United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1998 No. 49

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable TIM HUTCHINSON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, life can be simply awful or awfully simple. Today, we choose the awfully simple but sublime secret of a great day: Your work, done on Your power, achieves Your results on Your timing. We reject the simplistic idea that things work out, and ask You, dear Lord, to work out things. Before us is a new day filled with more to do than we can accomplish on our own strength. You have given us the power of inspired imagination to envision a day in which what is truly important gets done. Help us to move expeditiously through today's work, to listen to You and each other, and to make guided decisions. Pull our anchors out of the mud of combative competition, lift our sails, and remind us that it is Your set of our sails, and not the gales, that determines where we will go.

Lord, we believe that the work we will do this day is crucial for our Nation. This is the day You have given. We intend to live to the fullest with Your guidance, by Your power, and for Your glory. In the name of the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, April 28, 1998.

To The Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TIM HUTCHINSON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
President pro tempore

Mr. HUTCHINSON thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this morning the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:45 a.m. Following morning business, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the treaty on NATO enlargement. Senator HARKIN will then be recognized to offer an amendment regarding U.S. costs.

Under the previous order, there will be 2 hours equally divided for debate on the amendment. At 12:45 p.m., the Senate will recess until 2:15 p.m., to allow the weekly party caucuses to meet.

When the Senate reconvenes at 2:15, there will be 10 minutes of debate equally divided for closing remarks on the State Department Reauthorization Conference Report. Following that debate, at 2:25 p.m., the Senate will proceed to the first of two stacked rollcall votes. The first vote will be on the adoption of the State Department Conference Report, to be immediately followed by a vote on or in relation to the Harkin amendment. Members should expect further rollcall votes throughout Tuesday's session on amendments to NATO enlargement, or any other legislative or executive items cleared for action.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 10:45 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Maine is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS and Mr. FEINGOLD pertaining to the introduction of S. 1993 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Ms. COLLINS. If there is no other Senator seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this morning the front page of the Washington Post has an article that says, ''Interest Rate Fears Drive Stocks Down.'' The article makes the point that the Dow Jones average tumbled 147 points yesterday. And John Berry, in the

● 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

Post, who writes a fair amount about the Fed and about economic news, says the analysts on Wall Street indicate there was a strong concern by investors that the long-running bull market might be nearing a peak and that the Federal Reserve Board is looking at the potential of increasing interest rates.

It is interesting to me that it is a front page story that the stock market is down 147 points. The fact is the Dow Jones industrial average is nearly 9,000. It is a stock market that has increased dramatically. We have had up days of 70 points, 90 points, 120 points. It is not surprising that we will have downturns in the market of 140 points or more when you have a market that is over 9,000 in the Dow Jones industrial average.

But what surprises me is the notion somehow that the Federal Reserve Board somewhere behind closed doors at a March 19 meeting indicated that, gee, they were concerned that the economy was growing too fast and that maybe American workers are making too much money. They are concerned that maybe too many people in this country are employed.

There is no amount of good news that will not give the economists down in the Fed a bellyache for a week or two. There is no amount of good news that does not cause them great concern. ''Gosh, the economy is doing well, so we better have a heartache about how well the economy is doing.'' It is interesting to me that the Fed has been consistently wrong. I know there are people in this Chamber who will stand up and say, the Fed ought to be credited with the good economic news in this country. In fact, just the opposite is the case.

The Fed has been consistently wrong about this economy. They indicated time after time after time that if unemployment ever went below 6 percent we were going to be in huge trouble, we were going to see the new fires of inflation stoke up. Well, unemployment went below 6 percent and has stayed below 6 percent. We have not seen new waves of inflation. The Federal Reserve Board has just missed the fact that the global economy has put downward pressure on wages in this country.

But having said that, the Federal Reserve Board now has short-term interest rates higher than it ought to be, higher historically than it should be by a full half a percent. This means the prime rate is higher than it ought to be and higher than it historically would be given the rate of inflation of well over 1 percent at this point. Yet, they are talking about maybe increasing interest rates down at the Federal Reserve Board.

