the American general and asks what his orders are.

I don't know. For all this lack of cooperation we are talking about, how much the Russians hate expansion, how much they view it as a threat, how it is going to bring to a crashing end any cooperation on military matters, on arms control, conventional and strategic, I don't see it. I see no evidence to suggest that.

For someone like me of the cold war generation, this was mind-boggling to watch this Russian colonel salute an American general. In spite of the policy differences between Moscow and Washington with regard to Bosnian Serbs, cooperation on the ground is exemplary. I heard the same thing from the Russian Ambassador who is deputy to the American civilian administrator in Brcko when I was in Bosnia. I scarcely need to say that neither the Russian colonel nor the Russian Ambassador had even one word to say about NATO enlargement. It was a nonissue to them. In fairness, there was no way I brought it up. It wasn't like they raised it and I responded. Nobody said anything to me.

The salient point which the naysayers would like to obscure is that NATO enlargement is simply a matter of catching up with reality. It would be nothing less than grotesque, in my view, for the U.S. Senate, out of a totally misplaced fear of offending Russian sensibilities, to consign the thoroughly Western Poles, Czechs and Hungarians either to Moscow's sphere of influence or to a ''gray zone'' in Central Europe.

Imposed spheres of influence have no place in Europe in the 21st century. Every country must have the right to choose its own political system, its own economic system, its own cultural direction and its own security arrangements, including whether or not to join the alliance. If we would reject the Poles, the Czechs and Hungarians for fear of antagonizing the Russians, the only people we would be helping would be the Russian ultranationalists and Communists by validating their outdated, vicious portrait of the United States, a view not shared by the democrats.

The worst you hear, by the way, in Russia from Russian democrats, the worst you hear is not that ''we think expansion is a threat, we think expansion will be a problem to us.'' We know it is not. The worst you hear is ''this expansion will or might give fodder to the ultranationalists and the Communists in our battle to establish democracy.'' That is the worst you hear—the worst you hear.

The only people, in my view, we would be helping if we rejected expansion would be the ultranationalists and Communists by, again, validating their outdated and vicious portrait of the West and their outdated and dangerous notion of what they are entitled to do in terms of influencing their neighbors.

That rather obvious conclusion brings up a more basic point, which is regularly glossed over by the opponents of NATO enlargement. The choice is not between enlarging or maintaining the status quo; the harsh reality is that the status quo is not an option.

It is myopic, in my view, to believe that three booming, vigorous Central European countries, all of whom have bitter historical memories of Russian domination, if rebuffed by NATO would sit idly by and trust good fortune to protect them.

It should be obvious that they will not. They didn't do it in the interwar period earlier in this century, and they wouldn't do it now. The renationalization of security policy would take place, undoing all the stability that has been painstakingly created since the fall of communism. It would allow the poisonous forces of ethnic and religious hatred and international crime to regain a foothold in that volatile region.

Nearly 60 million highly educated, talented Central Europeans are ready and willing to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area. All three candidate countries have carried out rigorous reforms to conform to NATO's political and military standards. All three have already contributed to NATO-led missions in the gulf war and in Bosnia. They will be an invaluable asset in controlling the forces of chaos and destruction that are now the real threats in Central and Eastern Europe. Indeed, this is the basic rationale for NATO enlargement—to extend the zone of peace and stability in Europe. It is a zone within which democracies do not fight with each other and which other countries, Russia included, need not fear.

Obviously, there are certain risks associated with NATO enlargement, as there are with any policy initiative. But the risk of not enlarging NATO, of not catching up with history, in my view, are far greater.

One other word about history. In the frantic flurry of last-minute attempts to derail ratification of NATO enlargement, I have even heard the accusation that we would be undermining the young Russian democracy, of helping to create a so-called ''Weimar Russia.'' Well, that charge wins the prize for historic illiteracy.

After World War I, the victorious allies imposed punitive reparations upon Weimar Germany and kept it out of the League of Nations until 1926.

After the cold war, on the contrary, the victorious West has done exactly the opposite with Russia. The United States and Western Europe have pumped more than $100 billion in aid and investment into Russia and have brought Russia into the international bodies where it was formerly not represented. They have even brought Russia into a working relationship with the inner councils of NATO itself.

So please, in this round of Senate debate, let us spare ourselves hearing about ''Weimar Russias'' and ''Iron Rings'' and other ridiculous historic constructions. We are building a partnership with Russia which can continue to grow. Later in this session, Senators will have the opportunity to strengthen this process by voting resoundingly for the administration's enhanced funding request for assistance to Russia and the Nunn-Lugar program. I want to see all those who are opposed to expansion of NATO on the grounds of, it is going to offend Russia, to step up to the ball and do what they say they really are concerned about. Let us see them vote for enhanced funding for assistance to Russia and the Nunn-Lugar program.

Another canard of the opponents of enlargement is that we will saddle the American taxpayer with mountainous new costs. Although I would invite my colleagues who wish to debate this to set a time tomorrow to do that, and do it in a coherent way, let me very briefly speak to that.

Fortunately, we now have indisputable facts to refute this element of the basic scare tactic which is being engaged in: Is it going to cost $250 billion? $125 billion? and so on. NATO officials estimate that the total common cost of enlargement is $1.5 billion over 10 years. Of this, the share of the United States will be approximately $400 million, or an average of about $40 million per year over 10 years. And that is based upon our accepting the same proportion of responsibility for enlargement as we have for NATO thus far—burdensharing as we have been engaged in it for the past 20 years.

As I said, later in the floor debate I hope to have an opportunity to explain this official cost estimate in some vivid detail. For now, however, I refer the doubters to the analysis of two U.S. Government agencies, the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Budget Office.

The GAO concluded last month that NATO's approach to determining the $1.5 billion estimate over 10 years is reasonable. The CBO, which traditionally uses worst-case analysis as a hedge against any surprises in the future, set the common cost at $2.5 billion over the next 10 years.

The worst estimate is one-tenth of what the worst estimate suggested by our colleagues is. Even the CBO figure, however, would yield an annual American contribution that amounts to only .15 percent of our total defense budget—.15 percent—almost only one-tenth of 1 percent.

One final word is in order. No resolution, or even final legislation, is perfect. And there may be a few areas in the resolution of ratification that could be improved upon. Senator HELMS and I plan to offer an en bloc managers' amendment that includes several of the amendments proposed to date.

I anticipate that in these coming days several other amendments to the resolution of ratification will be offered and we will have ample time to discuss them. So I will not go into detail now. But, Mr. President, I see my senior colleague from Delaware is on the floor, so let me wrap up what I am about to say and what I have been saying in order to give him a chance to speak.

Mr. President, it is important to note that the resolution of ratification is thoroughly a bipartisan product, as you will soon hear from my colleague from Delaware, a product in the committee crafted by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator HELMS and myself, with significant input from other members of the committee and our respective staffs. It was voted out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a vote of 16–2 after hundreds and hundreds of pages of recorded testimony for and against expansion.

I urge my colleagues to reread the resolution before offering amendments, for upon careful scrutiny, some of them prove to be superfluous, others harmful, and some both.

An example of this is the amendment introduced by my friend and distinguished senior Senator from Virginia which would mandate a 3-year pause for additional countries before they could be invited to join the alliance, if they were to be invited. This would tie our hands diplomatically, Mr. President, if, for example, a clearly qualified country like Austria should apply for membership, and will put an arbitrary hold on Slovenia's case for membership which I believe is already convincing.

Other amendments offered by my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from New York, for whom I have no higher regard, would require new NATO members to first join the European Union. This, in my view, equates apples and oranges, forgetting that the criteria to qualify for those two organizations are dramatically different.

Moreover, his amendment would turn the institutional history of the last 50 years on its head. Traditionally, NATO membership has preceded EU membership. And I would further add that he chooses, as we are trying to come up with a new architect for the security of Europe, a requirement to go forward first by a group of which we are not a member and in which we have no say.

We are not a member of the EU. To suggest that, before we could consider membership in NATO, it has to be decided by the EU whether or not they can join essentially takes us out of the game. And every time we have been taken out of the game in Europe—I might note parenthetically, this is not a direct analogy—but every time we have been taken out of the game or taken ourselves out, there has been real trouble in Europe. We are still a European power. We must remain a European power. We must continue to have a major say in the structures of Europe, because we have found, when we do not, nothing good usually happens.

Still other amendments proposed by the junior Senator from Texas and the junior Senator from Missouri would use the enlargement ratification process as a vehicle to alter the very fundamentals of the NATO treaty that exists today, either by changing the rules of the North Atlantic Council or by putting severe restrictions on non-article V missions—an issue that is being debated right now within NATO.

I want to put my colleagues on notice that I will oppose any amendments that will undermine the most successful military alliance in history.

Mr. President, nearly 50 years ago, NATO was founded to counter a Soviet threat in Western Europe and to establish stability in the rest of Europe. Today, the new threat is instability itself arising out of ethnic and religious conflicts. And this is, at a minimum, a hedge against any future wrongheaded decisions by Russia. Enlarging NATO to include Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary is a unique opportunity to expand the zone of stability in the continent. It serves America's interest, Europe's interest, and the world's interest. I am absolutely confident, if we do this, history will record, as well, it serves Russian interests.

I thank the Chair, and I now am happy to yield the floor to my colleague from Delaware, Senator ROTH.

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. First, let me express my gratitude and thanks to my colleague, the junior Senator from Delaware, for his effective leadership in this most important foreign affairs matter. He, of course, speaks as an expert, as one who is the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee and, of course, cochairs with me the Senate observer group. I just want to publicly acknowledge the strong leadership role he is playing in what I consider the most important foreign policy matter that will come before this Congress.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent David Stephens of Senator KYL's staff be permitted on the floor for the duration of the debate on NATO enlargement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, as the Senate resumes consideration of the resolution of ratification for NATO enlargement, I would like to commend my colleagues for the debate that has occurred thus far.

In the few days that the Senate has already dedicated to this important issue, and I speak before the debate today, some 21 Members of this Chamber have expressed their views. I have listened intently to their arguments and I have been impressed by the substantive dialog. This vote on NATO and its future is perhaps the most important foreign policy decision we will make since the end of the cold war. I appreciate the efforts my colleagues have dedicated to this matter.

I have long felt that NATO enlargement is a policy whose time is past due. The case for NATO enlargement is indisputable. The accession of Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary, the only three countries that are the focus of the resolution before us, will, without a doubt, strengthen the alliance. It will eliminate the stabilizing and immoral dividing lines imposed upon Europe by dictators of the past. It will consolidate peace and stability on that continent. A stable and peaceful Europe will benefit the entire transatlantic community, as well as Russia.

I could elaborate on these points and other important benefits of NATO enlargement, but I have done that on many occasions in the past. Today, instead, I wish to address a number of arguments that I have heard made directly against this important policy. For example, in the course of our debate it has been incorrectly asserted that the Senate is rushing this important debate and that it remains inadequately prepared to address this issue.

This is wrong. Few issues of national security have been as extensively examined by the Congress as well as the public. NATO enlargement has been the topic of countless editorials and opinion pieces in national and local papers. By one estimate, over 1,000 scholarly article opinion pieces and editorials on NATO enlargement have been published in leading journals since 1994. A quick count of editorials and opinion pieces in the New York Times found that it has run some 72 such articles over the past 3 years. A quick survey of the Washington Post found another 90 over the same period of time. In other words, these two nationally syndicated papers have published articles on NATO enlargement at a rate exceeding one every 10 days. This does not take into account the other important national, local journals.

I might suggest that those who believe this issue has not been well vetted may not be reading the right papers. Either that or they have not been interested enough in the issue to be aware that a debate concerning this policy has been waged for 3 years. Over the last 2 years, some 15 States—including my first State, Delaware—have passed resolutions endorsing nuclear enlargement. Moreover, this policy has been endorsed by countless civic public policy, political, business, and veteran organizations.

I point to a chart beside me, the number of organizations that have supported NATO enlargement. All of our outstanding veteran organizations, the AMVETS, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars—just to mention a few—have all endorsed NATO enlargement. We could point to the many other organizations that have done exactly the same.

Congress itself has been deeply engaged in NATO enlargement from the very beginning of this policy initiative. In fact, Congress has not only done its homework on this matter, Congress Has led the charge for NATO enlargement. I think that is particularly important to understand, that Congress has been in the lead on NATO enlargement.

Its committees have examined in detail the military, intelligence, foreign policy and budgetary implications of this long overdue initiative.

Since last July alone, thirteen hearings have been conducted on NATO enlargement by the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations, Armed Services, Appropriations, and Budget.

The Senate NATO Observer Group, which I chair with Senator JOE BIDEN, has convened seventeen times with, among others, the President, the Secretaries of State and Defense, NATO's Secretary General, and the leaders of the three invitee countries.

In support of these Congressional initiatives, the Congressional Research Service and the General Accounting Office have produced some 30 objective, non-partisan reports and countless memos on the subject of NATO enlargement.

As I said when we began this debate, it is no surprise—indeed, for me, it is a matter of pride—that Congress has legislatively promoted NATO enlargement every year since 1994. Perhaps a good question is how can we ensure that all dimensions of U.S. national security policy benefit from this much public attention and endorsement.

The second argument that one often hears falsely asserts that the extension of NATO membership to Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary will dilute the Alliance because their military capabilities do not match those of Allied nations.

It is true that the militaries of these three countries must be modernized. They do not deny that. That is why these three countries have embarked on military modernization programs that involve regular increases in their defense budgets. And, these programs have been endorsed by NATO's political and military authorities.

Earlier this year, I and a few members of the NATO Observer Group met with General Klaus Naumann, a highly respected German military officer who is Chairman of NATO's military committee. He stated that because Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary are so committed to modernizing their militaries they may sooner rather than later find themselves better equipped and more technologically advanced than some of the current Allies.

To see the level of contribution that these countries will make to the Alliance, we need only look at what they have done and are doing today. Already, they are enhancing the Alliance's military capabilities. They contributed forces to Operation Desert Storm. They have forces serving by the side of U.S. Forces as part of S–FOR in Bosnia. They were among the first to commit forces to stand by the United States in the recent stand-off against Saddam Hussein.

NATO commanders, including those from the United States, have stated clearly that the admission of Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary will increase the capabilities of the Alliance. And this view is shared by some sixty retired four-star admirals and generals, including former Chiefs of the Joint Staff, former Supreme Allied Commanders of Europe, and numerous former Service Chiefs.

Mr. President, the facts before us today, and the endorsements of these military leaders, can only leave one fully confident that the admission of Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary into NATO will leave the Alliance stronger. We can be confident that these three democracies will not only be model members of the alliance but also pro-American Allies.

A third argument that has been voiced by some of my colleagues falsely asserts that NATO enlargement threatens Russia, or that we should abandon this policy because Russia perceives it as threatening.

The reality is that NATO is a defensive Alliance of democracies. Its decision-making process is consensual, and I find it hard to believe that any one of its members—all democracies—would ever advocate aggression.

The fact is that NATO poses no immediate military threat to Russia. U.S. force deployments in Europe, arguably the Alliance's most mobile component, has been reduced by two-thirds since the Cold War. Allied force structures and defense budgets have declined steadily over the last decade. The Alliance has stated that it has no intention to permanently station foreign forces or deploy nuclear weapons on the territories of new member states. Where is the threat to Russia?

Those who argue that NATO enlargement threatens Russia have also asserted that this policy directly contradicts efforts to reduce the risk of nuclear confrontation with Russia and to ensure that Russia's nuclear arsenal does not leak out to rogue states.

The evidence however shows that this assertion is false. Since 1994, when NATO first announced its intentions to open its membership to the democracies of Central Europe, the risks of

nuclear war have not increased, but been reduced. There is no evidence that NATO enlargement has hurt cooperation with Russia on nuclear matters.

First, the actual number of Russian and American operational strategic nuclear weapons have continued to decline. In 1990, that number was about 24,000 warheads. Today, that number is in the vicinity of 14,000 warheads, and Moscow is dismantling its strategic nuclear forces at a rate faster than that required by the START I treaty.

Second, the Russian government has again reiterated its commitment to ratify the START II treaty, which will further reduce these two strategic nuclear arsenals. Those who note that the Russian parliament, which has voiced its opposition to NATO enlargement and continues to block the ratification of START II, should recognize that the same Duma has blocked START II long before NATO enlargement was formally endorsed by the NAC.

And, let me add that the Russian government has agreed to pursue a START III accord once START II enters force.

Third, the Nunn-Lugar Threat Reduction Program continues to improve the Russian's control and security of their nuclear arsenal. Indeed, this program has been enthusiastically received by Russia. It stands out as one of the true success stories of Russian-American partnership in the post-cold-war era.

Our policies toward Europe must focus on these objective strategic realities and must be structured to enhance economic, political, and military stability in all parts of Europe. That is exactly what NATO enlargement does. That is in our national interest and in Russia's national interest.

For those who are still concerned about Russia's fear of NATO enlargement, let me share with you a recent poll conducted in Moscow.

Earlier this year, a branch of the Gallup Organization, found that among respondents in Moscow: 53 percent said that Poland should be allowed to join NATO; 57 percent said that the Czech Republic should be allowed to join NATO; and 54 percent said that Hungary should be allowed to join NATO.

These polling results are not surprising if one takes into account the fact that NATO enlargement is facilitating unprecedented reconciliation between Russia and its neighbors. The reconciliation now occurring between Warsaw and Moscow and Moscow and Kyev are positive developments for Russian citizens, and they understand this. They also understand that such developments would not be occurring with NATO enlargement.

And, let us not forget the open and inclusive manner in which Nato and the West has approached Russia. The Alliance has extended the hand of partnership through the NATO-Russia Founding Act, and today Russian troops serve with NATO forces in Bosnia. The West has extended some $100 billion in assistance since 1991, to help Russia's democratic and economic reforms, and over $2 billion in weapon dismantlement and security assistance. On top of that, Russia has regularly been invited to participate in the G–7 or G–8 meetings. This is hardly—as some detractors might try to persuade—a policy of punishment and isolation.

It is false and even misleading to assert that Russia is being surrounded by a ring of isolation. Rather, NATO's policies have been more like a strong magnet drawing Russia out of its historically self-imposed isolation into a growing web of political and military cooperation. Such cooperation holds out the prospect of an entirely new and constructive relationship with a reforming and democratic Russia.

Mr. President, I hope that these three points have added clarity to the Senate's consideration of NATO membership. There are few policy initiatives as important as this one. There are few that stand to offer peace-living people throughout the transatlantic community and in Central and Eastern Europe so much hope—hope for greater stability, increased security, enhanced cooperation, and even a collective vision for the future. I encourage my colleagues to support NATO enlargement. History is being made, and for the sake of those who have long-awaited this moment, we must not keep it waiting.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the NATO issue. I understand that we have 10 minutes before a vote. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to address the legislation before the Senate, the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 to include Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic as members of the NATO alliance.

Mr. President, let me begin by sharing a statement made to me last fall by Hungarian Ambassador Banlaki during his visit to my office. He said, ''The people of my country would like to be able to choose our own allies. We would like to enjoy all those things that history has denied us.''

Mr. President, I am here today to say, this is the U.S. Senate's chance to make Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic's hopes come true—let them choose their own allies for they are choosing to join NATO where they have been denied in the past the right to choose their own allies. We all know that. We all understand that.

Let me be clear—I am fully supportive of this treaty before the Senate allowing these three countries membership into NATO. NATO is an alliance that has been a success beyond anyone's expectations—it has never been permeated—and since its inception, no great wars have been fought within its borders.

NATO embodies our continued commitment to Europe. Its existence ties U.S. security to peaceful relations among our European allies. The historic, political and cultural connection between the U.S. and Europe provide the foundation for this transatlantic alliance.

The objective of the myriad institutions and organizations created in the aftermath of World War II were a reaction to the carnage of two great wars in the first half of this century. The NATO alliance, the Organization for Cooperation and Development, and the European Union were all created with one purpose in mind—preventing further conflict between the states of Europe. This goal of peace was achieved. The only tragic failure in the history of these alliances was their inability to encompass nations beyond the Iron Curtain.