What on Earth can they be thinking? I mean, if the job of the Federal Reserve Board is to simply slow down the economy, my uncle can do that. There are five or six people in my hometown who can do that. We do not have to pay them a lot of money to do that. What can they be thinking? Too many people are working? We are starting to see maybe some increases in some salaries at the bottom of the economic scale?

I would say to the Federal Reserve Board, if you have a lot of time on your hands, take off those gray coats you wear from those gray suits you wear to work every day and start thinking about bank mergers. Maybe start thinking of what the CEOs make at the top—not workers at the bottom, and wonder what it does to the economy.

The Fed should be talking about the biggest bank mergers in the history of this country. What does it mean for consumers that all of the biggest banks of this country are getting together and deciding there is so much romance going on in the financial industry and they would like to marry up?

The Federal Reserve keeps a list down there called the ''too-big-to-fail'' list. That is a list of the biggest banks in the country that will never be allowed to fail because the consequences of their failure would be too catastrophic for the economy. So they have the too-big-to-fail list.

As more and more banks merge, of course, that list gets bigger, and it means the risks of the merger will be borne by the American taxpayer. So this monopoly game played by American giants passes off its risk to the American taxpayer.

So I say to the Federal Reserve Board, if you have lots of time on your hands, don't sit around scratching your heads and increasing interest rates, when the short-term Federal funds rate is already higher than is justified, given the rate of inflation. Start thinking about what these bank mergers do to the American economy. Start asking yourself why—if you keep a list that is called ''too-big-to-fail,'' why in this economy do family farmers out there face a risk of serious financial problems right now? And they seem to be, in the eyes of the Fed, and others, too small to matter? Why is it that some are too big to fail and others, who are critical of this country's success, somehow too small to matter?

I would just say to the Fed—when I read this story this morning, I wondered again about those we hire to do monetary policy and who think about economic policy. What they can be thinking about when they suggest—and have now for about 3 years—that any good economic news in this country is somehow a step backwards.

I just ask the Fed to understand this economy is doing quite well, notwithstanding the Fed's advice. And there is no justification—none—for this Federal Reserve Board to be considering increasing interest rates.

The Federal funds rate at the moment is historically higher than it should be, given the rate of inflation. If they take any action at the Fed, it ought to be to decrease the Federal funds rate to where it ought to be, given the current rate of inflation which, incidentally, is almost nonexistent.

THE AGENDA OF THE SENATE

Mr. DORGAN. Now, Mr. President, just a couple final points.

The agenda of the Senate—I was talking here about the agenda of the Federal Reserve Board, something I do not control. I guess the same is probably true with respect to the agenda of the Senate, because the majority leader controls the agenda of the Senate. He determines what to bring to the floor of the Senate for debate, and the agenda for the U.S. Senate is a very important agenda.

In front of us in the coming weeks I hope will be the following pieces of legislation, some of which are already very, very late. The so-called highway bill or ISTEA bill which is very important. It should have been passed last year. It is now in conference. We need to get that and get it done. It is important for this country, an investment of roads and infrastructure.

The tobacco bill. We have just passed a tobacco bill out of the Senate Commerce Committee. It should be ready to come to the floor of the Senate. I hope it is done sooner rather than later. A supplemental disaster bill—that bill has been passed for some while, and the Senate is now in conference. In fact, I am a conferee. We will have a conference at 2 o'clock this afternoon. That ought to be done. There is no excuse, especially with respect to the disaster funds, for further delay. That ought not sit there waiting. This Congress has a responsibility to get that work done and bring it to the floor of the Senate.

Another important issue that we want brought to the floor of the Senate as soon as possible is the Patients Bill of Rights, which deals with managed care and the abuses that are occurring in managed care in this country.

Those are just a handful of bills we want to be brought to the Senate floor soon. Some of them have already been through the Senate and have been languishing in conference. The highway bill, for example, the supplemental disaster bill, others, need to come to the floor so we can make some progress on them.

I ask the majority leader and all others on both sides of the aisle in the Senate that we do our work and do it on time and tell the American people that things like investment in infrastructure, building roads, repairing bridges, and the kind of things done in this important highway bill get done on time. They were supposed to have been done last year. It is now getting towards May of this year. It is in conference. A very, very important piece of legislation. I hope it is brought to the floor of the Senate soon.