Today we have the opportunity to realize what was impossible only a few years ago—expanding a cooperative alliance to the nations previously locked in a coercive pact.

I have listened to many of the arguments for amending this treaty and for delaying this treaty. I have also heard the criticism aimed at the U.S. Senate for not debating it further.

So let me make this point—NATO was a defensive alliance. But it was never an exclusive alliance. We in the free world waited for the day when the rest of Europe would be free—free from tyranny, free from communism, and free from the everyday controls placed on the people of Eastern and Central Europe.

Mr. President, that day is here. These countries are free. They have been free for 7 years. They have struggled to establish democratic, free market societies. To a greater or lesser degree, all three of them are being successful. They desire a place at the table among the democratic, free states of the West. And in my opinion, we should have allowed them to join NATO sooner than 1999, as this treaty before us states.

This Senate would be foolhardy to turn its back now on these countries or even to continue to delay the treaty's implementation.

In January, I visited the NATO headquarters in Brussels and met with NATO officials as well as the ambassadors from the new member countries. I was impressed by their perspective that this was not NATO expanding out to engulf these countries, but rather this was Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic asking to come into NATO.

It is crucial to remember that NATO is not expanding against any sovereign

will, but exactly the opposite. This treaty allows the West to let these countries fulfill their destinies—and if this Senate does not allow the treaty to pass and pass quickly—we are denying them the ultimate freedom—as the Hungarian Ambassador said—to choose their own allies.

I do not believe that Russia should fear the free association of allies, even those that might have been former enemies. There is nothing for Russia to fear. They should be reassured that the borders of Russia are peaceful today, that there is a united and growing Europe. They should be welcoming of NATO's ability to maintain peace and harmony among its members.

I would like to address those Senators who have expressed the need to link European Union membership with NATO membership. We must recognize that NATO enlargement, European Union expansion and monetary union are inextricably linked.

Last fall, I began considering the different arguments for and against this treaty. The Committee which I chair, the Senate Budget Committee, held a series of hearings on U.S.—European issues which gave me a different perspective to the many questions about the U.S. and Western European roles in Eastern Europe.

We cannot ignore that it was the presence of a U.S.-led NATO that provided the security for European Union that has facilitated its economic development. Without sovereign security, economic security cannot happen. These are exciting, new times in Europe. We have Europe in the next months uniting beyond its original common market alliances to become a monetary union.

While I know European Union membership is desired by Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, EU membership is very different from NATO membership. And Monetary Union cannot even be considered until membership to the EU has been granted. Someday, I am convinced, they will become members of the European Union.

Some day, when they have developed their free markets which are emerging and their emerging new democracies, they will also be part of the new monetary union, the new single currency that many European countries will have in the not too distant future. They need the security and the structures of democracy to make capitalism work. To tie NATO membership with European Union membership at this time would not be wise. Defense security first will then lead to economic security.

On costs, over the last few months, I have had CBO, GAO and the administration explain their estimates of the costs of NATO expansion. CBO estimates that the costs to the U.S. will approximate $100 million per year for the next four or five years.

From the perspective of the Budget Committee, this cost is very affordable when compared to the overall levels of defense spending this year of $272 billion that we approved for the 1999 budget resolution.

Let me conclude Mr. President, that while the debate on NATO has raised several issues, one issue keeps dominating my thoughts. Here is an alliance, that once was designed to respond to the threats of the Cold War. Those threats included the armies of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. Now this same alliance is being asked by those same three countries to be allowed to join today. How can we possibly say no?

I have no doubt that we are witnessing a major event in the histories of these former Warsaw Pact countries as well as the Free World.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article ''For Expansion: The Case Clinton Isn't Making'' from The Wall Street Journal, April 21, 1998, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR EXPANSION: THE CASE CLINTON ISN'T MAKING

(By Zalmay Kualilzad)

This week the Senate will start debating the question of whether to allow the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. A vote on the issue is likely next week. Although the Clinton administration supports NATO expansion, it has not made its case forcefully enough. In its public defense of NATO expansion, the administration has emphasized bringing the three Central European states into the zone of democracy, peace and prosperity. This argument is a good start, but a much stronger case can be made. NATO expansion is vital not only for the well-being of these potential new members, but also for the security of the U.S. and its Western allies.

The first strategic argument for an expanded NATO is to hedge against uncertainties in Russia. The administration argues that NATO expansion is not directed against Russia. This is true, to a point. As long as Russia is not expansionist, it will have nothing to fear from an enlarged NATO. In fact, a democratic and nonimperial Russia should be NATO's partner. But Russia's future is not certain. Many in the Russian elite are unhappy with the current international system and the U.S.'s preeminence in it. They are nostalgic for their lost empire and would like to reimpose hegemony over the former Soviet territories and Eastern Europe.

Russia is too weak to dominate its former empire today. However, even with its current difficulties, Moscow is developing two new long-range nuclear missiles, is reluctant to ratify the Start II treaty, and insists on interpreting the Antiballistic Missile treaty in ways that put severe limits on effective defense against ballistic missiles to which both the U.S. and Russia are increasingly vulnerable. Moscow's statements and behavior towards the Baltic states, Ukraine, the Caspian Basin and Central Asia at times have neoimperial overtones.

Russian weakness, however, will not last forever. Rich in natural and human resources, it will eventually reemerge as a great power. A revitalized and democratic Russia would most likely seek greatness through economic prosperity and political stability. However, should a revitalized Russia prove hostile and expansionist, NATO membership for Eastern European states will act as a powerful deterrent against future Russian aggression in this region. Unfortunately, Russia can go either way—and which way it goes will not be affected by NATO expansion.

Second, an expanded NATO keeps Germany as part of an American-led international system. Eastern Europe is Germany's backyard, and the European Union is unable to look after the security of Western Europe by itself, let alone protect Eastern Europe. Therefore, if NATO does not stabilize Germany's frontiers, Germany might do so alone. Germany is a key democratic ally of the U.S. and prefers to cooperate within NATO to stabilize Eastern and Central Europe. A renationalization of German security policy will end NATO as we know it and could lead to a less stable, less unified Europe. This would create an enormous problem for U.S. security interests, not only in Europe—both East and West—but around the world.

Third, an expanded NATO strengthens the U.S. position in Western Europe. The Eastern Europeans are more pro-American than most of our current allies. They attribute their freedom to the American-led containment of the Soviet Union, and they know that the U.S. led the alliance to expand NATO eastward. Within the alliance, they are likely to be strongly supportive of the dominant U.S. role. And should they also join the EU—as they are likely to—they will be a strong force for a continued U.S.-European alliance.

Fourth, an expanded NATO ties Europe and the U.S. closer together and opens the door for greater cooperation in other parts of the world, especially the Middle East, a region vital to both sides of the Atlantic.

NATO expansion eastward should be accompanied by an effort to develop a common U.S.-European strategy for ensuring energy security and for countering the spreading of weapons of mass destruction and missiles. And we need to consider steps to increase military cooperation between the U.S. and European nations for the longer term and agree to financial formulas for sharing the burden of Persian Gulf security as the Europeans develop their military capabilities. The Europeans have been freeloading at U.S. expense. Thousands of the U.S. troops protect the gulf from Iran and Iraq. Europe contributes little, though it is more dependent on the region's oil and more vulnerable to its missiles. In exchange, the U.S. should be willing to give Europeans a greater say in decisions about the Middle East, including policies towards Iran. As with NATO expansion such steps are unlikely to be taken without U.S. leadership.

Although the administration may want to avoid publicly voicing these strategic reasons for NATO expansion in order to avoid offending Russia and some of our European allies, it is important that we recognize that NATO expansion is necessary to protect vital U.S. interests, increase cooperation among European and North American democracies and sustain America's global leadership. Given the stakes involved, congressional support should be overwhelming.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF SCOTT SNYDER FLEMING TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR LEGISLATION AND CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 6 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now proceed to vote on Executive Calendar No. 567 which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Scott Snyder Fleming, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Legislation and Congressional Affairs, Department of Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. FAIRCLOTH), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 104 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Abraham	Enzi	Mack
Akaka	Feingold	McCain
Allard	Feinstein	McConnell
Ashcroft	Ford	Mikulski
Baucus	Frist	Moseley-Braun
Bennett	Glenn	Moynihan
Biden	Gorton	Murray
Bingaman	Graham	Nickles
Bond	Gramm	Reed
Boxer	Grams	Reid
Breaux	Grassley	Robb
Brownback	Hagel	Roberts
Bryan	Harkin	Rockefeller
Bumpers	Hatch	Roth
Burns	Helms	Santorum
Byrd	Hollings	Sarbanes
Campbell	Hutchinson	Sessions
Chafee	Hutchison	Shelby
Cleland	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Coats	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Kempthorne	Snowe
Collins	Kerrey	Specter
Conrad	Kerry	Stevens
Coverdell	Kyl	Thomas
Craig	Landrieu	Thompson
D'Amato	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Daschle	Leahy	Torricelli
DeWine	Levin	Warner
Dodd	Lieberman	Wellstone
Domenici	Lott	Wyden
Dorgan	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—8

Durbin	Inhofe	Kohl
Faircloth	Inouye	Murkowski
Gregg	Kennedy	

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, Calendar Nos. 554, 558 and 569 are confirmed.

The nominations were considered and confirmed, as follows:

THE JUDICIARY

Garr M. King, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

Gregory Moneta Sleet, of Delaware, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Cherryl T. Thomas, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term expiring August 28, 2002.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the President will be notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

NOMINATION OF SCOTT SNYDER FLEMING

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, since September of 1997, the General Accounting Office, at my request, has been conducting an investigation into possible anti-lobbying violations—as well as possible violations of the Federal Advisory Committee Act—at the Department of Education.

This investigation is ongoing and I have no reason to believe at this time that the nominee in question, Mr. Fleming, is a key figure in this investigation nor have I been presented with any evidence of wrongdoing on his part that would compel me to oppose his nomination. I would, however, like to take this opportunity to urge Mr. Fleming, in his new capacity as Assistant Secretary of Education for Legislation and Congressional Affairs, to cooperate fully with the GAO investigation in order to resolve this matter expeditiously.

Mr. President, let me explain my involvement with this issue and my concerns as they relate to allegations of an unusually close, and perhaps improper, relationship between the Department of Education and certain lobbyists in this town.

This matter was first brought to my attention by an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post on September 4, 1997.

That editorial, written by nationally syndicated columnist Robert Novak, described how—each week while Congress was in session—senior Department of Education officials and special interest group representatives gathered in Secretary Riley's conference room for what, in my opinion, amounted to 'political action' or 'legislative planning' sessions.

News of these meetings surfaced in a report published by the Alexis de Tocqueville Institution's, Paul Steidler. For seven months, Mr. Steidler attended these meetings and kept detailed minutes of what was discussed. What emerges from the Steidler notes, if substantiated, is extremely troubling.

Without discussing the particulars of this investigation, Mr. President, let me note that I take Mr. Steidler's allegations very seriously. Collusion between special interest lobbyists and the executive branch for the express purpose of defeating or promoting specific legislation, at the grass roots level or here in Congress, is unacceptable.

Mr. President, the GAO investigation into these matters is still underway. And, as I said, it does not appear that Mr. Fleming was a central figure in the formation or conduct of the weekly meetings in question.

My concern is that the Department of Education cooperate fully with this investigation so this body and the American people can be certain that the Department of Education's interests correspond with our children's best interests and not just the needs of those special interests that dominate the landscape here in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the Novak editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 4, 1997]

TRIUMPH OF THE BLOB

(By Robert D. Novak)

At 4 p.m. today, some 45 education lobbyists—''back to school'' after the August congressional break—will resume weekly sessions with Department of Education officials in the secretary of education's conference room. There is doubt whether these meetings are legal but no question that they have been effective and, until now, a rare Washington secret.

They began in 1995, when what former education secretary William J. Bennett calls The Blob—the special-interest groups that want to maintain the educational status quo—feared the worst from a newly Republican Congress. With more than a hundred bills for abolition of the Department of Education introduced, the Thursday meetings began without the formal notification required by law for ''advisory committees''. After 2½ years of this collaboration the tide has turned on education, with the Republicans in full retreat.

''It's pretty much an open meeting,'' Acting Deputy Education Secretary Marshall (Mike) Smith, who usually presides, told me. He added that I would be welcome, which he conceded would make me the first journalist there. In fact, the sessions have been attended almost exclusively by The Blob, providing intelligence for the government bureaucrats who in turn disclose Clinton administration strategy. ''We rely on you, partly, as your eyes and ears,'' Smith told participants July 24.

But an interloper appeared at this year's meetings. Paul Steidler, senior fellow of the conservative Education Reform Project, heard about them and asked to attend. He got permission after interrogation by reluctant education officials. Steidler's subsequent weekly minutes offer a wondrous insight into how Bill Clinton's Washington works.

''There was boisterous conversation, and one could sense the camaraderie in the air,''

Steidler said of the atmosphere preceding his first meeting. The regulars represent such pro-Clinton groups as the National School Boards Association, the American Association of School Administrators and the American Federation of Teachers. First among equals is the National Education Association (NEA), the powerful teachers' union. Joel Packer, the NEA's expert lobbyist, sits next to and is deferred to by the Education Department's senior official present.

When an Education Department official described Republican Sen. Paul Coverdell's proposal for $50 million in grants to fund school-choice pilot programs somebody exclaimed. ''Yeah, the fear voucher.'' Another voice joined in: ''You get it if you are scared.'' Steidler noted: ''There was loud and sustained laughter. I found this to be quite chilling.''

Through seven months of these minutes, the administration and The Blob marched in lock step to maximize federal funding and suppress school choice, with scarcely a critical word for the Clinton administration and no kind word for Republicans.

When it was mentioned that former education secretary Lamar Alexander would testify to Congress, ''moans and snickers'' were followed by the NEA's Packer saying, ''It's called Mr. Voucher time''. Commenting on a C–SPAN broadcast of Republican congressmen discussing education, then-Education Department lobbyist Kay Casstevens said: ''If you didn't see it, you're probably better off.''

Ad budget negotiations neared their climax, Smith asked everybody to make sure they could be reached if they left town. The joint Education Department-NEA clout soon was demonstrated.

At the June 16 meeting, the NEA's Adele Robinson alerted the department to House committee approval of Democratic Rep. Benjamin Cardin's proposed $150 tax credit for after-school private tutoring. Smith declared: ''It drives a stake through [the president's] America Reads [program]. It's close to a voucher, folks.'' Cardin's proposal was eliminated, thanks to administration pressure.

So was a Coverdell amendment to the tax bill permitting parents to use their own tax-free savings for kindergarten through 12th-grade private schools. ''On behalf of the NEA,'' Packer said at the July 31 meeting, ''I want to profusely thank the administration for its stand on Coverdell.''

Is the administration's failure to list these meetings in the Federal Register a violation of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA)? ''The meetings are not covered by FACA'' acting Education Department General Counsel Jiumenne Studley told me, because they have no fixed membership or specific purpose. ''Anyone who wants can join in,'' she said. But her assertions are refuted by Paul Steidler's minutes, as Mike Smith may hear when he comes up for Senate confirmation.

NOMINATION OF GARR ''MIKE'' KING

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, we have confirmed the nomination of an outstanding judicial nominee to the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon. Garr ''Mike'' King is a consummate professional, who is universally respected within the Oregon legal community for his integrity and professionalism. His long and distinguished legal career as a trial lawyer began as a Deputy District Attorney with the Multnomah County Oregon District Attorney's Office. He helped draft the Oregon Rules for Civil Procedure and wrote the arbitration rules used in Multnomah County. Since 1971, as a partner with the Portland firm of Kennedy, King & Zimmer, he has handled a variety of cases, including commercial litigation, professional malpractice, products liability, and employment litigation in an exemplary fashion. In addition, Mr. King has been active in the U.S. District Court mediation program, has served as an arbitrator through the American Arbitration Association and, in 1995, was elected to the Board of Regents for the American College of Trial Lawyers.

Mr. President, I am confident that Garr ''Mike'' King will bring to the U.S. District Court for the district of Oregon the same dedication, professionalism, and integrity that has exemplified his entire legal career.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today we confirmed an outstanding lawyer, a knowledgeable and diligent servant of justice and great judicial nominee from my State of Oregon. It was a great honor to present to the Senate the name of Mr. Garr ''Mike'' King to be a United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

Mr. King comes before the Senate today with the bipartisan support of the Oregon Congressional delegation, and with broad support from both Oregon's law enforcement community and our state's legal community. Mr. King has served as a member of the Oregon State Bar Association since 1963 and has distinguished himself as one of the finest attorneys in the state. During this period of time, Mr. King has developed a sterling reputation for integrity, hard work, intelligence, and diligence.

In addition to his outstanding career as an attorney in private practice, Mr. King also has served as Multnomah County Deputy District Attorney and was elected to the Board of Regents of the American College of Trial Lawyers. He helped draft the Oregon Rules for Civil Procedure, authored the arbitration rules for Multnomah County and served as an arbitrator through the American Arbitration Association. He has been active in the U.S. District Court Mediation program since it was initiated and has worked quite closely with the Court to improve the federal mediation system.

Mr. King is a veteran of the United States Marine Corps who served his country with honor from 1954 to 1957. He has lived in Oregon for the past 35 years and is a proud father of seven children who is deeply involved in his church and community affairs. As those of my colleagues who were at Mike's confirmation hearing can attest, I think he single-handedly managed to fill about half of the hearing room with family members from all over the country, and I believe that speaks volumes about the kind of caring, concerned and committed family man Mike King is.

As with previous recommendations that I have made for the federal bench, the recommendation of Mr. King was preceded by an extensive bipartisan screening effort undertaken by a committee of leading Oregon attorneys. The selection committee was appointed with input from all the members of the Oregon Congressional delegation and the Governor's office. All applicants reviewed by the committee were evaluated on three criteria: judicial temperament, fitness to serve on the federal bench, and legal qualifications. Mr. King was rated very highly by the committee, and after personally interviewing him, I found him very well qualified for this position.

I want to again thank the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH for moving us to this point in the process. I am very grateful for both the amount of time and good counsel you continue to give me in the consideration of my region's needs on the federal bench.

I also thank my colleague, Senator SMITH, for his efforts on behalf of this nominee. Senator SMITH and I have now worked together in support of two other fine candidates to the federal bench, both of whom have been confirmed by the Senate.

I am certain that Mike King will bring to the federal bench the same intelligence, legal skill and integrity that he has brought to his work as one of our state's most respected attorneys.

THE NOMINATION OF GREGORY M. SLEET

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise to recognize Judge Gregory Sleet, who was confirmed by the Senate earlier today as a District Judge for Delaware. Unfortunately, I did not have an opportunity to personally greet him or his family when they came to the Capitol for his hearing before the Judiciary Committee just over a month ago. But today, it is my pleasure to congratulate Judge Sleet, his wife Mary and their two children on this achievement.

Since 1994, Greg Sleet has served Delaware as our U.S. Attorney. From that post, he was appointed by Attorney General Janet Reno to serve as the Vice-Chair of her Advisory Committee.

While his record of public service is impressive, so, too, is his previous work in the private sector. You see, Judge Sleet served Hercules Incorporated, an outstanding Delaware company, as legal counsel before becoming our U.S. Attorney. Having worked in the same capacity with Hercules some years earlier, I know first-hand that they hire only the sharpest young lawyers to handle their legal affairs.

Mr. President, the Senate needed not even four months to complete our work on Judge Sleet's nomination. I thank Judiciary Committee Chairman HATCH for his efforts to review the nomination in such an expeditious manner. Such prompt action speaks to the quality of the nominee, and I am happy to again congratulate Judge Sleet on the occasion of his confirmation by the Senate.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I support the confirmation of the nomination of Greg Sleet to be the 22d Federal district court judge in Delaware.

One of the most important duties of any U.S. Senator is the duty of advice and consent to the President's judicial appointments. I have worked hard throughout my career to ensure that the Senate provides the Federal courts with a steady supply of judges to enforce our Federal laws.

But, after serving on the Judiciary Committee for the last 20 years, and after serving as U.S. Senator from Delaware for the last 25 years, this is my first opportunity to recommend a Federal district court judge for Delaware.

I took this responsibility very seriously. And I have no doubt that Greg Sleet is the most qualified and experienced person for this position.

This is the second time President Clinton has put Greg's name through the rigors of Senate confirmation. But this is no surprise—he enjoys a reputation for impeccable integrity in the Delaware legal community.

In 1993, when I recommended Greg as U.S. attorney for Delaware, President Clinton was wise to follow my advice—he could not have nominated a more qualified, well-rounded, experienced Delawarean.

Greg was confirmed unanimously and flawlessly, and for the past 4 years has exceeded even my highest expectations.

And it is not only his distinguished service for Delaware, but also the breadth of Greg's experience that has impressed Delawareans, and convinced me that he will make a distinguished Federal judge.

Greg is a graduate of Rutgers University School of Law and completed his undergraduate work at Hampton University in Virginia.

He began his legal career in 1976 by serving for 7 years as a Philadelphia public defender—arguing before juries and representing indigent defendants at all stages of the criminal process—from pre-trial through the appellate courts.

He than gained experience in civil litigation, civil rights, estates, and criminal defense as an associate in private firms—most recently as a sole practitioner for his own firm. I know how tough—and rewarding—running your own firm can be.

In 1990, Greg began his service as deputy attorney general for the State of Delaware, where he gained experience prosecuting a variety of criminal cases at the State level.

He has practiced corporate and commercial law as well—working as an attorney in the legal department for Hercules Inc., where he helped manage corporate operations and litigation, and provided advice on acquisitions and antitrust matters.

Since Greg became U.S. attorney, he has demonstrated strong leadership as my State's chief Federal law enforcement officer—

He has developed a solid reputation by prosecuting many significant criminal cases, including numerous Federal drug and gun cases.

He has prosecuted hate crimes and fraud cases more aggressively than ever before.

And, in addition to his accomplishments in the criminal court at the Federal level, he has made it a priority to strengthen the civil division in Delaware's U.S. attorney's office.

Mr. President, I will not take up any more time—other than to repeat my ''bottom line'' from Greg's Judiciary Committee hearing:

Greg Sleet's record speaks for itself—the Federal bench needs judges like him. His background makes him exceptionally qualified to service on the Federal bench, and his record shows that he is tough—as we need our Federal judges to be—with the practical abilities and experience to do the job.

I am deeply proud to be associated with Greg's service as Delaware's U.S. attorney, and look forward to his service as a U.S. district court judge.

I commend my colleagues for taking the time to review Greg's record and thank them for their support for the candidacy of this fine nominee.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFENDING THE FALSE CLAIMS ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on Friday, a new audit report was released by the Health Care Financing Administration. It is the Chief Financial Officer's report. It shows that a staggering $20 billion of tax dollars were improperly paid through Medicare last year. That is 20 billion reasons to defend the False Claims Act and oppose the bill percolating in the House that's being pushed by the American Hospital Association, and sponsored by Congressman BILL MCCOLLUM—H.R. 3523.

The audit is only the latest reminder of why the False Claims Act is the law of the land. Whether it is the derivation of the law signed by Abraham Lincoln in 1863, or the amendments that I sponsored, which passed in 1986, the reason the law exists is to protect the public's vital interests.

In the case of health care, those vital interests are clear. The False Claims Act helps maintain the integrity of Medicare so that senior citizens won't have to fear the possibility that the program won't be there for them in the future. It helps maintain the standards we want for our seniors with respect to the quality of health care. The False Claims Act is beginning to be used successfully by U.S. Attorneys to improve the quality of care in the health care industry, such as nursing home care.

Finally, the False Claims Act is the final yet most effective line of defense to protect the taxpayers' hard-earned money. Since my amendments in 1986, the Act has been used to return more than $4 billion, fraudulantly taken, back to the taxpayers. Nearly $2 billion of that is from the health care industry. And somewhere between $150 and $300 billion-worth of potential fraud has been deterred.

There is a critical and obvious need for the False Claims Act to safeguard the public interest. The Act is also highly successful. It has built up a track record for accomplishing exactly what it was designed to do—to promote integrity in taxpayer-funded programs.

Suddenly, integrity in such programs is under a fierce attack. The attack is the McCollum bill, which would gut the False Claims Act. What's wrong with this picture?

The McCollum bill is a misguided missile in the war against fraud. If it passes, perpetrators of fraud will be celebrating in the streets. It is ill-founded, and would send the wrong message both to the public and to those who would commit fraud.

The bill is the product of the American Hospital Association. The AHA came to me earlier this year and reported what they claim are examples of the Justice Department going after hospitals with heavy-handed tactics, and using the False Claims Act to prosecute innocent mistakes. I also visited with the Iowa Hospital Association, from my home State.

After listening to their concerns, it seemed to me that the examples the AHA provided spoke more to problems in the implementation of the law, rather than to problems with the law itself. I agreed to approach the Justice Department and help begin a dialogue between DOJ, the AHA, and myself and other members of Congress. The goal was to examine the evidence and see where the problems were occurring and why. And then to fix any real problems.

After much examination and discussion, I and others determined that the AHA had some legitimate concerns involving the way some U.S. Attorneys were communicating with some hospitals around the country.

To its credit, the Justice Department has reevaluated its process and made changes. It has changed its approach, and has taken steps to ensure higher standards prior to any investigation for fraud. It is not often that the Justice Department willingly reexamines its process, admits changes are needed, and then makes them. Because it did so in this case, I believe that the Justice Department should be commended for its responsiveness.

As a case in point, let me refer to a letter I received this month from the president of a medical center in Iowa. Next year, he will be in the leadership of the Iowa Hospital Association. He is one of those who had expressed concerns to me months ago about how the Justice Department was implementing

the False Claims Act. After the dialogue, and after DOJ changed its process, this official wrote to me and said he was satisfied that the law doesn't need to be changed. This official further says that after meeting with the local U.S. Attorney, he is confident in DOJ's intentions to not use the False Claims Act to go after honest mistakes.

In this case, the dialogue seems to have worked. Reason prevailed. Where reason has not prevailed is with those supporters of the McCollum bill who believe that the False Claims Act should be gutted anyway. There is a logical disconnect between the problems identified by the hospital industry, and the solution they now advocate.

Pure and simple, the False Claim Act is a tool against fraud. It is not to be used, and is not used, against innocent mistakes. There is clearly an agenda behind this bill. It is to remove the taxpayers' most effective weapon in its arsenal against fraud. And it is being pushed by some in an industry that has been clearly ravaged by those who have committed fraud.

There is no question that the vast majority of hospitals and hospital employees in this country are honest, civic-minded, and true public servants. Many are absolute heroes. Those in industry who get caught committing fraud threaten to give the industry a tarnished reputation.

If that is so, can't we also say that those who are pushing to gut the law also threaten to give the industry a tarnished reputation? After all, given the changes made by DOJ, there is no empirical basis for this bill. Just as changes were demanded of the Justice Department to refrain from taking action without a legal or factual predicate, shouldn't there be a legal and factual predicate for advancing this bill. There is none.

The McCollum bill is not designed to stop the prosecution of innocent mistakes. Rather, it would make fraud easier to accomplish more often. And, it would establish new ''look-the-other-way'' loopholes, including for on-going cases such as Columbia/HCA. And remember, this bill would do all that at a time when there's $20 billion of potential fraud out there, fraud in the medical industry has been rampant, and the public has had it up to their keesters.

Is this what the supporters of the McCollum bill really think the public wants and needs? Do you really thing the public wants a white flag of surrender in the war against fraud?

Specifically, the McCollum bill would do the following:

First, it would create a ''fraud-free zone.'' No false claims case could be brought unless the taxpayers' damages are a ''material amount.'' That ''material amount'' is unclear but it could be as much as ten percent. In other words, we will write off the first 10 percent of fraud. In effect, it legalizes or legitimizes up to ten percent of what is now illegal. For a company like Columbia/HCA, for example, which pulled in more than $6 billion from the taxpayers last year, the first $600 million would be okay. For the entire Medicare program, which was $210 billion last year, we could write off the first $21 billion. That is a $21 billion loophole. A real whopper.

Second, let us say a false claims case involved a ''material amount.'' there are still three more ways a company could get off the book anyway. The McCollum bill would open up three more whoppers to raise that $21 billion—''free fraud zone'' to substantially more. Companies would be able to better insulate themselves from liability simply by, among other things, showing a commitment to setting up better procedures in the future despite defrauding Medicare today.

Finally, the bill would make it much harder to provide that claims were wrongfully submitted. The normal standard for civil statutes is ''a preponderance of the evidence.'' The McCollum bill would raise it to ''clear and convincing evidence.'' That is basically a criminal standard, not a civil one. Once again, reason has not prevailed in the formulation of this bill.

The McCollum bill would establish a fortress around the medical industry. It would prevent legitimate efforts on behalf of the taxpayers to punish those bad apples that undermine the integrity of health care programs and raid the treasury. The solution is not to gut the law. The solution was and is to take the steps DOJ has already taken, and to ensure DOJ stays on that rack in the future. We have addressed the process dealing with innocent mistakes.

At the same time, we need the toughest possible law to go after mistakes that aren't innocent. Those who continue down the road of supporting this bill pose a clear and present danger to the public's vital interests—to the highest quality of health care for our senior citizens, and to the integrity of how our tax dollars are spent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATE DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZATION CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the State Department authorization conference report debated on Friday and to be voted on tomorrow. Unfortunately, I was unable to participate in the debate on Friday, and I appreciate the chance to take the time now to express my views on this legislation.

I would like to express my extreme regret and disappointment that the debate over the important issues of the long-overdue payment of our arrears to the United Nations and the reorganization of the U.S. Department of State has once again become a sideshow to an exercise by some Members of Congress regarding the issue of reproductive choice. I find it astounding that these members insist on holding our international commitments hostage to a desire to score political points on a domestic issue.

We should be on the floor talking about the important foreign policy priorities that were articulated during the Senate debate on S. 903. Instead, we are spending the majority of our debate time on this measure talking about one narrow issue that shouldn't even be in here in the first place!

As we all know, a minority of our colleagues in the other body successfully inserted language in this conference report that would impose severe restrictions on U.S. assistance to foreign non-governmental organizations engaged in family planning activities. These restrictions were inserted without consultation with the Democratic conferees. They were not consulted because they surely would have objected to these provisions. The restrictions fall into two basic categories.

First, the conference report would mandate that no U.S. population assistance may be given to any foreign non-governmental organization unless that organization certifies that it will not use its own funds to perform abortions during the period in which it receives U.S. funds. If the President chooses to waive this restriction, which I am sure President Clinton would do, funding for family planning-related activities would then be capped at $356 million.

The second category of restriction would prohibit funding for organizations that lobby to change abortion laws in their own countries.

Mr. President, the authors of these restrictions see this version, that is, the provisions as written in this conference report, as a compromise of earlier iterations of restrictions on family planning. But—let us be very clear here—not only is this not a compromise, but the language is actually more restrictive than what we have seen before.

First of all, unlike the so-called ''Mexico City'' language, which has been considered each year as a rider to appropriations bills, the restrictions in this conference report would become permanent statutory changes. That is a rather disturbing concept.

Second, the waiver provision included for the President would result in a greater decrease in funding for family planning than we have seen in earlier versions. Many observers believe that the $356 million cap amounts to a decrease of $29 million, a cut that would come solely out of USAID's family planning account. But, the language in this conference report would also apply to ''all funds for programs

and activities designed to control fertility or to reduce or delay childbirths or pregnancies, irrespective of the heading under which such funds are made available.'' What this means is that the cap would also apply to certain birth-spacing related programs that currently fall under other USAID accounts, and in fact, would represent a larger total decrease than is immediately evident—about $44 million. That represents an 11 percent decrease in funding for these programs, which, Mr. President, I think we all would agree is rather substantial.

Third, the definition of ''lobbying'' that is used in the second restriction is disturbingly broad in that it would ban all sorts of public statements or the participation of individuals at public meetings. It is so bad that many of us call it ''the global gag rule.''

Finally, the President would have no waiver authority over this gag rule provision.

Let me turn for a moment to the substance of these provisions.

While proponents of the Mexico City language say they do not want U.S. dollars to pay for abortions overseas, the adoption of the restrictions in this conference report would actually increase the number of unintended pregnancies worldwide, and, correspondingly, the number of abortions and deaths of mothers and children due to high-risk pregnancies.

The funding at issue here has nothing to do with performing abortions and everything to do with preventing them. It is about family planning, and about a woman's right to know about all options that are legally available to her. It is about helping non-governmental organizations educate women around the world about family planning and other health care issues.

I firmly oppose all of these restrictions and will oppose this conference report because of them for several reasons, which I will discuss in turn.

First, U.S. assistance for family planning initiatives abroad is a sound investment that pays dividends including healthy women and children. According to the Johns Hopkins Population Information Program, approximately 120 million women in developing countries who need family planning services do not have access to them. Family planning services educate women about contraception, pre-natal care, birth spacing, the prevention of sexually transmitted diseases, and other important, life-saving issues. These programs have proven to be enormously effective—not only in improving the health of hundreds of thousands of women and children, but also in reducing the pressures that rapid population growth places on food and water, housing and education, and the environment in developing countries.

Second, this language reinstates—and expands—the Mexico City policy that prevents U.S. population assistance from being disbursed to non-governmental organizations that use other funds to engage in abortion-related activities. This restriction does not prevent abortions, Mr. President, it increases their likelihood by cutting off funds to reputable family planning organizations which happen also to use their own money for abortion-related activities.

Finally, this language contains a troubling restriction on the freedom of speech of those working for family planning programs which receive U.S. funding. By linking funding for much-needed family planning assistance to the stifling of freedom of speech, the language runs counter to the very principles upon which our own nation was founded. We cherish our right to freedom of speech in this country, and the promotion of democracy and respect for basic freedoms around the globe represent an important aspect of our foreign policy.

The language in this conference report is an assault on free speech, one of the most fundamental human rights. In this country, citizens are encouraged to speak their minds and participate in the political process. In fact, the First Amendment states that ''Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech * * * or the right of the people * * * to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.''

If the language in this conference report were adopted, it would mean U.S. citizens who have this constitutionally-guaranteed right would be forcing people in other countries to give up similar rights if they wish to keep receiving U.S. funding for family planning programs. The only way I can interpret this, Mr. President, is as an attempt by some Members of Congress to control the free speech of people in foreign countries relating to one particular issue about which they may not agree: abortion.

In essence, this language tells foreign non-governmental organizations which seek family planning assistance that they will get it if, and only if, they comply with a restrictive set of rules for how they may use their own money. It is a thinly veiled threat to pull much-needed funding if the word ''abortion'' is uttered to any woman seeking counseling at any foreign family planning agency that receives U.S. funds. This language violates the spirit of the Constitution which we have all sworn to uphold.

I would like to talk about two family planning programs that would be jeopardized if this conference report were to become law.

The humanitarian organization CARE is working with a local non-governmental organization that promotes dialogue within local communities and at a national level regarding important issues facing Bolivian women, such as violence against women, sexual harassment and lack of appropriate medical services. One of the most critical issues for discussion is the alarmingly high rate of maternal mortality in Bolivia—the highest in Latin America. According to the World Health Organization, a women in Bolivia has a 1 in 27 chance of dying from a pregnancy-related cause. This compares to women in the U.S., who have a 1 in 3,500 chance of dying from such circumstances. CARE's Bolivian partner works to educate women and men about the importance of family planning and the dangers of illegal abortion and how it contributes to Bolivia's appalling rate of maternal mortality.

Under the language in the conference report, U.S. funding for this Bolivian organization would be at risk because the organization makes ''public statements'' about women's health issues that may be construed as lobbying for abortion rights. This is a capable, effective organization that is addressing real needs within Bolivia.

My second example relates to South Africa. As Ranking Member on the African Affairs Subcommittee, I have had the opportunity to learn much about the success of family planning programs in Africa and, indeed, of U.S. assistance to such programs in Africa.

We all watched with awe and amazement as South Africans of all races participated in the first multiparty elections in that country in 1994. We were further inspired by the country's adoption of its first permanent, post-apartheid constitution which was signed into law on December 10, 1996, by President Nelson Mandela, one of the greatest heros of our time. The Government of South Africa continues to consider various proposed amendments to the constitution on outstanding issues, and is also working on the implementation of many of its provisions. Not surprisingly, the Government is consulting widely with a variety of groups and interested parties from around the country.

Why, you may ask, am I talking about the South African constitution and South African legislation during a debate over family planning assistance?

Because, the language of this conference report would actually put limitations on the ability of South Africans to participate in the democratic process in their country.

The Government has asked Dr. Helen Rees, president of the Planned Parenthood Association of South Africa, to become an advisor to the National Department of Health and a member of the country's Medical Advisory Board to assist the Government in its implementation of a law enacted in 1996 concerning access to safe abortion during the first twelve weeks of pregnancy. Prior to this law's enactment, Dr. Rees had also helped in its drafting.

Had this conference report been law at the time of Dr. Rees' participation in the drafting of that law, the Planned Parenthood Association of South Africa would have lost its U.S. family planning assistance, even though her activities related to the drafting process were conducted without U.S. funds.

In other words, the Association might have been forced to suffer simply because the South African government chose to invest in Dr. Rees' expertise. Dr. Rees would have been forced to choose between allowing her organization to receive much-needed U.S. assistance or to become an active participant in the political process of her country. This is a totally unfair choice, and one that we, members of the U.S. Congress, should not be forcing foreign citizens to make. In fact, it contradicts what the Congress worked so actively for over the last several decades, and that is the freedom of all South Africans to be able to participate in their own political process.

I want to make my last point very clear, Mr. President. The language contained in this conference report would be unconstitutional if this were a piece of domestic legislation because it violates the First Amendment.

I repeat, this language would be unconstitutional if this were domestic legislation.

Mr. President, the United States has a long history of promoting democracy and basic freedoms around the world. This global gag rule runs counter to that tradition. If adopted, this language would not encourage free speech—it would squelch it.

None of these restrictions belong in this legislation in the first place, but now that they are there, I encourage all of my colleague, who all profess to support free speech and our constitutionally-guaranteed liberties, to defeat this conference report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a February 27, 1998, editorial from the Washington Post, which makes some excellent arguments as to why this report should be defeated, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 27, 1998]

EXPORTING THE ABORTION DEBATE

It is scandalous that an unrelated domestic dispute over abortion is holding up congressional approval of funds for international purposes of vital American interest. One such purpose is to enable the International Monetary Fund to help troubled Asian economies, among other things, buy more American goods. A second is to pay up American arrears to the United Nations, an organization in the center of American efforts to banish proscribed weapons from Iraq.

The trouble arises from an amendment offered by Rep. Christopher Smith (R–N.J.) and supported by the House Republican leadership. Current law already bars any U.S. funding for foreign abortion-related services, lobbying or research. Mr. Smith would go on to revive the Reagan-Bush ''Mexico City Policy.'' It denies American aid to any foreign nongovernmental organization that performs abortions or lobbies for abortion even with its own money.

In the domestic debate we support the side favoring choice. But of course both sides are principled in their fashion, and both stir important constituencies. You could call it a difficult but unavoidable fight among Americans.

But why must this fight be exported onto foreign terrain? The limitations that the Mexico City Policy imposes upon the work of foreign nongovernmental organizations intrude directly upon the options available to poor countries to manage their own future. The anti-lobbying provision intrudes especially egregiously not only into the medical standards but also into the political practices of aid recipients. As Secretary of State Albright put it, that provision punishes nongovernmental organizations ''for engaging in the democratic process in foreign countries and for engaging in legal activities that would be protected by the First Amendment if carried out in the United States.''

The current House Republican position is to demand that the administration negotiate a compromise banning lobbying but allowing limited family-planning aid. The Clinton administration is right to want no part of a compromise that narrows the personal choices open to women abroad, interferes in the development policies of other countries and invades the public space they maintain for policy debate. House Republicans have attached the abortion measure to essential foreign-policy legislation, including United Nations reform and State Department reorganization. Their amendment constitutes a rank intervention into other countries' domestic business, and deserves defeat.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to Senate adoption of the Conference Report on the State Department Authorization Bill, which we will be voting on tomorrow.