One more point. The tobacco legislation is very important. Some, I know, want to stall on that legislation, but we reported it out of the Commerce Committee under the leadership of Senator MCCAIN. That piece of legislation, I think, because of the short year that we were involved with that piece

of legislation, should be brought to the floor of the Senate as soon as possible. The later that it is brought to the floor of the Senate, the less likely it is that Congress will get its work done on the tobacco bill. I ask the majority leader, bring the tobacco bill to the floor of the U.S. Senate, and let's get it done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). Under the previous order, the hour of 10 a.m. having arrived, the Senator from Indiana, Mr. COATS, is recognized to speak for up to 45 minutes.

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

(The remarks of Mr. COATS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. BROWNBACK pertaining to the introduction of S. 1994 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

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 privilege order, the Senate will now go into executive session to resume 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 Accession of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

The Senate resumed consideration of the treaty.

Pending:

Kyl amendment No. 2310, to establish principles of policy of the United States toward the Strategic Concept of NATO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 10:45 having arrived, the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN, is recognized to offer an amendment on which there shall be 2 hours of debate equally divided.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

EXECUTIVE AMENDMENT NO. 2312

(Purpose: To limit any United States subsidy of the national expenses of Poland, Hungary, or the Czech Republic in meeting its NATO commitments)

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] proposes an executive amendment numbered 2312.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

In section 3(2)(A), strike ''and'' at the end of clause (ii).

In section 3(2)(A), strike ''(iii)'' and insert ''(iv)''.

In section 3(2)(A), insert after clause (ii) the following:

(iii) any future United States subsidy of the national expenses of Poland, Hungary, or the Czech Republic to meet its NATO commitments, including the assistance described in subparagraph (C), may not exceed 25 percent of all assistance provided to that country by all NATO members.

At the end of section 3(2), insert the following new subparagraph:

(C) ADDITIONAL UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE DESCRIBED.—The assistance referred to in subparagraph (A)(iii) includes—

(i) Foreign Military Financing under the Arms Export Control Act;

(ii) transfers of excess defense articles under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(iii) Emergency Drawdowns;

(iv) no-cost leases of United States equipment;

(v) the subsidy cost of loan guarantees and other contingent liabilities under subchapter VI of chapter 148 of title 10, United States Code; and

(vi) international military education and training under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I will yield myself such time as I may consume for opening comments and then reserve some time for others on the amendment.

Mr. President, we are, as the Senate and the country now know, debating the issue of whether or not the Senate will advise and consent to the President's signature on a proposal to bring three more nations into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

While I was not present yesterday in this Chamber, I did watch some of the debate that unfolded yesterday, and I think the debate is taking a good course of action. The debate yesterday was a good debate. I hope that the debate today will continue along those lines. In other words, what I mean by that is not just people giving a speech and then walking off the floor but where we can actually engage one another in asking and answering questions about the implications of the NATO treaty.

So I hope that will be the course of action during the Senate's responsibility to advise and consent here.

Mr. President, I want to make some extended remarks about the whole picture of NATO expansion, but I will just talk very briefly right now about the amendment I sent to the desk.

Basically, I think one of the most important issues facing us on NATO expansion is what it is going to cost, what it will cost the taxpayers of this country. So what I have sent to the desk is an amendment that will hopefully clear this up a little bit and provide for an accurate accounting of all of the expenses incident to the expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. And I will have more to say about that a little bit later.

Concerns about the extension of our military obligations—and let's again be frank about this; NATO is a military alliance—have been voiced by Senators and interest groups, academics across the political spectrum, and when the voices expressing caution include Republicans and Democrats and progressives and conservatives, libertarians and others, such a diverse opposition may be a sign that we ought to really act very deliberately and deliberatively on this issue. So I am glad the debate has finally begun, and as I said, I am delighted with the course of action in the debate.

At the outset, I hope the Senate would not simply rubber stamp this bill that we have before us. We have a constitutional responsibility to both advise and consent on treaties. This is a responsibility that is taken seriously by every Senator and ought to because, as you know, under our Constitution a treaty overrides the Constitution. So anytime we advise and consent on a treaty, we are advising and consenting on a document that basically overrides much of our Constitution. So we have to be very careful about this.