I do so with disappointment, and concern. As an advocate of many of the good provisions in this bill, it is ironic to be arguing today against adoption of this Conference Report.

With its provisions to reorganize America's foreign policy institutions and to press for reform at the United Nations while paying off our arrears, I think it is fair to say that the State Department Authorization bill is one of the most far-reaching and important bills that we will consider this Congress.

I am disappointed, therefore, that Congress finds itself seemingly unable to pass this bill in a form which will allow it to become law.

Now, we find ourselves in this position today is because a few hard-line House Republicans, by insisting on the inclusion of language to restrict international family planning assistance, have been unwilling to compromise and be flexible in the interests of American foreign policy and national security.

Let me briefly state 3 reasons why I think that without the family planning restrictions this is a good bill.

First, this bill authorizes funding of both existing needs and the correction of long-time existing problems, such as a failing computer system, the construction of two major long overdue embassies, and the remediation of security and maintenance problems around the world. International law enforcement, narcotics abatement, and refugee programs are all increased under this bill.

Second, the State Department Authorization Bill takes an historic step in working with the administration and Secretary Albright to reorganize the foreign policy bureaucracy of the United States, so that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the United States Information Agency, and the Agency for International Development are brought within the State Department and other operations are streamlined.

The reorganization plan presented by this bill preserves the unique skills and capabilities of each of the current foreign affairs agencies while creating a new, streamlined, structure capable of meeting the challenges of the twenty-first century. It is a plan supported by the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Foreign Relations Committee and by the President and Secretary of State.

Finally, this bill also contains a package to allow repayment of our arrears to the United Nations, some $926 million, with much-needed reform benchmarks designed to ensure that the United Nations will remain an effective organization in the decades to come.

I am an unabashed supporter of the United Nations. I believe a strong and effective United Nations is both important to the world and to the national interest of the United States.

With little fanfare or recognition the United Nations serves American interests each and every day. Through the UN High Commission for Refugees, it feeds and clothes homeless refugees in time of war. The World Health Organization fights diseases like AIDS. The United Nations Children's Fund combats childhood poverty, hunger, and sickness. The UN Development Programs helps the poorer nations of the world develop their infrastructures. The UN provides a forum for negotiating multilateral agreements on arms control, protecting the environment, and other matters that affect all nations.

The United Nations helps to protect peace and security in dozens of trouble spots around the world. Although we are often quick to criticize UN operations, we are slow to credit those successful U.N. peacekeeping operations in such places as the Golan Heights, Macedonia, Angola, and Kuwait—all important to American foreign policy concerns.

This is not to say the United Nations is without its faults. The need to reform and streamline the UN bureaucracy, refocus the budget structure, eliminate duplication, and add transparency to all its operations are all included in the 3 year time-period of this bill.

As the Ranking Member of the International Operations Subcommittee, I was involved in the initial discussions on UN dues payment arrears. The final result negotiated by the Secretary of State, the Chairman, and the Ranking Member is a tough, but achievable, series of reforms to be implemented by the United Nations over the next three years, during which time the United States will pay the $926 million it owes in back dues.

Payment of these arrears is no trivial matter. The U.N.'s current financial difficulties are threatening to render it unable to implement many of its most important programs. Prompt payment by the United States of its arrears is the best way to ensure that the UN will be able to survive as a force for international peace and security in the post-Cold War era.

As someone who values the United Nations, I regard the United Nations arrears and reform package included in this bill to be a major step forward, and one of which we can all be proud.

That is why I find it so unfortunate that we are faced today with the prospect that all of these achievements will be for nothing. And why? Because a small group of abortion opponents in the House have tied up this Bill over the issue of the so-called ''Mexico City'' family planning language. In so doing, they are placing their own narrow domestic concerns and political agenda ahead of all the substantial achievements and reforms encapsulated in this Bill.

In short, unable to advance their agenda through the normal channels of congressional policy making (an agenda unsupported by the vast majority of the American people, I might add) they have decided to hold this bill hostage to achieve a major blow to family planning throughout the world.

Ironically, their opposition to family planning is antithetical to their goal of reducing abortions because family planning actually reduces the need for abortions, and without it terrible starvation and deprivation is visited upon millions in other lands. The irony is that no U.S. international family planning funds are spent on abortion in this or any other bill.

Since 1973, U.S. law has prohibited any USAID funds from being used to pay for abortions as a method of family planning or to coerce any person to have an abortion. Today each and any program supported by these dollars are voluntary, and none involve abortion. All programs are rigorously monitored to ensure strict compliance.

In Russia, where the average Russian woman used to have a stunning 7 or 8 abortions in her lifetime, family planning has made a huge difference. An active family planning effort has actually reduced the number of abortions in Russia from 1990 to 1994 by over 20%, from 3.6 million to 2.8 million. That is 800,000 fewer abortions in a four years period of time due to family planning efforts.

The story repeats itself over and over, wherever family planning exists. As our esteemed former colleague Mark Hatfield, who was a proudly pro-life Senator, reminded us each time we debated this issue, family planning assistance prevents abortions.

I also find the prohibitions placed on free speech contained in the Conference Report—in essence a global gag rule on responsible family planning discussions—to be unacceptable. Foreign family planning providers would only be eligible for U.S. dollars if they agree to have their voices silenced. They could neither lobby nor discuss or educate under the terms of this Bill. The fact that the language included in this Conference Report dictates what public statements can be made, what conferences can be attended, and what educational materials can be produced with an entity's own funds I find an overreaching and dictatorial edict by a country that prizes free speech.

One of the most important and effective components of U.S. foreign assistance has for years been our family planning programs. These programs reduce poverty, improve health, and raise living standards around the world by enhancing the ability of couples and individuals to determine freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children in some of the most overpopulated and depraved countries on earth. Most of us take these rights for granted. None of us knows the level of deprivation and suffering that exists outside our borders.

What we can not do now—what we should not do now—is allow a small minority of this and the other body to effectively stop any U.S. family planning efforts worldwide.

The President has stated that if the Conference Report passes with the family planning restrictions he will veto this bill. By including language in this Conference Report which we know will result in a veto we will sacrifice—needlessly and pointlessly—all the important work accomplished to date.

I sincerely hope and urge that there are sufficient votes in this body to reject this Conference Report, return it to Conference, remove the counterproductive language, and develop a report which the Senate can support, and which the President can sign.

I urge my colleagues to reject adoption of this Conference Report.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING LLOYD M. PELFREY

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to commend Lloyd Pelfrey for his service to Central Christian College of the Bible in Moberly, Missouri. Mr. Pelfrey, an ordained minister of the Christian Church since 1953, will retire as President of the college on May 8, 1998.

President Pelfrey's service to Central Christian College started when the school opened in September 1957. He has worn many hats during his tenure at the school, serving as: the President of the college, the Acting President, the Executive President, the Dean of Faculty, the Academic Dean, and a Professor of Old Testament. On April 6, 1973, Mr. Pelfrey became the fourth President of Central Christian College. He has held this esteemed position longer than any other president of the college.

Under President Pelfrey's leadership many exciting transformations have occurred at the college. He oversaw the completion in the construction of the Memorial building. Central Christian College received accreditation with the Accrediting Association of Bible College under President Pelfrey's administration. He also contributed to an increase in the college's endowment.

I wish President Pelfrey all the best and thank him for his service to the community of Central Christian College of the Bible. May God bless him and protect him in his future endeavors.

REPORT CONCERNING THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS CENTERED IN COLOMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 117

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report concerning the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

1. On October 21, 1995, I signed Executive Order 12978, ''Blocking Assets and Prohibiting Transactions with Significant Narcotics Traffickers'' (the ''Order'') (60 *Fed. Reg.* 54579, October 24, 1995). The Order blocks all property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of four significant foreign narcotics traffickers, one of whom is now deceased, who were principals in the so-called Cali drug cartel centered in Colombia. These persons are listed in the annex to the Order. The Order also blocks the property and interests in property of foreign persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, (a) to play a significant role in international narcotics trafficking centered in Colombia or (b) to materially assist in or provide financial or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, the narcotics trafficking activities of persons designated in or

pursuant to the Order. In addition the Order blocks all property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, persons designated in or pursuant to the Order (collectively ''Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers'' or ''SDNTs'').

The Order further prohibits any transaction or dealing by a United States person or within the United States in property or interests in property of SDNTs, and any transaction that evades or avoids, has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, the prohibitions contained in the Order.

Designations of foreign persons blocked pursuant to the Order are effective upon the date of determination by the Director of the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Public notice of blocking is effective upon the date of filing with the *Federal Register,* or upon prior actual notice.

2. On October 24, 1995, the Department of the Treasury issued a notice containing 76 additional names of persons determined to meet the criteria set forth in Executive Order 12978 (60 *Fed. Reg.* 54582, October 24, 1995). Additional notices expanding and updating the list of SDNTs were published on November 29, 1995 (60 *Fed. Reg.* 61288), March 8, 1996 (61 *Fed. Reg.* 9523), and January 21, 1997 (62 *Fed. Reg.* 2903).

Effective February 28, 1997, OFAC issued the Narcotics Trafficking Sanctions Regulations (''NTSR'' or the ''Regulations''), 31 C.F.R. Part 536, to further implement my declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against significant foreign narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia (62 *Fed. Reg.* 9959, March 5, 1997).

On April 17, 1997 (62 *Fed. Reg.* 19500, April 22, 1997), July 30, 1997 (62 *Fed. Reg.* 41850, August 4, 1997), and September 9, 1997 (62 *Fed. Reg.* 48177, September 15, 1997), OFAC amended appendices A and B to 31 C.F.R. chapter V, revising information concerning individuals and entities who have been determined to play a significant role in international narcotics trafficking centered in Colombia or have been determined to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, or to be acting as fronts for the Cali cartel in Colombia. These actions are part of the ongoing interagency implementation of Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995. These changes to the previous SDNT list brought it to a total of 426 businesses and individuals with whom financial and business dealings are prohibited and whose assets are blocked under the Order.

3. OFAC has disseminated and routinely updated details of this program to the financial, securities, and international trade communities by both electronic and conventional media. In addition to bulletins to banking institutions via the Federal Reserve System and the Clearing House Interbank Payments System (CHIPS), individual notices were provided to all relevant State and Federal regulatory agencies, automated clearing houses, and State and independent banking associations across the country. OFAC contacted all major securities industry associations and regulators. It posted electronic notices on the Internet and over 10 computer bulletin boards and 2 fax-on-demand services, and provided the same material to the U.S. Embassy in Bogota for distribution to U.S. companies operating in Colombia.

4. As of March 25, 1998, OFAC had issued nine specific licenses pursuant to Executive Order 12978. These licenses were issued in accordance with established Treasury policy authorizing the completion of presanctions transactions and the provision of legal services to and payment of fees for representation of SDNTs in proceedings within the United States arising from the imposition of sanctions.

5. The narcotics trafficking sanctions have had a significant impact on the Cali drug cartel. Of the 133 business entities designated as SDNTs as of February 20, 1998, 41, or nearly a third, having a combined net worth estimated at more than $45 million and combined income of more than $200 million, had been determined to have gone into liquidation. As a result of OFAC designations, 3 Colombian banks have closed about 300 SDNT accounts of nearly 100 designated individuals. One of the largest SDNT commercial entities, a discount drugstore with an annual income exceeding $136 million, has been reduced to operating on a cash basis. These specific results augment the less quantifiable but significant impact of denying the designated individuals and entities of the cartel access to U.S. financial and commercial facilities.

Various enforcement actions carried over from prior reporting periods are continuing and new reports of violations are being aggressively pursued. Two criminal investigations are ongoing. Since my last report, OFAC has collected its first civil monetary penalty for violations of IEEPA and the Regulations under the program. OFAC collected $2,625 from a commercial agent for ocean-going oil tankers for violative funds transfers.

6. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from October 21, 1997, through April 20, 1998, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency with respect to Significant Narcotics Traffickers are estimated at approximately $620,000. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of Justice, and the Department of State. These data do not reflect certain costs of operations by the intelligence and law enforcement communities.

7. Executive Order 12978 provides my Administration with a tool for combatting the actions of significant foreign narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia and the unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm that they cause in the United States and abroad. The Order is designed to deny these traffickers the benefit of any assets subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and to prevent United States persons from engaging in any commercial dealings with them, their front companies, and their agents. Executive Order 12978 demonstrates the United States commitment to end the damage that such traffickers wreak upon society in the United States and abroad.

The magnitude and the dimension of the problem in Colombia—perhaps the most pivotal country of all in terms of the world's cocaine trade—are extremely grave. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against significant foreign narcotics traffickers and their violent and corrupting activities as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 24, 1998.*

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. FORD:

S. 1989. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the standard deduction amount to reduce the marriage penalty, simplify the filing of individual tax returns, and provide tax relief for lower and middle income individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. GRAMM):

S. 1990. A bill to authorize expansion of Fort Davis National Historic Site in Fort Davis, Texas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 1991. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations to provide for improvements in the conspicuity of rail cars of rail carriers; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1992. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the $500,000 exclusion of a gain on the sale of a principal residence shall apply to certain sales by a surviving spouse; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. Res. 217. A resolution recognizing the Valley Forge Military Academy and College for establishing the ''General H. Norman Schwarzkopf Library''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. Res. 218. A resolution to authorize testimony, production of Senate documents, and representation by Senate Legal Counsel in civil case; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FORD:

S. 1989. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the standard deduction amount to reduce the marriage penalty, simplify the filing of individual tax returns, and provide tax relief for lower and middle income individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE MARRIAGE PENALTY REDUCTION ACT

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, it is the time of the year when we are certain to hear more ideas for tax reform. We're certain to hear many colleagues discuss the unfairness of our current tax code. Although taxes in this country remain lower than major competitors like the United Kingdom, Japan, and Germany, many families feel their tax burden has been increasing.

One of the interesting reasons why some individuals feel squeezed is the changing nature of the tax burden over the last few decades. For example, individual income taxes—both as a percentage of all federal taxes paid and as a percentage of gross domestic product—are at roughly the same levels as they were in 1970. Yet during that same time period the so-called social insurance taxes or payroll taxes have risen dramatically, primarily to fund Social Security and Medicare. And the portion of revenues collected from corporate income taxes has fallen by an equally dramatic amount. For example, in 1960, we collected $1.89 in individual income taxes for every $1.00 in corporate income taxes. By 1980 this ratio has risen to $3.78 in individual income taxes for every $1.00 in corporate income taxes. And today we collect $4.02 in individual income taxes for every $1.00 in corporate income taxes. It is no wonder individuals feel squeezed.

As we begin to debate several tax reform proposals this year, perhaps none will receive as much attention as the so-called marriage penalty. The marriage penalty refers to the aspect of the tax code, which results in many married couples paying more in taxes than they would if both spouses remained single. Yet few will discuss—and I found this to be very interesting—that 51 percent of married couples actually receive a marriage ''bonus'', meaning they pay less in federal taxes as a result of being married.

Let me repeat that. Fifty-one percent of married couples—a majority of married couples—pay less in federal taxes than they would if both spouses remained single. Last June CBO found that 51 percent of married couples receive a marriage bonus averaging $1,300 per couple. If they were required to file as single individuals, federal revenues would be $32.9 billion greater each year.

CBO also found that 42 percent of married couples are subject to a marriage penalty, paying an average of $1,400 more per couple in taxes than if both were single, for a total of $28.8 billion per year in additional revenues. In other words, fully eliminating the marriage penalty costs $28.8 billion per year. However, if both marriage penalties and marriage bonuses were eliminated, there would actually be a net increase in federal revenues of $4.1 billion per year. Forty-two percent of married couples would receive a tax cut, but 51 percent of married couples would receive a tax increase.

There is no way to make a statement about income tax exciting. There is nothing you can talk about that brings you out on the edge of your seat. I am not going to try to do that. So I am going to put into the RECORD several examples of how couples, both making $20,000 a year and filing jointly or filing single, and then one breadwinner making $200,000 while his spouse stays home and cares for the children—how much less they would pay than the married couple making $40,000.

I think you can already see the trend is to try to take care of that lower income and not increase the bonus, as S. 1285 does.

CBO found numerous causes for these differentials in tax treatment. However, two major factors explain most of the reason why married couples are treated differently: (1) the standard deduction, and (2) the tax rate schedules. In each case, the cutoff for married couples is about two-thirds higher than for single individuals.

For example, in 1998, the standard deduction is $4,250 for singles and $7,100 for married joint filers—about 67% higher, but applying to two people instead of one. This has significant implications for married couples who do not itemize their deductions. For a couple where one spouse earns all the income, this means a deduction of $2,850 more than if both spouses were single, giving them a marriage bonus. However, for a couple where both spouses have significant income, the result is a deduction of $1,400 less than if both were single.

Similar results occur when comparing tax rates. In 1998 the 15% bracket extends to incomes of $25,350 for singles, and $42,350 for married joint filers—about 67% higher. Most one-income couples receive a marriage bonus because an additional $17,000 is taxed at the lower 15% level. However, many dual-income married couples will find that less of their income is taxed at the 15% level.

So it is far more complex than some have been led to believe. For instance, many married couples currently receiving a marriage bonus have the impression that all married couples are penalized. Many married couples are unaware that there is such a thing as a marriage bonus. But remember—51 percent of all married couples currently receive a marriage ''bonus'' and pay an average of $1,300 LESS in taxes than if they were single, according to CBO. They tried to eliminate the so-called marriage penalty. But they increased the marriage bonus we now have for over 50 percent of our filers. Therefore, I think that is a little bit unfair for a $200,000-a-year filer to receive an additional tax cut where we are just trying to make it even for those who make $40,000 or less.

I believe we should consider taking reasonable steps to address the marriage penalty. However, I strongly disagree with the approach taken in the leading Senate bill proposed on this topic—S. 1285. S. 1285 would allow married couples to file ''combined'' returns where income can be split 50–50, and each spouse taxed at single rates.

S. 1285 would add significantly to the complexity of the current Tax Code. Last year we went through all of this. ''We are going to reduce the Tax Code; we are going to make it simpler.'' We only added almost 900 pages to the Tax Code last year. We go out here and beat our chest and say, ''Oh, we have reformed the Tax Code. We have made it simpler, we have given some tax cuts with 900 additional pages.'' No wonder H&R Block and CPAs are doing business. We made it so complicated even the smartest minds do not want to fool with it.

S. 1285 would add significantly to the complexity of the current tax code, requiring many couples to calculate their taxes under both the traditional ''married filing jointly'' category and also under the new ''combined'' category. But even more troubling, it goes well beyond what is necessary to address the marriage penalty. The costs of the bill appear astronomical—somewhere in the neighborhood of $40 billion per year. For many couples who currently face a marriage penalty under S. 1285 their tax burdens would now be even lower than if they were both single. In other words, many couples currently facing a marriage penalty would find that S. 1285 would not only eliminated the penalty but create a new marriage bonus as well.

And beyond the impact on the marriage penalty, S. 1285 would have the effect of actually increasing the marriage bonus for many couples who already receive a marriage bonus. Let me provide an example.

Consider a young, affluent family of four. Spouse No. 1 makes $200,000 while spouse No. 2 stays at home to raise their two children. They have $30,000 in deductions. According to estimates supplied to me by Citizens for Tax Justice, this family currently receives a marriage ''bonus'' of $3,161, but under S. 1285 the marriage ''bonus'' would grow to $4,807.

Mr. President, I understand the marriage penalty, I also understand the appeal of this issue politically. But why in the world would we pass a bill to give a couple making $200,000 the chance to pay $4,807 less in taxes than if they were single, and claim we are doing this in the name of fighting the marriage penalty? It seems that S. 1285 would give very generous tax cuts to wealthy married couples who currently do not face any marriage penalty whatsoever, Why would we do this?

I believe there is a much more logical approach. It is a simpler approach. It would significantly reduce the marriage penalty, especially for lower and middle income families. And it would simplify the tax code at the same time. And perhaps most importantly it would not give huge tax windfalls to wealthy couples who already receive a marriage ''bonus'' under current law.