There are important issues to consider in NATO expansion—burdensharing, command and coordination, responses to real and perceived threats, even the basic questions of mission and scope of the organization itself. They are not simple questions that lend themselves to a simple, sound bite debate. These questions and their answers will shape for better or worse our defense and foreign policy options for decades to come.

There is no doubt that NATO has been one of the greatest military alliance success stories in our Nation's history. And, again, at the outset we have to ask the question. Here is an organization founded in 1949 shortly after the end of the Second World War—the Second World War in this century—when 12 countries signed the North Atlantic treaty to establish the military alliance known as NATO.

Now, let's face it. The reason for NATO was the Soviet Union. The reason for being in that alliance, and also to preserve the nations of Europe together, was to preclude any possibility of cross-border excursions by European countries. The treaty had as its goal ''to unite their efforts for collective defense and the preservation of peace and security in Europe.''

Four nations have been added. Spain, the most recent, joined in 1982. So, again, it has been a success. It has kept the peace in Europe for nearly 50 years, both by deterring aggression by the Warsaw Pact and by encouraging cooperation between its members.

I must say, due to the commitment of its members and the leadership of the United States, NATO has largely fulfilled the reason for its very birth—the demise of the Soviet Union. So we have to, I think, at the outset, say, if something was born because of the Soviet Union and it has succeeded, what,

then, are the reasons not only for continuing it but for expanding it? And, subsequently, are there better and other ways in which we can fulfill other goals, such as democracy, economic progress, market-based economies, and integration of the countries of Europe into one economic entity?

So, what role will NATO play in a new century? And what is the cost going to be in financial terms? And what is the cost going to be in other less tangible areas, like the potential for strained relations with nonmember nations? Or what will the cost be in a dangerous rollback, perhaps, of nuclear arms control and nonproliferation progress made since the end of the cold war?

By the administration's own admission, ''Enlargement will take place in a European security environment in which there is no current threat of large-scale conventional aggression and where any such threat would take years to develop.'' This is from the administration's own admission. There is no current threat and any threat would take years to develop. In response to questions from many Senators, the administration reiterated this point when they wrote, ''Current members and prospective new members face no imminent threat of attack.''

This seems to be one of the few issues on NATO expansion where we can find wide consensus. There is no large-scale external threat, including Russia. They just don't exist. The administration's expectation for the role of an expanded NATO include:

No. 1, helping to deter future threats; No. 2, expanding our collective defense capabilities to respond to both traditional and nontraditional security challenges; and, No. 3, helping to support and stabilize emerging democracies. I agree that these are goals that the United States should pursue. They are worthwhile goals. But again I ask, is NATO the proper framework in which to accomplish these goals?

Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic have legitimate concerns about protecting their borders and their national sovereignty. After all, they persevered through a century of invasions and decades of outside control by a large and powerful neighbor. But, again, let me also say that I remember when I happened to be in Moscow shortly after the Berlin Wall came down and the Soviet Union was breaking up, I remember one of the Russian Members of the Duma telling me that, ''You think you were the victims of the Soviet Union. You think Europe was the victim of the Soviet Union,'' he said. ''We Russians were the biggest victims of the Communist Soviet Union.''

So we have to think about it in that context also; of Russia, and of them coming out from underneath the yoke of a Soviet Communist empire. Think about Russia, also, in terms of its history, when it has gone, also, through a century of invasions and decades of control by a power not necessarily of Russian being.

I learned a lot about what countries in this region had endured. Last year I attended the dedication of the National Czech and Slovak Museum in Cedar Rapids, IA.

It is interesting. I was there with President Clinton and Ambassador Madeleine Albright, who was then-Ambassador to the United Nations, President Vaclav Havel of the Czech Republic, and President Kovac of the Republic of Slovakia.

Again, these people of these nations have shown a commitment and resilience to the democratic ideals during the economic and political transition. They are working in concert with the community of nations and peacekeeping operations in Bosnia, in Iraq also. I want to commend and recognize their efforts. That is all well and good. But is that a reason to expand NATO?

I am not convinced it is the most appropriate vehicle that we can use to get the goals of security, stability, political reform, and economic integration with the West sought by these newly free countries.

I am really worried we are buying into a mentality that has its roots in the cold war, and not the mentality that is looking ahead to the next century. Yes, it is true that Europe has sustained decades, almost a century, of warfare, invasions, domination and oppression by the people of Eastern Europe. This approach to foreign policy would be appropriate if the world climate was similar to what it was, say, before World War II. But the world has changed.

To those who say that, well, we can have another cross-border invasion by a country in Europe against another country, even the administration admits this is not going to happen. This would not happen for years. It would take years for anything like this to develop. You are not about to see any headlines exclaiming that Russian troops are marching toward Poland or Czechoslovakia.

The czars are gone. The Third Reich is gone. Germany is united as a democracy. Again, we need to reorient ourselves to the realities of the 21st century where the security threats are not czars and Hitlers and people like that, but are more likely to be rogue nations, international terrorists, and, as we have seen again in Europe, internal ethnic clashes.

For example, the security threat of most concern to Europe now is Bosnia and Kosovo. There is also the so-called nontraditional threat—terrorism, chemical, biological weapons. Again, we need to consider, is NATO the best way to deal with these challenges? But my primary concern now, and with this amendment, is the cost.

In February of 1997, the administration estimated the total cost of between $27 to $35 billion, of which the U.S. share would be $1.5 to $2 billion.

In December, NATO released their own study with the astonishingly low total cost estimate of $1.5 billion. Well, then the Clinton administration revised their initial projections down to reflect the NATO estimate of $1.5 billion.

Some would argue that comparing these numbers is like comparing apples and oranges—I heard that—because of the different assumptions and scenarios. But I would argue that is exactly the point. We do not have any consensus or concrete ideas on what posture NATO will take in the future and at what cost.

I have a chart here that shows basically the varying cost estimates so we get an idea of just how widely divergent they are. NATO, as I said, estimates $1.5 billion. The Clinton administration initially, as I said, came in last year—a year ago—at $27 to $35 billion. Now the administration says it is $1.5 billion. They just picked up the NATO estimate. CBO has given us a range of $21 to $125 billion. The Rand Corporation says it is $10 to $110 billion.

As I said, the first Clinton administration estimate was $27 billion to $35 billion—to $1.5 billion. So we go from $1.5 billion to $125 billion.

Where is it? How much of this will the U.S. taxpayers have to pick up? The GAO issued a report late last fall, the title of which explains my concerns and the reason for this amendment. It says, ''NATO Enlargement Cost Implications for the United States Remain Unclear.''

Now, much of the uncertainty is because—a quote from the GAO report—''It will not be until June of 1998 that NATO will make decisions about whether or how much to increase the common budgets which would then be shared among current and new members. Until this has been done, the implications for the U.S. contributions to NATO's common budgets will be unclear.''

Now, again, this is one reason why several other Senators and I asked for a delay in voting on NATO expansion. I felt and some others felt that we should have delayed this until this summer. We are not going to get this NATO estimate until at least June of this year. So why should we be voting on a blank check for the American taxpayer before we have the data? What is the rush? Why could we not wait until this summer until we get the NATO decisions on how much they want to increase their common budgets?

The same GAO report went on to discuss the financing for commonly funded items, such as the needed infrastructure to send reinforcements to new allies in times of crisis, communications systems, or interoperability with NATO's air defense system. None has been agreed to yet. None of it has been agreed upon yet.

Again, from the GAO report: ''Whether they will be financed within existing budgets or by increasing the size of NATO's common budgets will not be determined until June of 1998.''

That is from the GAO report.

I am hopeful that the managers of the bill would engage with us in discussing why we would go ahead with this before we have this data that NATO will come up with in June of 1998. So that is a missing piece of the puzzle right there.

Another piece of the puzzle we are missing is how new members are to address their military shortfalls. The countries' force goals will not be set again until this spring. In other words, we are without a plan to address the force goals and the price tag associated with it.

Again, I and others are uncomfortable signing the American taxpayers' names to a potentially ballooning blank check, so that is a second part of this puzzle that I believe is missing.

The GAO concluded that while DOD's key assumptions were reasonable, their ''cost estimates'' are speculative. ''NATO enlargement could entail costs in addition to those included in DOD's estimate, including costs for assistance to enhance the PFP or other bilateral assistance for countries not invited to join NATO in July 1997.''