Mr. President, today I am introducing the Marriage Penalty Reduction Act. My legislation would significantly increase the standard deduction, to $6,000 for singles, $9,000 for heads of households, and $12,000 for married couples. For many lower and middle income married couples who face a marriage penalty, the current standard deduction is the single most important reason. Under my proposal, the standard deduction would no longer have any role in creating a marriage penalty. None.

There are several advantages to this approach. By setting the standard deduction for married couples at exactly twice the level of singles, no marriage penalty can occur.

Mr. President, 70 percent of all individual tax filers currently take the standard deduction. In other words, only 30 percent itemize their deductions. For married couples who currently take the standard deduction, my proposal will grant them a tax cut of at least $735, significantly reducing any existing marriage penalty. If this $12,000 deduction were in effect in 1998, along with the current personal exemption of $2,700, a family of four would find that their first $22,800 would not be subject to income taxes.

Let me give a second example. Couple No. 2 is a young, newlywed couple. Each makes $20,000 per year, for a total of $40,000. They take the standard deduction. Under current law they owe $4,125 in income taxes as a married couple, but would only owe $3,915 in combined income taxes if both remained single. In other words, current law imposes a ''marriage penalty'' of $210 on couple No. 2.

Under S. 1285, couple No. 2 would, in fact, be able to eliminate their entire marriage penalty. Their tax bill would be reduced by $210. However, under may proposal, since the standard deduction would also be raised overall, couple No. 2 would see their overall tax bill decline by $765. My proposal would completely eliminate the marriage penalty, and also provide tax relief for this moderate income couple.

There are advantages for some of those who currently itemize deductions as well. Of the 30 percent who do itemize, the average amount of deductions is about $16,000. However, for married couples with itemized deductions under $12,000, they will no longer have to go to the trouble of making calculations under the legislation I am proposing today. They can simply take the higher standard deduction. For many, this will greatly simplify the process of doing their taxes.

And my proposal will cost significantly less than S. 1285. Most who have looked at the issue of tax relief in 1998 understand that S. 1285 is far more than we can afford. My approach costs far less. I intend to ask the Joint Committee on Taxation for an official estimate of this proposal. If we are to debate a tax package later this year with a significant component devoted to the marriage penalty, it is my hope that the proposal I am introducing today can form the basis for a more logical, more rational approach, to the issue. It is also an approach which costs less and simplifies the tax code at the same time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this straightforward proposal appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1989

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 ''Marriage Penalty Reduction Act''.

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN STANDARD DEDUCTION AMOUNT.

(a) STANDARD DEDUCTION AMOUNT.—Section 63(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to the basic standard deduction) is amended—

(1) by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$12,000'' in subparagraph (A),

(2) by striking ''$4,400'' and inserting ''$9,000'' in subparagraph (B),

(3) by striking ''$3,000'' and inserting ''$6,000'' in subparagraph (C), and

(4) by striking ''$2,500'' and inserting ''$6,000'' in subparagraph (D).

(b) INDEXING OF AMOUNT.—Subparagraph (B) of section 63(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to adjustments for inflation) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking ''(2) or'', and

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end,

(2) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting '', and'', and

(3) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) 'calendar year 1998' in the case of the dollar amounts contained in paragraph (2).''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1998.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 1991. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations to provide for improvements in the conspicuity of rail cars of rail carriers; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

RAILROAD CAR VISIBILITY ACT

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the ''Railroad Car Visibility Act,'' requiring that all railroad cars have some form of visible marker such as reflectors or reflective tape.

The purpose of this legislation is to reduce the number of accidents with both moving trains at rail crossings, and with rail cars parked on sidings. In South Dakota a number of such accidents have occurred recently at rural and small town rail crossings and sidings which are often unprotected or unlighted. Such accidents occur in rural areas across the country.

As a result, last year I urged the Department of Transportation (DOT) to take appropriate measures to improve railroad car visibility. While DOT has begun enforcing rules governing locomotive visibility, rail cars are still not required to have reflective lighting. However, DOT research concludes that ''retroreflective materials are useful and satisfactory for enhancing the visibility of railroad cars.''

This legislation has the support of both South Dakota's legislature and Governor Janklow. For relatively little cost, this legislation will improve railroad car visibility and thereby reduce the number of accidents, unnecessary injuries and deaths at rail crossings and sidings. Therefore I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and work with me to secure its passage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this bill printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1991

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

SECTION 1. IMPROVED CONSPICUITY OF RAIL CARS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 20132 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the heading and inserting the following:

''§ 20132. Visible markers for train cars'';

and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) IMPROVED CONSPICUITY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of Transportation shall—

''(1) develop and implement a plan to ensure that the requirements of this section are met; and

''(2) issue regulations that require that, not later than 2 years after the date of issuance of the regulations, all cars of freight, passenger, or commuter trains be equipped, and, if necessary, retrofitted, with at least 1 highly visible marker (including reflective tape or appropriate lighting).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 201 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 20132 and inserting the following:

''20132. Visible markers for train cars.''.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 263

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 263, a bill to prohibit the import, export, sale, purchase, possession, transportation, acquisition, and receipt of bear viscera or products that contain or claim to contain bear viscera, and for other purposes.

S. 361

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. D'AMATO), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 361, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to prohibit the sale, import, and export of products labeled as containing endangered species, and for other purposes.

S. 1334

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1334, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a demonstration project to evaluate the feasibility of using the Federal Employees Health Benefits program to ensure the availability of adequate health care for Medicare-eligible beneficiaries under the military health care system.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) were added as cosponsors of S. 1360, a bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify and improve the requirements for the development of an automated entry-exit control system, to enhance land border control and enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1589

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1589, a bill to provide dollars to the classroom.

S. 1677

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1677, a bill to reauthorize the North American Wetlands Conservation Act and the Partnerships for Wildlife Act.

S. 1723

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1723, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to assist the United States to remain competitive by increasing the access of the United States firms and institutions of higher education to skilled personnel and by expanding educational and training opportunities for American students and workers.

S. 1903

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. FAIRCLOTH) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1903, a bill to prohibit the return of veterans memorial objects to foreign nations without specific authorization in law.

S. 1957

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1957, a bill to provide regulatory assistance to small business concerns, and for other purposes.

S. 1982

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1982, a bill to equalize the minimun adjustments to prices for fluid milk under milk marketing orders.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 65

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 65, a concurrent resolution calling for a United States effort to end restriction on the freedoms and human rights of the enclaved people in the occupied area of Cyprus.

SENATE RESOLUTION 170

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 170, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Federal investment in biomedical research should be increased by $2,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

SENATE RESOLUTION 197

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 197, a resolution designating May 6, 1998, as ''National Eating Disorders Awareness Day'' to heighten awareness and stress prevention of eating disorders.

SENATE RESOLUTION 212

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 212, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that at the upcoming United States-China summit the President should demand the release of all persons remaining imprisoned in China and Tibet for political or religious reasons, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 217—RECOGNIZING THE VALLEY FORGE MILITARY COLLEGE FOR ESTABLISHING THE ''GENERAL H. NORMAN SCHWARZKOPF LIBRARY''

Mr. SPECTER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 217

Whereas General H. Norman Schwarzkopf graduated from Valley Forge Military Academy and College as Valedictorian in 1952 and graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1956;

Whereas General H. Norman Schwarzkopf served with distinction with over 35 years of service, earning numerous distinguished service awards including awards for valor and two purple hearts, foreign decorations, as well as the Congressional Gold Medal and the Presidential Medal of Freedom;

Whereas General H. Norman Schwarzkopf commanded a multi-national coalition of 34 members during Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm and freed and country of Kuwait on February 26, 1991; and

Whereas the Valley Forge Military Academy and College intends to build the General H. Norman Schwarzkopf Library and to dedicate it as a national commemorative site for Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate recognizes Valley Forge Military Academy and College for establishing a ''General H. Norman Schwarzkopf Library'', which will serve as a national commemorative site for Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the Valley Forge Military Academy and College.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, today I seek to submit a resolution recognizing the Valley Forge Military Academy and College for establishing the ''General H. Norman Schwarzkopf Library.''

The Valley Forge Military Academy and College, located near Historic Valley Forge National Park and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, is the ideal site to commemorate General H. Norman Schwarzkopf and his many accomplishments. The Academy broke ground in March, 1998 to begin construction of a Regimental Mess Hall, a section of which will serve as a Library to honor those Americans who participated in the Desert Shield and Desert Storm campaigns. The Library, which would serve both the Academy and the community, will contain some of the General's personal papers, memorabilia, and artifacts commemorating Desert Storm and Desert Shield. It would be appropriate and beneficial for young collegians to have access to history they have witnessed. In 1989, General Schwarzkopf is quoted as having said, ''West Point prepared me for the Army, but Valley Forge prepared me for life.''

General Schwarzkopf graduated from the Valley Forge Military Academy as Valedictorian in 1952, thereafter he entered the United States Military Academy at West Point. During Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, General Schwarzkopf served as the Commander in Chief of the United States Central Command. From his days as an accomplished cadet, General Schwarzkopf has proven himself to be a

superior and compassionate commander.

General Schwarzkopf has served the United States with distinction for more than 35 years. Throughout his military career, the General has earned numerous distinguished service awards including commendations for valor, two purple hearts, honoring decorations, as well as the Congressional Gold Medal and the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

For these reasons, I take great pride in sponsoring this resolution to recognize the Valley Forge Military Academy and College for establishing the ''General H. Norman Schwarzkopf Library,'' which will serve as a national commemorative site for Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

SENATE RESOLUTION 218—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY, PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS, AND REPRESENTATION BY SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. LOTT. (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 218

Whereas, in the case of *Buroojy, et al.* v. *Walsh, et al.*, Civil Case No. 97–91407, pending in the Superior Court of the State of Arizona, documents have been subpoened from the offices of Senator John McCain and Senator Jon Kyl;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent Members, officers, or employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for evidence relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That employees of the offices of Senator McCain and Senator Kyl are authorized to testify and produce documents in the case of *Buroojy, et al.* v. *Walsh, et al.*, except concerning matters for which a privilege or objection should be asserted.

SEC. 2. That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Senator McCain and Senator Kyl and their employees in connection with the testimony and document production authorized in section one of this resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

PROTOCOLS TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY OF 1949 ON ACCESSION OF POLAND, HUNGARY, AND CZECH REPUBLIC

KYL (AND LOTT) EXECUTIVE AMENDMENT NO. 2310

Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. LOTT) proposed an amendment to the resolution of ratification for the treaty (Treaty Doc. No. 105–36) protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. These protocols were opened for signature at Brussels on December 16, 1997, and signed on behalf of the United States of America and other parties to the North Atlantic Treaty; as follows:

In paragraph (1) of section 3, after ''(1) THE STRATEGIC CONCEPT OF NATO.—'' insert the following:

(A) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES TOWARD THE STRATEGIC CONCEPT OF NATO.—The Senate understands that the initial adaptation of NATO's strategy for the post-Cold War environment is contained in the Strategic Concept of NATO (as defined in (1)(E)), and that its core concepts remain relevant today as the North Atlantic Alliance approaches the 21st century. The Senate understands that the policy of the United States toward the revised Strategic Concept shall reflect that fact and shall be based upon the following principles:

(i) FIRST AND FOREMOST A MILITARY ALLIANCE.—NATO is first and foremost a military alliance. NATO's success in securing peace is predicated on its military strength and strategic unity.

(ii) PRINCIPAL FOUNDATION FOR DEFENSE OF SECURITY INTERESTS OF NATO MEMBERS.—NATO serves as the principal foundation for collectively defending the security interests of its members against external threats.

(iii) PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES VITAL NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS.—Strong United States leadership of NATO promotes and protects United States vital national security interests.

(iv) UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP ROLE.—The United States maintains its leadership role of NATO through the stationing of United States combat forces in Europe, providing military commanders for key NATO commands, and through the presence of United States nuclear forces on the territory of Europe.

(v) COMMON THREATS.—NATO members will face common threats to their security in the post-Cold War environment, including—

(I) the potential for the re-emergence of a hegamonic power confronting Europe;

(II) rogue states and non-state actors possessing nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons and the means to deliver these weapons by ballistic or cruise missiles, or other unconventional delivery means;

(III) threats of a wider nature, including the disruption of the flow of vital resources, and other possible transnational threats; and

(IV) conflict in the North Atlantic area stemming from ethnic and religious enmity, the revival of historic disputes or the actions of undemocratic leaders.

(vi) CORE MISSION OF NATO.—Defense planning will reaffirm a commitment by NATO members to a credible capability for collective self-defense, which remains the core mission of NATO. All NATO members will contribute to this core mission.

(vii) CAPACITY TO RESPOND TO COMMON THREATS.—NATO's continued success requires a credible military capability to deter and respond to common threats. Building on its core capabilities for collective self-defense of its members, NATO will ensure that its military force structure, defense planning, command structures, and force goals promote NATO's capacity to project power when the security of a NATO member is threatened, and provide a basis for ad hoc coalitions of willing partners among NATO members. This will require that NATO members possess national military capabilities to rapidly deploy forces over long distances, sustain operations for extended periods of time, and operate jointly with the United States in high intensity conflicts.

(viii) INTEGRATED MILITARY STRUCTURE.—The Integrated Military Structure of NATO underpins NATO's effectiveness as a military alliance by embedding NATO members in a process of cooperative defense planning and ensuring unity of command.

(ix) NUCLEAR POSTURE.—Nuclear weapons will continue to make an essential contribution to deterring aggression, especially aggression by potential adversaries armed with nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons. A credible NATO nuclear deterrent posture requires the stationing of United States nuclear forces in Europe, which provides an essential political and military link between Europe and North America, and the widespread participation of NATO members in nuclear roles. In addition, the NATO deterrent posture will continue to ensure uncertainty in the mind of any potential aggressor about the nature of the response by NATO members to military aggression.

(x) BURDENSHARING.—The responsibility and financial burden of defending the democracies of Europe will be more equitably shared in a manner in which specific obligations and force goals are met by NATO members.

CRAIG EXECUTIVE AMENDMENT NO. 2311

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. CRAIG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution of ratification for the treaty (Treaty Doc. No. 105–36) protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. These protocols were opened for signature at Brussels on December 16, 1997, and signed on behalf of the United States of America and other parties to the North Atlantic Treaty; as follows:

Insert after subparagraph (A) of section 3(1) the following new subparagraph:

(B) REQUIREMENT OF UNITED NATIONS COMMITMENT FOR REIMBURSEMENT OR CREDITING OF UNITED STATES EXPENDITURES FOR CERTAIN NATO MISSIONS.—Prior to the deposit of the United States instrument of ratification, the President shall certify to the Senate that he has obtained a commitment from the United Nations that United States expenditures for costs incurred in any mission described in subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be treated by the United Nations as in-kind contributions by the United States to a United Nations peacekeeping operation and shall be—

(1) reimbursed to the United States out of funds available to the United Nations; or

(2) credited toward contributions assessed the United States by the United Nations for such operations.

Redesignate subsequent subparagraphs in section 3(1) accordingly.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, today I am filing an amendment related to the

resolution of ratification for the proposed expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Last May, President Clinton publicly embraced the idea of a ''new NATO'' mission. It is my concern that the President's vision of a new NATO will signal the end of NATO as a defensive alliance and begin its role as a global peacekeeping organization.

I have several concerns about the President's vision for NATO, not the least of which is cost for a ''new'' NATO. It seems to me that if the President continues to eagerly commit our men and women in uniform to dangerous peace-keeping missions, for which, the U.S. invariably pays the lion's share of the cost, the United Nations should either be forced to reimburse us for those costs, or relieve our so-called arrears.

Therefore, I will be offering an amendment which requires that prior to the deposit of the instrument of ratification for NATO expansion, the President must certify that the Senate has obtained a commitment from the United Nations that the U.S. will be reimbursed or credited for costs incurred in peace-keeping missions.

I am offering this amendment because I am both concerned and frustrated by the tremendous costs that the U.S. incurs in peacekeeping and humanitarian missions around the globe. Our men and women in uniform are asked to do more and more, with less and less. Meanwhile, American taxpayers foot the bill for these missions. Yet, the United States is handed the single largest assessed contribution for any U.N. member, despite the huge commitments we maintain across the globe.

I hope my colleagues will support this common-sense amendment to force the United Nations to account for the contributions that the United States has made to peace-keeping around the world.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for information of the Senate and the public that a hearing of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources will be held on Wednesday, April 29, 1998, 10 a.m., in SD–430 of the Senate Dirksen Building. The subject of the hearing is ''Assistive Technology Act.'' For further information, please call the committee, 202/224–5375.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for information of the Senate and the public that a hearing of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources will be held on Thursday, April 30, 1998, 11 a.m., in SD–430 of the Senate Dirksen Building. The subject of the hearing is Agency for Health Care Policy Research. For further information, please call the committee, 202/224–5375.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NORTHERN IRELAND PEACE AGREEMENT

● Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I was unable to vote on Senate Concurrent Resolution 90, which acknowledges the historic Northern Ireland Peace Agreement. Had I been present I would have voted in favor of the resolution. I request that the official record so indicate.

Mr. President, Ireland has suffered thirty years of turmoil, a tragic set of circumstances which has taken a deep toll on the Irish people. This toll can be measured in the loss of thousands of lives, and the instability which arises from thirty years of constant fighting, and terror. Despite the best efforts of the governments of the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom over the years to find an equitable solution, these, until recently were to no avail.

Mr. President, finally I would note that the symbolism of this accord being reached on Good Friday should not escape us. It has been said that Good Friday is the vortex to which all history is drawn, and out of which all history flows, forever transformed. Let us hope that this momentous accord will set Ireland on a course towards peace and prosperity from which there is no turning back.●

STEPHEN C. ROBINSON—U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there are few issues as important as protecting our citizens and keeping our communities free of crime. Americans should feel secure in their homes, at their schools, and in their neighborhoods, and in recent years we have made tremendous progress in this area, reducing the crime rate for a record five years in a row. But more work needs to be done. One of the most effective ways to make our streets safer is attracting talented and committed individuals to work in law enforcement. That is why I am so pleased that my Senate colleagues have displayed great wisdom and unanimously confirmed Stephen C. Robinson to serve as U.S. Attorney for the State of Connecticut.

Mr. Robinson has extensive and varied law enforcement experience in the public sector and his legal and investigative work for the private sector well qualify him to serve in this position. I was proud to recommend his nomination to the President, and I believe that he will bring a sense of intelligence, integrity, and energy to this office.

After graduating from Cornell University and Cornell Law School, Mr. Robinson was in private practice for several years. He then became an Assistant U.S. Attorney in the Southern District of New York where he directed the prosecution of narcotics cases and tax fraud and securities fraud cases. He also argued appeals in the U.S. Court of Appeals in the Second Circuit. In 1990, Mr. Robinson received the Department of Justice's Director Award for Superior Performance as an Assistant U.S. Attorney.

Mr. Robinson also has served as Associate General Counsel and Managing Director at Kroll Associates, the world's largest private investigation firm. In 1993, FBI Director Louis Freeh asked Mr. Robinson to join the Bureau as his Special Assistant and General Counsel. At the FBI, he oversaw counter-terrorism and counter-espionage policy and investigation; revision of the selection and promotion process for Special Agents; and FBI undercover investigation proposals. Mr. Robinson has most recently worked as Chief Compliance Officer for Aetna U.S. Healthcare in Middletown, Connecticut, and he is also an instructor of Trial Practice Law at Yale Law School.

Mr. Robinson's confirmation is particularly significant in Connecticut, because he is the first African-American to ever serve as our State's top federal prosecutor. He has spoken publicly about the sense of hopelessness amongst young blacks throughout the country. And having grown up in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, Mr. Robinson hopes that young people from inner cities will look at him and see someone who can not only relate to their circumstances, but who also illustrates that if you get your education and work hard you can attain your goals, regardless of where you come from. Mr. Robinson stands as a positive role model for African-American youths, and in fact all young people.

By taking the post of Connecticut's U.S. Attorney, Mr. Robinson is renewing his connection to public service. But this may have never been possible were it not for a conversation between Steve and his mother in 1996. During the Thanksgiving holidays, his mother encouraged him to return to public service and give more back to his community. Mr. Robinson has frequently stated that this conversation prompted him to reevaluate what he wanted to do with his life. Upon reflection, he decided to take his mother's advice, and he decided that he should return to public service. On behalf of the people of Connecticut, I would like to thank Steve's mother. Steve Robinson is a man of outstanding character and intelligence, and we are fortunate to have him serve as our next U.S. Attorney.

I offer my sincere congratulations to Steve, his wife Kathleen Sullivan, his daughter Victoria, and all of his family and friends on his well-deserved confirmation. I have every confidence that he will flourish in this position.●

THE 5TH ANNUAL HEARTS FOR LIFE BENEFIT

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a very special event in the state of Michigan. The 5th Annual Hearts for Life Benefit, sponsored by Right To Life—Lapeer County, will take place on Monday, May 4, 1998, at the Lapeer County Center Building. The Master of Ceremonies will be the Honorable Michael P. Higgins and the guest speaker for the evening will be Monsignor James P. Lisante, director of Family Ministry and Pastor of St. Thomas the Apostle in West Hempstead, New York. He is a champion of pro-life causes.

An event like this one is very important for the pro-life movement. It reinforces the fact that at every level, we have people who value the sanctity of life working together. This is very encouraging. All who are involved with the Hearts for Life event should be commended not only for their efforts in planning it but for their efforts in promoting this very important cause. I extend my best wishes and appreciation to the Right To Life—Lapeer County.●

KATHERINE PATERSON, WINNER OF THE 1998 HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSON AWARD

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my wife and I have lived our lives in Vermont. One of the great advantages of that is the wonderful Vermonters we have gotten to know over the years.

One of our valued Vermonters is Katherine Paterson, who has just won the 1998 Hans Christian Anderson Award for her authorship of children's books.

Mrs. Paterson has written 27 children's books, and she and her husband, the Reverend John Paterson, live on Cobble Hill in Barre Town, not far from our tree farm in Middlesex, Vermont.

While I was home for Easter Break, I read a wonderful article about her in the Saturday, April 11th, Times Argus, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Times Argus, Apr. 11, 1998]

BARRE AUTHOR WINS WRITING AWARD—FOR KATHERINE PATERSON ''THE CLOSEST I'LL EVER GET TO A NOBEL PRIZE''

(By David W. Smith)

BARRE TOWN—Author Katherine Paterson has just won what may be the most prestigious award in her field, the Hans Christian Ansersen Award, but that doesn't make finding a last-minute seat on a plane to New Delhi any easier.

''It's hard to get a ticket to India,'' she said with a sigh, as yet another phone call interrupted her train of thought.

Paterson, the well-known Barre author of 27 children's books, needs to find her way to the other side of the world by April 20 to receive the award, bestowed every two years by the International Board on Books for Young People (IBBY). An international jury of children's literature specialists selects a recipient who has created a body of work important to the genre. Paterson's work has been translated into 22 languages.

''An award for a body of work is the best kind,'' said Paterson. ''None of your children get neglected.''

Sitting in the parlor of her house on Cobble Hill Road, Paterson joked about the award and the prestige that children's authors accept in lieu of money, but also reflected with a sense of wonder on the amount of attention she's received in her 34-year writing career.

''It's thrilling. I'm surprised at how thrilled I was,'' she said. ''It's the closest I'll ever get to a Nobel Prize.''

Paterson's first attempt at serious writing was a book for the Presbyterian Church explaining questions of religious faith to children. ''Who Am I?'' was published in 1964, but from there it would be a long seven years until another of her works went to press.

''I feel I've paid my dues,'' she said.

Working in a small corner room of her house with a single skylight which she described as ''the room that has books all over the floor,'' Paterson tries to rise each day and write for a few hours before breakfast.

''(It's when) your critical mind is lazier than your creative mind,'' she said. ''I'm glad I have a critical mind, it just gets in the way when you're trying to get through the first draft.'' Paterson writes for children of all ages, but is best known by her novels for 10–14 year-olds, like ''Lyddie,'' The Great Gilly Hopkins,'' ''Bridge to Terabithia,'' and ''Jip, His Story.''

''I really am a writer for children and very happy to be a writer for children,'' she said. ''They're your best audience. They want your book to be the best book they ever read.''

The recipient of many awards, Paterson has also been subject to critical scrutiny. Her books have been singled out as containing everything from obscenity and profanity to religious blasphemy and have even been banished from libraries.

Never one to shy away from difficult subject matter, ''Lyddie,'' deals with the sexual harassment and exploitation of mid-19th century factory girls, while ''Terabithia'' focuses on a child's grief at the death of a special friend. Paterson said that usually it is the adults, not the young readers, who are upset by her work.

''(Adults) don't want to believe that children feel things as deeply as they do,'' she said. ''They want them to stay innocent.''

Paterson said she felt her more controversial work was often released at the same time as other children's books which dealt with similar topics.

''We all breaths the same air,'' she said, ''and we all sort of breathe in themes at the same time.''

A play based on her novel, ''The Great Gilly Hopkins,'' which was adapted by her son David, will be presented by the Center Stage Theater Group on May 8 and 9 at the Barre Opera House. The same play is being performed on Broadway.●

DEDICATION OF THE BETHEL CHURCH OF GOD IN CHRIST

● Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, on April 26, the Bethel Church of God in Christ will celebrate ''A New Work.'' Not only will this two year old ministry install a new pastor, Elder George Shepherd Christopher, but also, the congregation will dedicate its new church in Pittsburgh. The theme for the installation service comes from Psalm 118:23, ''This is the Lord's doing, it is marvelous in our eyes.''

The Bethel Church of God in Christ is a community based, Bible believing, Christ centered, Spirit directed fellowship. For the past two years, this church has selflessly dedicated itself to community service. The congregation believes it is necessary to minister to the whole person for the glory of God. Having pledged to provide ''Ministry to the heart of East Liberty and beyond,'' the church looks forward to the challenges and promises of the future.

Mr. President, the parishioners and clergy have worked and prayed tirelessly for both the new building and their new pastor. In closing, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending the Senate's best wishes to the Bethel Church of God in Christ. With God's help, this church will be a light for lost souls in East Liberty and throughout Pittsburgh.●

HONORING THE ARMENIAN VICTIMS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the memory of the ethnic Armenians who died at the hands of the Ottoman Empire from 1915–1923. Last week, we marked the 83rd anniversary of the beginning of a systematic, officially-sanctioned genocide that would eventually claim 1.5 million lives and force more than 250,000 to flee their homeland. As a result, there are fewer than 80,000 Armenians remaining in present-day Turkey.

I have spoken about these events every year of my term, on or near this date, in order to remind the Senate—and to remind the American people—of the sacrifice of these 1.5 million people who were murdered simply because of their ethnicity. In a country where we cherish the ethnic diversity of our citizens and welcome legal immigrants from around the globe, we sometimes forget about the ethnic strife that existed—and continues to exist—all over the world.

Unfortunately, ethnic conflict has led to genocide all too often, as we have seen during this decade in Bosnia, Rwanda, and elsewhere. More recently, there has been a resurgence of ethnic fighting in Kosovo, where the minority Serb population seeks to control the majority Albanian population.

Mr. President, human rights violations have become all too commonplace in the modern world. Beatings, rapes, murders, and ''disappearances'' have become routine weapons of war in battles where the perpetrators are rarely brought to justice. It is my strong view that the United States must continue to lead the fight for global human rights.

The recent death of Khmer Rouge leader Pol Pot—who died before he could be tried for the murders of millions of Cambodians—reinforces the urgency of bringing those responsible for genocide to justice. I applaud the efforts of the United Nations International Criminal Tribunal which is currently working to prosecute those responsible for the atrocities committed in Rwanda and the Former Yugoslavia.

As we honor the memory of the 1.5 million Armenians whose annihilation began 83 years ago, we must also remember the countless other victims of ''ethnic cleansing'' around the globe, and recommit ourselves to the effort to punish those responsible for these unspeakable crimes.●

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF SRI LANKA

● Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of independence of Sri Lanka. I believe it is appropriate that we so mark this occasion by offering our congratulations to her excellency, President Kumaratunga and the people of Sri Lanka.

In the five decades since Sri Lanka gained its independence from British colonial rule, Sri Lanka has held regular national elections as well as provincial and local government elections. The most recent parliamentary elections were held in August 1994, and the third presidential election was held in November 1994.

Sri Lanka has prospered economically since 1977, when it introduced economic liberalization policies which shifted the economy away from state controls, subsidies and public sector involvement to a market-oriented system in which private entrepreneurship flourishes. The U.S. is Sri Lanka's largest trading partner, accounting for 30% of the latter's exports, and over 90 U.S. companies have invested in Sri Lanka, with a heavy concentration in mining and textiles.

U.S. official relations with Sri Lanka date back to 1850 when John Black, an American merchant residing in Colombo was appointed the first American commercial agent in Galle. Fifty years later the agency moved to Colombo and became a consulate. It subsequently became an embassy in 1948 after Sri Lanka became independent.

The exchange of bilateral visits has played an important role in strengthening the cordial relations between our two nations. Then Secretary of State John Foster Dulles visited Sri Lanka soon after its independence, and since that time members of this body as well as our colleagues in the House have regularly visited this lovely country.

Despite its prosperity and commitment to democratic principles, Sri Lanka has been plagued for many years by two domestic insurgencies, one mainly Tamil in the North, and the other mainly Sinhalese, in the South. The result has been the loss of many lives and heavy damage to property. The government has reiterated its commitment to addressing grievances articulated by these groups through dialog and the process of negotiation. Four rounds of unconditional talks with the Tamil Tiger separatists were held following the President's election in November 1994, and a cease fire was subsequently reached. This however, was breached by the separatists after 3½ months when they resumed their terrorist activity.

As a result of these terrorist actions at home, Sri Lanka has placed counter terrorism at the forefront of its foreign policy. Sri Lanka was the Vice Chair of the United Nations Ad hoc Committee on Terrorism and played an important role in the drafting of the Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombing, being the first to sign the Convention at United Nations Headquarters on January 12, 1998.

I am therefore, Mr. President, pleased to acknowledge this occasion by expressing best wishes to the Government and people of Sri Lanka as they celebrate 50 years of independence. I know that we all look forward to continued cooperation and friendship with the Government and people of Sri Lanka in the years ahead.●

RECOGNIZING ARIZONA'S TOP TWO 1998 YOUTH VOLUNTEERS

● Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate and honor two young Arizona students who have achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in their communities. Eliza Robinson of Scottsdale and Jason Kelley of Prescott have just been named State honorees in the 1998 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on only one high school student and one middle school student in each state, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

Ms. Eliza Robinson is being recognized for her many years of dedication and service to the Multiple Sclerosis Society, culminating with a term as spokesman for that wonderful organization.

Mr. Kelley is being recognized for his efforts to start a Youth Chamber of Commerce. Jason's organization will give other young people in his community the opportunity to participate in Chamber events similar to those sponsored by their local Chamber of Commerce, as well as interact with business leaders from the area.

In light of numerous statistics that indicate Americans today are less involved in their communities than they once were, it's vital that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contributions these young people have made. People of all ages need to think more about how we, as individual citizens, can work together at the local level to ensure the health and vitality of our towns and neighborhoods. Young volunteers like Mr. Kelley and Ms. Robinson are inspiring examples to all of us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

The program that brought these young role models to our attention—The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards—was created by the Prudential Insurance Company of America in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued and to inspire other young people to follow their example. In only three years, the program has become the nation's largest youth recognition effort based solely on community service, with more than 30,000 youngsters participating.

Ms. Robinson and Mr. Kelley should be extremely proud to have been singled out from such a large group of dedicated volunteers. As part of their recognition, they will come to Washington in early May, along with other 1998 honorees from across the country, for several days of special events, including a Congressional breakfast reception on Capitol Hill. While in Washington, ten will be named America's top youth volunteers of the year by a distinguished national selection committee co-chaired by our colleagues, Senators BOB KERREY of Nebraska and TIM HUTCHINSON of Arkansas.

I heartily applaud Mr. Kelley and Ms. Robinson for their initiative in seeking to make their communities better places to live, and for the positive impact they have had on the lives of others. I also would like to salute four other young people in my state who were named Distinguished Finalists by the Prudential Spirit of Community Awards for their outstanding volunteer service. They are: Chrissy Weiers of Maricopa, who has demonstrated an extraordinary commitment to make her peers aware of the dangers of drugs; Christina Barela of Glendale, who helped organize a day camp for elementary school girls; Purvi Patel of Yuma, who designed and built a park adjacent to her school with five peers from the Gifted and Talented Education Program; and Tirzah Orcutt of Phoenix, who created a volunteer project to paint a mural on the Veterans Administration Medical Nursing Home Care unit in Phoenix.

All these young people have demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly extraordinary in today's world, and deserve our sincere admiration and respect. Their actions show that young Americans can—and do—play important roles in their communities, and that America's community spirit continues to hold tremendous promise for the future.●

GORTON AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2646

● Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I rise to explain my support of Senator GORTON's amendment to the Coverdell A+ Accounts legislation. I was pleased to support the Gorton amendment because it returns the decision making authority over our children's education to parents, teachers, and locally elected school boards. After more than 30 years of top down control, it is clear that the hundreds of federal education programs and one size fits all policies from Washington, D.C. are not working.

The Gorton Amendment allows each state to choose from one of three options: to have federal funds sent directly to local school districts minus federal regulations; to have funds sent to the state education authority without federal regulations; or to continue to receive federal funds under the current system of categorical programs. Any changes to the current system are not mandated by the federal government—but are left to the discretion of the states.

I believe this is a wonderful opportunity to send money directly to local school districts free from the excessive mandates and regulations imposed on our schools from the Department of Education. I want it clearly understood, though, that this does not affect my support for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. I support the National Board and support further funding for its initiatives.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) seeks to establish high and rigorous standards for teachers. It is leading the way in making teaching a profession dedicated to student learning and to upholding high standards for professional performance. Teachers are role models for our students and our communities. Interestingly enough, they are the ones leading the way in establishing and implementing the National Board certification.

I fully support the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and hope that this body will support it for the sake of our young people. It is children in their care that are the beneficiaries of teacher improvement.●

THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VERMONT ELECTRICAL COOPERATIVE

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take this time to commemorate the 60th birthday of the Vermont Electric Cooperative. Beginning on that April day in 1939 when the co-op first brought electricity to a family farm in Eden, they have provided an indispensable service to generations of Vermonters who were missing out on the conveniences of electricity.

Mr. President, I ask that a short retrospective about the co-op which recently appeared in their newsletter be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

HAPPY BIRTHDAY CO-OP!!—A RETROSPECTIVE

Studying by lantern light, milking cows by hand, cutting blocks of river ice for refrigeration—life in Colonial America, perhaps?

In rural Vermont, this way of life was not so long ago and there are plenty of Co-op members who remember all too well those days before Vermont's Governor George Aiken pioneered the federal legislation that spawned the birth of Vermont Electric Cooperative.

This year, the Co-op celebrates the sixtieth anniversary of its creation which brought to rural residents of Vermont the conveniences of electricity which many Americans had been enjoying for years.

More than anyone, Vermont's farmers looked forward to the day when the power poles would march down the road to their own barns and houses. Harold Putnam, of Cambridge, was one of them.

''Some of our neighbors closer to town were already on CVPS and we were very anxious to get electricity to the barn and the house. The gas lanterns we were using in the barn were kind of dangerous, the gas-powered milking system didn't always work and it was hard to keep things clean without a constant supply of hot water.''

The Putnam farmhouse had running water from a spring by the kitchen door to keep food cool. Harold's mother, Maybelle, was especially looking forward to the day when the barn would have its own hot water tank and the endless parade of milking equipment through the kitchen to her sink would finally end, recalled Harold's wife, Lois.

The Putnams relied on a gravity-fed system to bring cold spring water into a tank in the barn which held milk cans. Until the late 1930's, the Putnams, like many farmers in Vermont, sold their cream to a local creamery. The Putnams worked with the Cloverdale Creamery in Westford on Route 15, where the Burlington and Lamoille Railroad had been stopping since 1887. The cream was then shipped to Hartford, Connecticut. The skimmed milk was fed to pigs and the family sold pork. Just before the advent of VEC, the Putnams began shipping fluid milk, which required not just the cool spring water, but also a steady supply of ice.

''We bought our ice from a neighbor who cut ice under the Cambridge covered bridge (the long bridge now at the Shelburne, Museum) or at Halfmoon Pond in Fletcher,'' Mr. Putnam explained.

For the Putnams, switching to electricity was a fairly simple matter: their barn was already equipped with a milk pump that had been powered by the unreliable gas-powered system. They wired just half the house at first to save money.

Mr. Putnam took on the task of helping to secure easements for the new Co-op line from the CVPS substation, then at the junction of routes 15 and 104 in Cambridge, out to Poker Hill Road in Underhill.

Twenty-five miles away from Cambridge, Evelyn and Ernest Earle were milking 20 cows by hand in Eden where the entire town was without electricity.

The Earles moved to their current home, just off route 118 between Eden and Belvidere, a year or so after they were married in 1940. It had been the first house in Eden on the Co-op's very first power line, and Mr. Earle was part of the crew that dug the holes for the poles to carry that first line in 1939.

The line that supplied power to what is now the Earle's home originated at the first substation built specifically to serve the Co-op. The house still has the wall brackets which held the gas lamps. Most houses had a large table lamp as well with several mantles that maximized the output of the lamp, easily brightening up an entire room, Mrs. Earle said.

Richard Parker and his brother Henry, who grew up in Lowell, wired many of the buildings served by the Co-op, including those owned by both the Putnams and the Earles, and were later long-time Co-op employees.

Richard Parker, then 21, remembers the day Governor Aiken came to Eden and turned on the lights for the first VEC line. The inaugural line ran from the new Eden substation through the villages of Eden and Eden Mills, where the first Co-op office was located, to Lowell.

''It was quite a gathering—40 or 50 people. The Co-op had tested the lines before-hand to make sure the lights were all working. Governor Aiken threw the switch and the Co-op was in business.''

It was a warm, sunny day in April 1939. It had taken less than a year from the creation of the Co-op to the construction of the first substation and transmission line.●

''FRIENDS COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARD'' RECIPIENTS

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to honor two very special people, Dr. Haifa Fakhouri and Ms. Florine Mark. Both will be receiving the ''Friends Community Service Award'' on Sunday, May 17, 1998 from the American Arab and Jewish Friends, a program of The Interfaith Round Table of the National Conference. American Arab and Jewish Friends was established in 1981 to promote a greater understanding between the Arab and Jewish Communities of Southeastern Michigan.

Dr. Fakhouri is the President and CEO of the Arab-American and Chaldean Council, the nation's largest community based, human service organization serving the Arab-American and Chaldean population. The ACC has grown tremendously under Dr. Fakhouri's leadership. In addition to her work with the ACC, she has served as special advisor to the United Nations on women's issues in the Arab world and as a delegate to the International Women's Conference in Mexico. She also serves on the boards of several national, state and local organizations. In all of her capacities, Dr. Fakhouri works to strengthen relations between the Arab-American and Jewish communities. She is well-deserving of the award being presented to her.

Ms. Florine Mark has been the President and CEO of the WW Group, Inc., the nation's largest franchise of Weight Watchers International for the last 30 years. In addition to this, Ms. Mark also finds time to serve on the boards of numerous community organizations including the American Red Cross, the Detroit Institute for Children and the United Jewish Appeal National Campaign. Ms. Mark's contributions to society, especially promoting Arab-American, Jewish relations are commendable.

Both of these women deserve special recognition for their contributions to the Arab-American and Jewish communities. I want to congratulate them on their awards. At this time, I would also like to commend the Interfaith Round Table on all of their efforts to improve understanding and friendship between the Arab and Jewish communities. I extend my best wishes for a successful 12th Annual Awards and Scholarship dinner.●

TRIBUTE TO UNIVERSITY OF UTAH ROTC CLASS OF 1944

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the University of Utah ROTC Class of 1944 which responded to the call for active military

duty during World War II. On May 2, 1998, at the University of Utah members of the ROTC Class of 1944 will hold a reunion commemorating the 55th anniversary of their activation into our national armed services. I believe it is fitting that we honor them today in the United States Senate.