So, in other words, it is not just those countries invited to join. What about the cost for assistance and other vital assistance for all of the other countries not invited to join in July 1997?

Mr. BIDEN. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I would be delighted to yield.

Mr. BIDEN. Wouldn't the Senator acknowledge the example he just gave has nothing to do with any commitment that is being undertaken by the expansion of NATO now? It is unrelated. We may or may not through the program which the opponents of expansion constantly point to—the Partnership for Peace, as what we should have stuck with—we may or may not do that. But passage of the expansion of NATO for these three countries in no way affects the point of whether or not we give assistance to Romania or we give assistance to any other country questioned. Is that not correct?

Mr. HARKIN. Well——

Mr. BIDEN. I respectfully suggest the answer is yes.

Mr. HARKIN. Well, wait a second. I do not think the answer is yes. What GAO said is NATO enlargement could entail costs in addition to those countries in the Partnership for Peace, for example, others who may not be invited to NATO but because of the enlargement of NATO there may be other costs incidental and associated with it. That is what they are saying.

Does the Senator say absolutely there will be no other costs associated to PFP countries when NATO is enlarged?

Mr. BIDEN. If the Senator will yield, the answer is I am saying there is no obligation we undertake. The Senator sits on the Appropriations Committee. The Senator will have to make an individual judgment as each of the items come before him whether he wishes to do it.

For example, we are going to have, and right now the President has sent up within the last 3 months a request for additional equipment for Turkey, additional military equipment for Greece. Now, they have nothing to do with our common budget in NATO, zero.

Now, the Senator sits on the Appropriations Committee. He can come to the floor, and on foreign military sales of those countries, he can say no, we don't want to do that, and we can vote against it. It is irrelevant. It has nothing to do with whether or not Poland is a member of NATO or the Czech Republic is a member of NATO.

What the Defense Department means, I respectfully suggest, is the following; that with NATO, with the additional three countries in NATO, we may conclude that our defenses would be further enhanced, bilaterally enhanced, U.S. interests enhanced if we gave more money, more for military sales to Romania or to the Baltics or somewhere else. But it has nothing to do—nothing to do, zero—with whether or not we expand NATO. Zero, nothing.

The Senator from Virginia is on the floor, a strong opponent of expansion. He knows that the Armed Services Committee has no obligation to send foreign military sales which we subsidize to Greece or Turkey, yet he votes for it. But it has nothing to do with NATO, zero. Nothing to do with NATO, zero. It is not part of NATO's common budget, common budget.

The only thing, I respectfully suggest to my colleague, that we are committing ourselves to with the expansion of NATO is that we will continue to participate roughly 25 percent of the cost of the common budget of NATO. The things that the DOD referenced and what my friend from Iowa is talking about have zero to do with the common budget.

There is a chart here, ''budget cost-sharing formula, in percentage of total NATO common budget.'' I will later in the day go into great detail, because I think one of the great misnomers here is how the NATO is funded. I am not speaking to my friend from Iowa, who knows this area very well because he serves on the Appropriations Committee. But many of us who do not serve on the Appropriations Committee or Armed Services Committee don't necessarily understand the details of how the NATO budget is constructed. There are three common budgets. I will not go into it now. But they are the things that all 16 NATO nations reach into their pockets and pay for. They are not the national budgets.

The national budget, my friend on the authorizing committee—both my friends stand here on the Armed Services Committee—in the national budget we decide whether or not out of our military budget we are going to help Greece beyond the common budget, whether we are going to help Turkey beyond the common budget, whether we are going to help Chile beyond the common budget, whether we will spend money in Korea beyond, and it has nothing to do with the common budget of NATO.

So what happens here is we are taking great big apples and putting them in baskets of small oranges. We talk about mixing apples and oranges. The reason why the numbers, which I will go into in great detail later, range from $125 billion to $1.5 billion is that we are counting the wrong things.

So the issue here, and we will get a chance to talk about this in detail, what is NATO's—and I know my friend from Virginia knows this well—what is the common budget of NATO? And what are we committing ourselves to spend in addition to what we are now spending on the common budget of NATO because these three countries are going to be added—if they are added, if we prevail?