The University of Utah Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) was an unique organization. It was one of the few military units which were called into service during World War II from a specific community and which can return to that home area for a reunion. Most military units include individuals whose residences are scattered throughout the country. Through an Act of Congress in 1916, ROTC programs were established in higher education institutions across the country. Since that time, they have been an important part of this nation's civil defense—in times of war and peace—training generations of students for service to their country.

In the early 1940s, this class trained at the University of Utah with horse-drawn artillery working with an old French 77 millimeter cannon and with a 105 millimeter howitzer, new at the time. As a unit, this ROTC class was first assigned to Camp Roberts in California, for basic training in truck drawn artillery. Later they were assigned to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, for further training and ultimately received further schooling at the Infantry Officers School at Fort Benning, Georgia. After graduation from Fort Benning, these young men, whose average age at the time was slightly over 20, served as officers in various combat units in Italy, France and the South Pacific.

These were brave and honorable men, each one of them. Of the 99 who were called to active duty in 1943, two were killed in action while serving in the 10th Mountain Division in Italy. One was later killed in the Korean Conflict. Of the group's original 99 members, 71 are still alive. Today, I speak for all Utahns and all Americans when I say, we honor these brave men and pay tribute to them for their service and sacrifice for this great country. The Class of 1944's great tradition of discipline and leadership continues today as many of its members are respected professionals in the public and private sector as well as their own communities.

I ask that the text of the unit's Activation Orders for March 16, 1943 be printed in the RECORD as part of this tribute.

And finally, Mr. President, before I close, I want to thank Chris S. Metos of Salt Lake City, Utah, for the outstanding job he has done to help organize this upcoming reunion and for the many years of service he has provided to this country and to the people of the state of Utah.

The material follows:

ACTIVATION ORDERS: HEADQUARTERS NINTH SERVICE COMMAND, FORT DOUGLAS, UTAH, MARCH 16, 1943

1. Following-named Enl Res, 1st yr Advanced ROTC, are ordered to AD. WP fr Univ of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah so as to rpt to Recp Cen. Fort Douglas, Utah on April 5, 1943 for processing and asgmt to Camp Roberts, Calif to receive Mil Tung in lieu of that normally given during 2d yr advanced course ROTC (FA) instructions. Ea Enl Res named herein reporting to Recp Cen will present to Classification Officer transcript of colg academic and ROTC records.

Pvt Ray N. Welling, in charge of detachment; Pvt Rodney E. Alsop; Pvt Arthur S. Anderson; Pvt David F. Anderson; Pvt Warren S. Anderson; Pvt Dale F. Barlow; Pvt Eliot D. Barton; Pvt Ronald A. Bell; Pvt Wallace G. Bennett; Pvt Wilford N. Bergener; Pvt Burton F. Brasher; Pvt Over J. Call; Pvt Louis B. Cardon; Pvt Gordon L. Carlson; Pvt John S. Carlson; Pvt Charles G. Chase; Pvt Lorin W. Clayton; Pvt Jack A. Clegg; Pvt Walter K. Conrad; Pvt Max T. Cornwell; Pvt Everett E. Dahl; Pvt Peter W. Eberle; Pvt Bernard J. Eggertsen; Pvt Keith M. Engar; Pvt Boyd C. Erickson; Pvt Roland T. Evans; Pvt Silvio J. Fassio; Pvt Moffet E. Felkner; Pvt Joseph B. Fetzer; Pvt Donald L. Fox; Pvt Norman J. Fuellenbach; Pvt Orin A. Furse; Pvt James H. Gardner; Pvt Phil R. Garn;

Pvt Edwin G. Gibbs; Pvt LeRoy B. Hansen; Pvt Dale A. Harrison; Pvt Leon G. Harvey; Pvt Clarence R. Hawkins; Pvt Charles S. Hewlett; Pvt Parnell K. Hinckley; Pvt Jesse H. Jameson; Pvt James R. Jarvis, Jr.; Pvt Victor D. Jensen; Pvt Frank L. Johnson; Pvt Melvin A. Johnson; Pvt William L. Korns; Pvt Robert J. Kurtz; Pvt Gerald P. Langton; Pvt Earl V. Larson; Pvt Jack D. Lawson; Pvt Franklin M. Leaver; Pvt Elwin C. Leavitt; Pvt George A. Lockhart; Pvt John S. MacDuff; Pvt Robert H. Marshall; Pvt Herbert W. Maw; Pvt Hal N. Mays; Pvt Christopher S. Metos; Pvt Franklin L. McKean; Pvt Clinton R. Miller; Pvt Edward L. Montgomery; Pvt Robert L. Montgomery; Pvt Jerome R. Mooney; Pvt Robert F. Moore; Pvt Henry G. Nebeker; Pvt Frank A. Nelson, Jr.;

Pvt Delbert E. Olson; Pvt August L. Orlob; Pvt Evan J. Pearson; Pvt Richard V. Peay; Pvt Artmas T. Peterson; Pvt Donald H. Pickett; Pvt Bill J. Pope; Pvt Robert F. Poulson; Pvt John R. Rampton, Jr.; Pvt Carry L. Rich; Pvt Charles E. Richards; Pvt William S. Ryberg; Pvt Ernest J. Sabec; Pvt Robert S. Shriver; Pvt Rocco C. Siciliano; Pvt Frank R. Slight; Pvt Allan R. Sloan; Pvt David W. Smith, Jr.; Pvt Craig Temple; Pvt Donald C. Thomas; Pvt Parry E. Thomas; Pvt LaMar Tibbs; Pvt Joseph Tibolla; Pvt Lawrence S. Tohill; Pvt John Van Den Berghe; Pvt Milton E. Wadsworth; Pvt James C. Waller, Jr.; Pvt Saint C. Weaver; Pvt Shirley R. Wood; Pvt Eugene T. Woolf; Pvt Verner H. Zinik; and Pvt William E. Zwick, Jr.

By command of Major General JOYCE:

P. R. DAVISON,

Colonel, General Staff Corps, Chief of Staff.●

TRIBUTE TO MRS. LOUISE CHASE

● Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Louise Chase, a very special constituent from Horsham, Pennsylvania. A Navy veteran during WWII, Mrs. Chase continues to serve her country and her community as commander of the American Legion, Pennsylvania Department.

Last summer, Mrs. Chase became the first woman to serve as commander of the Pennsylvania Department of the American Legion. She was elected at the conclusion of the 79th convention. Such an honor came as no surprise to those who have followed her involvement in the American Legion. In 1979, Louise was elected as the Department of Pennsylvania's first female vice commander. She has twice served as District Commander. Her Legion service also includes terms as adjutant of Philadelphia County and the Eastern Judicial Section, two terms as post commander, and 12 years as adjutant of Tioga Post 319. Other positions she has held within the organization include state legislative chairman, and chairman of the Select Committee on Economics and Benefits. Moreover, she is one of only two Pennsylvania Legionnaires who served on committees of the two National Conventions held in Pennsylvania.

In the business world, Louise proved to be an equally hard-working and dedicated employee. She was the controller and office manager of Philadelphia's prestigious Germantown Cricket Club for 13 years. She managed two high rise apartment buildings. Mrs. Chase was also a manufacturers' representative for paper container companies. Recently, she retired as an international marketing representative of a major computer manufacturer.

Mr. President, Louise Chase has continued her family's tradition of service to the nation, which literally spans from the Civil War to the Space Age. I ask the Senate to join me in extending the Senate's best wishes for continued success to Mrs. Chase and her family.●

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1186

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, after consultation with the minority leader, however not before the conclusion of the NATO treaty, may proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 214, S. 1186, the job training partnership legislation. I further ask unanimous consent that total debate be limited to 4 hours as divided on the amendments listed below. I further ask that the only amendments in order be the following:

One substitute amendment offered by Senator JEFFORDS, with 2 hours equally divided;

One amendment offered by Senator DEWINE, which is the text of Calendar No. 318, S. 1579, the rehabilitation bill, with 30 minutes equally divided;

Two amendments by Senator ASHCROFT, 10 minutes equally divided on each;

One amendment by Senator LAUTENBERG on service delivery area size with 10 minutes equally divided;

One amendment by Senator DOMENICI on business partnerships with 1 hour equally divided.

I further ask consent that no second-degree amendments be in order to the above listed amendments and that following the expiration of time or yielding back of time and disposition of any pending amendments the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), from the Committee on Armed Services, and the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), from the Committee on Appropriations.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. KEMPTHORNE), from the Committee on Armed Services, and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), from the Committee on Appropriations.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), from the Committee on Armed Services, and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), from the Committee on Appropriations.

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY, PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND REPRESENTATION BY SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 218 submitted earlier today by Senators LOTT and DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 218) to authorize testimony, production of documents, and representation by Senate legal counsel in a civil case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a civil case pending in the Superior Court for the State of Arizona. Prior to the litigation, some of the defendants sought assistance from Senator MCCAIN's and Senator KYL's offices in connection with a child custody dispute. The plaintiffs in the ensuing litigation have alleged, among other things, that the defendants defamed them in connection with the custody dispute. The plaintiffs have now subpoenaed correspondence from the files of the offices of Senator MCCAIN and Senator KYL.

Senators MCCAIN and KYL are willing to provide the requested correspondence to the parties in this case. Accordingly, this resolution would authorize Senator MCCAIN's and Senator KYL's offices to produce and authenticate documents in this case, except where a privilege or objection should be asserted. The resolution also would authorize the Senate Legal Counsel to represent Senator MCCAIN's and Senator KYL's offices, to protect the Senate's privileges in connection with this matter.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 218) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 218), with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 218

Whereas, in the case of *Buroojy, et al.* v. *Walsh*, et al., Civil Case No. 97–91407, pending in the Superior Court of the State of Arizona, documents have been subpoened from the offices of Senator John McCain and Senator Jon Kyl;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent Members, officers, or employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for evidence relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That employees of the offices of Senator McCain and Senator Kyl are authorized to testify and produce documents in the case of *Buroojy, et al.* v. *Walsh*, et al., except concerning matters for which a privilege or objection should be asserted.

SEC. 2. That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Senator McCain and Senator Kyl and their employees in connection with the testimony and document production authorized in section one of this resolution.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1998

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, April 28. I further ask that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted and the Senate then begin a period of morning business until 10:45 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions:

Senator COLLINS for up to 15 minutes;

Senator DORGAN for up to 15 minutes;

Senator COATS for up to 45 minutes beginning at 10 a.m..

I further ask that at the conclusion of morning business the Senate immediately proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the NATO enlargement treaty, and the Kyl amendment No. 2310 be temporarily set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I further ask that at 10:45 a.m. Senator HARKIN be recognized to offer an amendment and that there be 2 hours equally divided for debate on the amendment; further, that the vote on or in relation to the Harkin amendment occur immediately following the vote on the adoption of the State Department reorganization conference report previously ordered to occur at 2:25 p.m.; further, that no amendments be in order to the Harkin amendment prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from 12:45 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow the weekly party caucuses to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:45 a.m. At 10:45, the Senate will resume consideration of the NATO enlargement treaty, with Senator HARKIN being recognized to offer an amendment with 2 hours of debate on the amendment equally divided. When the Senate reconvenes following the weekly party luncheons, there will be 10 minutes equally divided for closing remarks on the State Department reorganization conference report. Following that debate at 2:25 p.m., the Senate will proceed to two back-to-back votes, the first being a rollcall vote on adoption of the State Department conference report, followed immediately by a rollcall vote on or in relation to the Harkin amendment. Members can expect further rollcall votes throughout Tuesday's session on amendments to the NATO treaty, or on any other legislative or executive items that are cleared for action.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:07 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, April 28, 1998, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 27, 1998:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SCOTT SNYDER FLEMING, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR LEGISLATION AND CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

CHERRYL T. THOMAS, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 28, 2002.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

THE JUDICIARY

GARR M. KING, OF OREGON, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON.

GREGORY MONETA SLEET, OF DELAWARE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NATIONAL COMMEMORATION OF THE DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE—CHILDREN OF THE HOLOCAUST: THEIR MEMORIES, OUR LEGACY

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1998

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was honored last Thursday, April 23 to participate in the National Civic Commemoration of the Days of Remembrance, the United State's annual national Holocaust memorial service. The theme of this year's commemoration was ''Children of the Holocaust: Their Memories, Our Legacy.''

The moving ceremony began with a processional and the presentation of the flags of the United States Army Divisions that liberated concentration camps. Following the Presentation of the Colors and the National Anthem, Benjamin Meed, Chairperson of the Days of Remembrance Committee made opening remarks recalling the horror he felt as a child in hiding in Warsaw as other Jewish children in the Warsaw ghetto were brutally burned to death. His Excellency Eliahu Ben Elissar, the Ambassador of Israel to the United States, remarked upon the legacy of the Holocaust from the perspective of the State of Israel's 50th Anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, I was deeply touched by the beautiful voice of Staff Sergeant Beverly Benda, accompanied by the U.S. Army Band (Pershing's Own). Sergeant Benda sang ''Oyfn Pripeshik'' (At the Fireplace), a song used in hidden ghetto classrooms to teach children the alphabet. The translation of the end of the song reads:

''When you grow older you will understand that this alphabet contains the tears and the weeping of our people. When you grow weary and burdened with exile, you will find comfort and strength within this Jewish Alphabet.''

Miles Lerman and Ruth Mandel, Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, noted the role of the United States Holocaust Memorial in allowing new generations of Americans to learn about the horrors of the Holocaust—the first step in understanding how it occurred and how we can prevent it from ever happening again. The keynote address by Yale University President Richard C. Levin elaborated on the theme of remembrance as the key to understanding. Dan Napolitano, a teacher at Georgetown Preparatory School, related how his experience as a student and teacher of the Holocaust and the history of anti-Semitism have reshaped his view of himself as a Catholic, a Christian, and a member of the human race.

As Josef Hapli and Rebecca Levy read heartbreaking excerpts from Children's Diaries of the Holocaust, pairs of Holocaust Survivors and Members of Congress lit memorial candles. I was honored to light the last candle with my constituent Alex Mutz, a survivor of three ghettos and five concentration camps. Others lighting candles of remembrance were Senator ARLEN SPECTER and Betty Grossman Goodfriend; Rabbi Alfred Gottschalk; Representative CHRISTOPHER CANNON and Charlene Perlmutter Schiff; Representative CAROLYN MALONEY; and Representative JIM KOLBE and George S. Pick. Tiffany Nickels of Romani heritage placed a rose among the candles to memorialize the fate of the Roma and Sinti murdered by the Nazis.

The Remembrance Program concluded with the singing of the service for the dead, ''El Moleh Rachamim,'' and the Hymn of the Partisans by Cantor Alberto Mizrahi and the recitation of the ''Kaddish'' led by Sigmund Strochlitz.

Mr. Speaker, I thaink Chairperson Benjamin Meed for giving me the privilege to play a small role in this remembrance program. It is an experience I will always remember and treasure. I ask all my colleagues to take this occasion to remember the tragedy of the Holocaust and to ensure that our children and our children's children learn about it, so that we can all work together to ensure that it will never happen again.

JUDICIAL REFORM ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1998

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Delahunt-Boehlert amendment. Let me say first, I believe judicial activism is a problem. I believe some judges overstep their judicial bounds. I believe some judges exercise poor judgment in formulating judicial plans forcing states and localities to comply with state and federal laws.

I believe in lowering taxes. I believe in H.J. Res. 111, the Tax Limitation Amendment, which sadly was voted down yesterday. I believe judges should not be able to direct states and localities to raise taxes. The Delahunt-Boehlert Amendment does not change this aspect of H.R. 1252.

I believe the government and private citizens should be treated equally before the law. H.R. 1252 exempts states and local governments from complying with judicial orders that ''necessarily require'' raising taxes no matter how egregiously the government violated the law. A private citizen who violates those same laws has to pay the penalty. Just about every federal law, whether its an environmental law, a civil rights law or a labor law carries penalties with it that could ''necessarily require'' a government violator to raise taxes to pay for.

If Congress thinks those penalties are too high, then lets lower them, but lets not give states free reign to violate either their own laws or federal laws just because the penalty may be costly. The Delahunt-Boehlert amendment strikes this ''necessarily require'' clause because state and federal laws must be enforced whether the violator is a state, locality, or private citizen.

I urge you to support the Delahunt-Boehlert amendment.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE BELLA ABZUG

SPEECH OF

HON. EVA M. CLAYTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1998

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the tribute to the Honorable Bella Abzug, a woman who has given the Congress—and people throughout the world—a legacy of which to be proud.

Bella's legacy is one of caring and concern, dedication and determination, and audacity—in the best sense of the word—and accomplishment. At the United Nations Conference on Women in Beijing, Bella said that she ''always believed that women will change the nature of power rather than power changing the nature of women.''

Bella cared about what happened nationwide and worldwide to those often considered the ''underclass.'' She was especially concerned about ensuring the rights of women, minorities, and people in need. She dedicated her lifetime determined to help improve lives and help empower people with little power.

She had the audacity early in her career as a lawyer to don a hat so that she would be viewed as a woman working in a profession and not in the stereotypic role for women—as staff support.

She had the audacity to want to be the first Jewish woman elected to Congress, the audacity to want to be the first person elected to Congress on a women's rights and peace platform, and the audacity to ''tell it like it is.''

She had the determination to make things happen, and she accomplished a lot—such as: the Freedom of Information Act, the Privacy Act, founding the National Women's Political Caucus to help other women become legislators, coming very close to passing the Equal Rights Amendment. As a pioneer in the women's rights movement, she fostered generations of female leaders.

It is in large part because of Bella's caring, concern, dedication, determination, and audacity that my sisters and I became the ''Class of 1992 in the 'Year of the Woman' '' here in the Congress.

She championed important issues and left a legacy for a better life. Legacies are important because of what they inspire other people to accomplish. However, these people must first hear about these legacies.

To my astonishment and dismay, I spoke recently with several younger women who are not familiar with the name ''Bella Abzug'' as well as the names of other important human rights advocates. Although these young people have reaped the benefits of their accomplishments.

We must inform the generations who come after us and help them recognize, appreciate, and remember the people and the work that paved their way. This is how we can preserve our history and pass on the important and wonderful legacies left by such special people as Bella Abzug.

NOTING THE PASSING OF MARY STRASSMEYER

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1998

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, in my Congressional District, we are mourning the passing of an outstanding individual and journalist. Mary Strassmeyer died on April 20, 1998. Before retiring from the Plain Dealer newspaper, her ''Mary, Mary'' column provided a wealth of information about Northeast Ohio's social events, people and other items of interest.

Mary Strassmeyer began her career as a reporter for the Cleveland News in 1956. Four years later, she came to the Plain Dealer, become Society Editor in 1965. For 21 years, readers were entertained and informed through her ''Mary, Mary'' column. She was an exceptional journalist whose dedication was unsurpassed. During her lifetime, she was the recipient of numerous awards, including being named one of the best society editors in the country. She was also inducted into the Press Club of Cleveland's Journalism Hall of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, throughout my congressional career, I enjoyed a close association with Mary Strassmeyer. She was a remarkable woman whom I admired and respected. I could always count on her coverage of events throughout my Congressional District, and I always looked forward to reading ''Mary, Mary'' for other tidbits of information. I am pleased that the Wednesday, April 22, 1998, edition of the Plain Dealer includes an article on the life and career of Mary Strassmeyer. In her memory, I include this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I extend my sympathy to Alex Machaskee and Mary's colleagues at the Plain Dealer, her family and many friends. We are saddened at her passing and she will never be forgotten.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Apr. 22, 1998]

MARY STRASSMEYER DEAD AT 68

SHE WAS A HARD-WORKING JOURNALIST WHO LOVED HER TOWN, HER NEWSPAPER AND WRITING HER COLUMN

(By Alana Baranick)

Mary Strassmeyer, retired Plain Dealer reporter who Mary, Mary column was an encyclopedia of people and places in Greater Cleveland, died of complications from diabetes Monday at Deaconess Hospital. She was 68.

She covered Cleveland's high society for 32 years and moved easily among British royals, Hollywood and Broadway celebrities and the Washington elite.

For 21 of those years, Strassmeyer wrote a column full of information about people, places and happenings in Northeast Ohio and beyond. She often included announcements about fund-raising functions for nonprofit organizations.

''Many charities and civic organizations benefited from a kind word in Mary's column,'' Plain Dealer President and Publisher Alex Machaskee said. ''Mary Strassmeyer was an excellent journalist, and she also was a very good friend. She has a great sense of humor and enjoyed life to the fullest. I will miss her warmth and honesty.''

Honesty was her trademark.

''Mary was to the print media as Dorothy Fuldheim was to TV,'' said Sam Miller, co-chairman of Forest City Enterprises. ''She was a high-class lady. She never broke her word. When she said 'off the record,' it was off the record. It just shows you can be a decent human being and be a first-class journalist at the same time.''

Strassmeyer did not kowtow to her subjects, no matter how much power they wielded. She was known for her dry wit and her take-no-prisoners approach.

She had a bemused affection for the ''swells,'' as she called socially prominent folks, and reported stories as truthfully as she saw them.

She didn't mince words with people who were trying to get items in her society column, often telling them in a brusque voice, ''You're going to have do better than that.''

Strassmeyer made a beachhead in The Plain Dealer newsroom when it was virtually devoid of women. She did it by exuding toughness on her beat and with her male colleagues.

Later, her desk was always covered and surrounded with roses, carnations and other flowers and plants, which came as thank-you gifts from people and organizations mentioned in her column.

Strassmeyer was a hard worker who loved her town, her newspaper and writing her column. She reluctantly retired in July because of poor health.

Her home in the Old Brooklyn section of Cleveland was on the same street as the house in which she was raised. For less than two years in the 1960s, she tried suburban living in Bay Village, but soon grew homesick for her hometown.

She graduated in 1951 from Notre Dame College in South Euclid, where she majored in English and history. She did post-graduate work in history at Toledo University.

In 1956, Strassmeyer joined the Cleveland News as a reporter. She was an education writer when the News closed in 1960 and she joined The Plain Dealer. She wrote features and travel stories and served as beauty editor before becoming the society editor in 1965.

While composing beauty colums for teens, Strassmeyer collaborated with a promotion department artist, Jeanne Harris, on a one-panel cartoon called, ''Sneakers'' which featured helpful hints on beauty, grooming and etiquette for teenagers.

The cartoon, which first appeared in The Plain Dealer in 1964, was soon syndicated internationally through King Features. In 1966, it was added to a display of American comics at the Smithsonian Institution.

She later wrote the words to photographer Bill Wynne's pictures for the book, ''Coco, The Special Delivery Dog.''

In 1976, Strassmeyer began writing a society column, called ''Today.'' which was the forerunner of ''Mary, Mary.''

She added broadcast media work to her resume in 1979. For 10 years, she had a weekly radio show, first on WCLV-FM and later on WERE-AM. She also had a show on WKYC Channel 3 for a short time.

Strassmeyer earned a law degree from the Cleveland-Marshall College of Law of Cleveland State University in 1981 and was admitted to the Ohio Bar in 1983. Since then, she maintained her own practice.

She received numerous accolades for her work as a journalist. In 1969, Charlotte Curtis of the New York Times named her one of the seven best society editors in the country. In 1982, ''Mary, Mary'' was described as one of the ''wittiest, best written of all American gossip columns, filled with double entendres and literary references'' in a Town & Country magazine article.

In 1994, she was inducted into the Press Club of Cleveland's Journalism Hall of Fame.

The Intown Club honored her in 1976 for her contributions to civic and cultural projects. Ten years later she became the first recipient of the WomenSpace media award for her support of women's issues and organizations.

Strassmeyer was the founder and first president of the Society of American Social Scribes. She was a member of Theta Sigma Phi, now know as Women in Communications, the Ohio Newspaper Women's Association and the Cleveland Play House Club.

She also belonged to Our Lady of Good Counsel Catholic Church and Kappa Gamma Pi, a national honorary society for Catholic women's college graduates. She volunteered with Catholic Charities.

She was a world traveler, belonged to numerous travel organizations and co-owned Gerry's International Travel Agency since 1991.

''Anytime she got a vacation, she was off to Singapore or more exotic places,'' said Plain Dealer Reporter William F. Miller. ''She could get along with virtually anyone.''

Retired Plain Dealer Reporter Pauline Thoma said, ''She was one of the world's best friends.''

Strassmeyer is survived by a sister, Joan Palus of Parma.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE ST. EDMUND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1998

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join all my friends and colleagues in celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the St. Edmund Elementary School. This wonderful school has been serving the community of Brooklyn, NY faithfully for 75 years, and is well deserving of recognition and praise.

On September 17, 1923 seventeen months after the founding pastor, Rev. Denis A. Maloney, celebrated the first Mass for the people of the St. Edmund Parish, a new church and school building were ready to serve the people of its community. St. Edmund is committed to the development of a Christian community; The Dominican Sisters of Sparkhill made sure that the children would receive a proper education. Under their leadership the school flourished and there was a need for new classrooms. In 1931, during the Great Depression, the school was able to raise $33,000 for new classrooms. This kind of support shows just how much the school meant to the community. Also, St. Edmund was one of the first Catholic schools to realize the need for women to have the opportunity for a full four year Catholic High School Education. Now as they celebrate the 75th Anniversary of St. Edmund Elementary School nearly four hundred boys and girls continue to celebrate a solid education in this parish school. Today the community's children continue to study in a faith filled community as they are given the tools needed to enter the new millennium.

For years, families have know this school as a living monument in the community, making

it a good place to study. I am certain that the strength of this community would not be what it is today without the commitment of this school. I am honored to congratulate the members of the St. Edmund's Elementary School for making it a source of community pride for the past 75 years.

TAX LIMITATION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1998

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I fully support H.J. Res. 111, which calls for an amendment to the United States Constitution prohibiting passage of tax increases without a two-thirds majority in each house of Congress, except in emergency cases such as military conflict. I have voted for it in the past, am a cosponsor, and am committed to passing the strongest tax limitation amendment possible.

Opponents claim, and will continue to claim, that constitutional amendments on taxing and spending make it harder to operate government as we know it. That is exactly the point—fiscal reality proves to us that we need an instrument, a tool, to control government spending and limit raising taxes.

The Federal Government has run deficits for over 25 years in a row, and for 56 of the last 64 years. This is not a short-termed trend, and points to a fundamental flaw in the political system that makes a constitutional solution both necessary and appropriate. Last year, Congress passed the historic Balanced Budget Agreement as a first step toward fiscal discipline. However, only nine months later, Congress is already breaking the transportation spending caps by $34 billion inviting criticism that fiscal discipline was just a fad for Congress. We need to pass H.J. Res. 111 to renew our commitment to fiscal discipline. Otherwise, irresponsible spending and higher federal taxes will continue to own us, cripple our economy and mortgage our children's future. Congress needs the legal and moral authority of a Constitutional amendment making it more difficult to raise taxes.

This Congress cannot afford to alienate our constituents by failing to pass this crucial legislation. I urge my colleagues to join us in restoring fiscal responsibility to this institution today, not tomorrow, and not next year.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, April 28, 1998, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 29

9:00 a.m.
Finance
To continue oversight hearings to examine the operation of the Internal Revenue Service.
SH–216

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1999 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Army programs.
SD–192

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1260, to limit the conduct of securities class actions under State law by setting national standards for stocks that are traded on the national markets, and S. 1900, to establish a commission to examine issues pertaining to the disposition of Holocaust-era assets in the United States before, during, and after World War II, and to make recommendations to the President on further action, and to consider the nomination of Donna Tanoue, of Hawaii, to be a Member and Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
SD–538

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings to examine proposed legislation relating to assistive technology.
SD–430

10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine opportunities for the blackmarket to raise tobacco prices.
SD–226

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
Closed business meeting, on intelligence matters.
SH–219

APRIL 30

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine agricultural transportation issues.
SR–332

Finance
To continue oversight hearings to examine the operation of the Internal Revenue Service.
SH–216

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1999 for the Envrionmental Protection Agency.
SD–138

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1999 for the United States Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.
SD–124

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nominations of James M. Loy, USC, to be Commandant, and James C. Card, USC, to be Vice Commandant, both of the United States Coast Guard.
SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1253, to provide to the Federal land management agencies the authority and capability to manage effectively the federal lands in accordance with the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.
SD–366

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up H.R. 1151, to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to clarify existing law and ratify the longstanding policy of the National Credit Union Administration Board with regard to field of membership of Federal credit unions.
SD–538

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SR–253

Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD–226

11:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Public Health and Safety Subcommittee
To resume hearings to examine the role of the Agency for Health Care Policy Research in health care quality.
SD–430

2:00 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Airport Improvement Program.
SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources
National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on title IV of S. 1693, to renew, reform, reinvigorate, and protect the National Park System, and S. 624, to establish a competitive process for the awarding of concession contracts in units of the National Park System.
SD–366

2:30 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.
SH–219

MAY 1

9:00 a.m.
Finance
To continue oversight hearings to examine the operation of the Internal Revenue Service.
SH–216

MAY 5

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1253, to provide to the Federal land management agencies the authority and capability to manage effectively the federal lands in accordance with the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.
SD–366

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1999 for foreign assistance programs.
Room to be announced

2:00 p.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Children and Families Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for Community Services Block Grant programs.
SD–430

MAY 6

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1999 for the Department of Defense, focusing on the U.S. Pacific Command.
SD–192

Indian Affairs
To resume hearings to examine the status of tribal sovereign immunity and the role its plays to preserve the Federal Government's protection of tribal self-government, and its impact on Indian economic development, commercial dealings, and taxation, focusing on S. 1691, to provide for for Indian legal reform.
Room to be announced

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 94and H.R. 449, bills to provide for the orderly disposal of Federal lands in Nevada, and for the acquisition of certain environmentally sensitive lands in Nevada.
SD–366

MAY 7

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine agricultural trade policies.
SR–332

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1999 for the National Science Foundation, and the Office of Science and Technology.
SD–138

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1999 for the Executive Office of the President.
SD–192

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on titles VI, VII, VIII, and XI of S. 1693, to renew, reform, reinvigorate, and protect the National Park System.
SD–366

MAY 11

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1999 for the Department of Defense.
SD–192

MAY 12

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to revise the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988, focusing on lands into trust for purposes of gaming.
Room to be announced

2:00 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on S. 1868, to express United States foreign policy with respect to, and to strengthen United States advocacy on behalf of, individuals persecuted for their faith worldwide, to authorize United States actions in response to religious persecution worldwide, to establish an Ambassador at Large on International Religious Freedom within the Department of State, a Commission on International Religious Persecution, and a Special Adviser on International Religious Freedom within the National Security Council.
SD–419

MAY 13

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1999 for the Department of Defense.
SD–192

MAY 14

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings on the Department of Agriculture's Year 2000 compliance.
SR–332

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on titles IX and X of S. 1693, to renew, reform, reinvigorate, and protect the National Park System, and S. 1614, to require a permit for the making of motion picture, television program, or other forms of commercial visual depiction in a unit of the National Park System or National Wildlife Refuge System.
SD–366

MAY 20

10:00 a.m.
Indian Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1691, to provide for Indian legal reform.
SR–485

MAY 21

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development, Production and Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1141, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to take into account newly developed renewable energy- based fuels and to equalize alternative fuel vehicle acquisition incentives to increase the flexibility of controlled fleet owners and operators, and S. 1418, to promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration, and development of methane hydrate resources.
SD–366

OCTOBER 6

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the legislative recommendations of the American Legion.
345 Cannon Building

POSTPONEMENTS

APRIL 28

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to reform bankruptcy law provisions.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1999 for the United States Agency for International Development.
SD–192

APRIL 29

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To resume hearings to examine Indian gaming issues.
Room to be announced

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine satellite reform, focusing on regulation policy and deregulation.
SR–253

APRIL 30

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on S. 1645, to prohibit taking minors across State lines to avoid laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.
SD–22

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3601–S3664

Measures Introduced: Four bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1989–1992 and S. Res. 217 and 218. **Page S3653**

Measures Passed:

Authorizing Representation by Legal Counsel: Senate agreed to S. Res. 218, to authorize testimony, production of Senate documents, and representation by Senate Legal Counsel in civil case. **Page S3663**

Treaty Considered: Senate began consideration of the Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on Accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, with seven declarations and four conditions, taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows: **Pages S3603–45**

Pending:

Kyl Amendment No. 2310, to establish principles of policy of the United States toward the Strategic Concept of NATO. **Pages S3624–45**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the Treaty on Tuesday, April 28, 1998. **Page S3663**

Job Training Partnership Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for the consideration of S. 1186, to provide for education and training, and certain amendments to be proposed thereto. **Pages S3662–63**

Appointments:

Air Force Academy Board of Visitors: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), appointed the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy: Senator Kempthorne, from the Committee on Armed Services, and Senator Burns, from the Committee on Appropriations. **Page S3663**

Military Academy Board of Visitors: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), appointed the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy: Senator Coats, from the Committee on Armed Services, and Senator Hutchison, from the Committee on Appropriations. **Page S3663**

Naval Academy Board of Visitors: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), appointed the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy: Senator McCain, from the Committee on Armed Services, and Senator Cochran, from the Committee on Appropriations. **Page S3663**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting the report concerning the national emergency with respect to narcotics traffickers centered in Columbia; referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–117). **Pages S3652–53**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By unanimous vote of 92 yeas (Vote No. 104 EX), Scott Snyder Fleming, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Legislation and Congressional Affairs, Department of Education. **Pages S3646–48**

Garr M. King, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

Gregory Moneta Sleet, of Delaware, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware.

Cherryl T. Thomas, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term expiring August 28, 2002. **Page S3646**

Messages From the President: **Pages S3652–53**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S3654–55**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S3656**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S3657–58**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S3658**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3658–62**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—104) **Page S3646**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 11 a.m., and adjourned at 7:07 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Tuesday,

April 28, 1998. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3663.)

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 1 public bill, H.R. 3733, was introduced. **Page H2331**

Reports Filed: One report was filed as follows:

H.R. 1872, to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, and for other purposes.

Amended (H. Rept. 105–494). **Page H2331**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Nethercutt to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2321**

Mexico-United States Parliamentary Group: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of Representative Kolbe, Chairman, and Representative Gilman, Vice Chairman to the Mexico-United States Parliamentary Group. **Page H2321**

Canada-United States Parliamentary Group: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of Representative Houghton, Chairman, to the Canada-United States Parliamentary Group. **Page H2321**

Presidential Message—Re Narcotics Traffickers: Read a message from the President concerning the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia—referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 105–241). **Pages H2322–23**

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H2321.

Referral: S. Con. Res. 90, to acknowledge the Historic Northern Ireland Peace Agreement, was referred to the Committee on International Relations. **Page H2327**

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H2331–33.

Quorum Calls—Votes: No quorum calls or recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today.

Adjournment: Met at 2:00 p.m. and adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No Committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1998

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on the Budget, to hold hearings to examine Japan's economic difficulties and their potential United States impact, 10 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, to hold hearings to examine possible problems relating to the Year 2000 computer conversion, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space, to hold hearings to examine the Department of Commerce's Federal research and development needs, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management, to hold hearings on S. 326, to provide for the reclamation of abandoned hardrock mines, S. 327, to ensure that Federal taxpayers receive a fair return for the extraction of locatable minerals on public domain lands, and S. 1102, to provide a reasonable royalty from mineral activities on Federal lands, to specify reclamation requirements for mineral activities on Federal lands, and to create a State program for the reclamation of abandoned hard rock mining sites on Federal lands, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance, to hold oversight hearings to examine the operation of the Internal Revenue Service, 9 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on the Judiciary, to hold hearings on S.J. Res. 44, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect the rights of crime victims, 2 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Labor and Human Resources, to hold hearings to examine reading and literacy initiatives, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Small Business, to hold hearings to examine environmental compliance tools for small business, 10 a.m., SR–428A.

NOTICE

For a listing of Senate committee meetings scheduled ahead, see pages E676–77 in today's Record.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, on Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission and the National Mediation Board, 10 a.m., and on the National Commission on Libraries and the Armed Forces Retirement Home 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, hearing on European Monetary Union, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth, and Families, hearing on Understanding Violent Children, 2 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on American Worker Project: Impact of Federal Workplace Agencies, Programs, and Laws on the American Worker, 2 p.m., 2261 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Subcommittee on Civil Service, hearing on FEHB Program as a Complement to Military Health Care, 2:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, oversight hearing on health care initiatives pursued under the False Claims Act that impact hospitals, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, hearing on the following: H.R. 1865, Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act of 1997; H.R. 3186, Rogue River National Forest Interchange Act of 1998; H.R. 3187, to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to exempt not-for-profit entities that hold rights-of-way on public lands from certain strict liability requirements imposed in connection with such rights-of-way; H.R. 3520, to adjust the boundaries of the Lake Chelan National Recreation Area and the adjacent Wenatchee National Forest in the State of Washington; and a measure to permit the Forest Service to sell their office in Medford, OR in order to fund an add-on to the Bureau of Land Management Medford District Office so they can co-locate, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands and Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, joint hearing on H.R. 2800, Battle of Midway National Memorial Study Act, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, hearing on H.R. 3220, to authorize the use of certain land in Merced County, California, for an elementary school, following joint Subcommittee meeting, 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to consider the following: H.R. 6, Higher Education Amendments of 1998; H.R. 3717, to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds for the distribution of needles or syringes for the hypodermic injection of illegal drugs; and H.R. 3546, National Dialogue on Social Security Act of 1998; and H.R. 3546, National Dialogue on Social Security Act of 1998, 2 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Technology, oversight hearing on International Standards: Technical Barriers to Free Trade, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, to continue hearings on proposals for a Water Resources Development Act of 1998, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Joint Meetings

Joint Economic Committee, to hold hearings to examine Chinese access to dual use and military technology, focusing on a GAO report on the effectiveness of Tianemen sanctions restricting technology transfer, 10 a.m., 2220 Rayburn Building.

Conferees, on H.R. 2400, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn Building.

Conferees, on H.R. 3579, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, 2 p.m., S–5, Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Tuesday, April 28

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: After the recognition of three Senators for speeches and the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 10:45 a.m.), Senate will continue consideration of Treaty Doc. 105–36, NATO Enlargement Treaty.

At 2:25 p.m., Senate will vote on the conference report on H.R. 1757, State Department Reorganization.

(Senate will recess from 12:45. p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:30 p.m., Tuesday, April 28

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: The House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and at 2:00 p.m. for consideration of 8 Suspensions:

1. H.R. 2807—Rhino and Tiger Product Labeling Act;
2. H. Res. 350—Congratulating the People of Sri Lanka on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of their Nation's Independence;
3. H. Con. Res. 218—Concerning the Need to Establish a Cease Fire in Afghanistan and Begin the Transition toward a Broad-based Multiethnic Government that Observes International Norms of Behavior;
4. S. Con. Res. 37—Expressing the Sense of the Congress that Little League Baseball Incorporated was Established to Support and Develop Little League Baseball Worldwide and Should be Entitled to all of the Benefits and Privileges Available to Nongovernmental International Organizations;
5. H. Res. 374—Expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives Regarding the Ongoing Violence in Algeria;
6. H. Con. Res. 222—Congratulating the Former International Support and Verification Commission of the Organization of American States for Successfully Aiding in the Transition of Nicaragua from a War-ridden State into a Newly Formed Democracy;
7. H. Con. Res. 215—Congratulating the People of the Cooperative Republic of Guyana for Holding Multiparty Elections; and
8. H.J. Res. 102—Expressing the Sense of the Congress on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Founding of the Modern State of Israel.

NOTE: *No recorded votes are expected before 5:00 p.m.*

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Castle, Michael N., Del., E673, E675
Clayton, Eva M., N.C., E673
Schumer, Charles E., N.Y., E674
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E673
Stokes, Louis, Ohio, E674

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $150.00 for six months, $295.00 per year, or purchased for $2.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.