So, that is the issue. With all due respect, my friend is mixing apples and oranges here when he refers to the DOD saying we might in the future decide to spend more money. It has nothing to do with any obligation we are taking on as a consequence of expanding NATO.

I thank my colleague. I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. I would like to respond, but I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa controls the time and the time has been running on his side.

Mr. HARKIN. I had 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Correct; the Senator has 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my distinguished colleague.

First, I want to say what a pleasure it is to sit and listen to a well-informed presentation on a very important amendment. Indeed, I will, in the course of the day, engage in another detailed colloquy with my friend on this.

I point out when you mention the Armed Services Committee, authorizing committee, I think the Senator should reconsider. It is your committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, that authorizes the level of assistance on matters like this, as opposed to the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BIDEN. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. A small matter, but I wanted to make——

Mr. BIDEN. We are so accustomed to other committees stealing our jurisdiction that it was a slip of the tongue.

Mr. WARNER. It is well-taken. At every opportunity the Armed Services Committee will do that.

Your question is correct, but I say to my good friend that while there is no fixed-in-law obligation for an increased contribution on behalf of the United States to these three potential new members, there is, indeed, a moral, and

it seems to me that that moral obligation will come into play very strongly. If for any reason their economies cannot support their quotient of final costs allocated among the three, I am certain the United States would be a participant in picking it up.

Mr. BIDEN. On my time, if I may respond, if I can take 3 minutes—and I guess it is not just my time but the time controlled by the majority here—if I can have 3 minutes to respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I say to my friend, one of the things the Armed Services Committee has been very jealous of, rightfully so, even though foreign military sales fall within the Foreign Relations Committee purview, when we argued in the Foreign Relations Committee, some of us, against some foreign military sales, the Armed Services Committee members and staff have often come to us and said, ''Joe, do you know what you are doing?'' If you don't let Lockheed or Marietta Martin sell that particular item subsidized to the Germans or to the Greeks or to the Spaniards or to whomever, do you know what you are doing? You are just subsidizing the French because they will sell them a Mirage; they will sell this, they will sell that.

When we make these judgments on foreign military sales, they are judgments that are not only made in terms of what we believe to be our security interest, but when we fail to participate in that, we find that we lose part of our infrastructure because we find that, as a lecture I received many times on the floor from Armed Services Committee members, we lose the competitive advantage to those foreign military sales merchants in France, in England, wherever else.

So what we are talking about is the independent judgment of whether or not we may, in the future conclude, as we have in the past, that in addition to our contribution to the common military budget, in order to keep peace in the Aegean, we have supplied in addition to that common NATO budget, we have supplied additional moneys or subsidies to Greece or to Turkey or Denmark. We have done it for almost all of the 15 members.

What the amendment of my friend here would do is something revolutionary. It would say that we will redefine what NATO's common budget is as it relates to the United States. We now would have to include as part of the economic budget any of the following: foreign military financing under the Arms Control Export Act, transfers of excess defense articles, emergency drawdowns or no-cost leases of U.S. equipment or subsidies or loan guarantees, which would in effect give veto power over our interests with the other 15 NATO nations. The reason we give a veto power is because if we draw down, if we have to draw down from a 25 percent foreign military sales, we can't then pay our common budget that is owed to NATO because we have agreed. If we don't do that, then NATO says ''Woe, woe, you are not engaging in cost sharing.'' And that, in turn, means that they can veto whether or not as a practical matter we decide it is in our national interest to sell Cobra helicopters to the Greeks. My time is up.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator is making my point. My friend from Delaware is making my point. We are limited to 25 percent of the common budgets. All of the cost estimates we keep hearing about only deal with the common budgets. We don't talk about the national budget. What my amendment says is what is good for one side ought to be good for the other. We are not mixing the two. We are applying a good, sound principle. If 25 percent is good for the common budgets, it ought to be good for the national budgets. That is what my amendment says. It says to the American people, look, you are right, we don't know what it is going to cost us in the future. The Senator just stated that. He said that we don't know what it may cost us in the future.

What this amendment says is that at no time will the portion of the national budgets of these countries or any other new members of NATO be more than 25 percent, so that if some cost comes in at $10 billion, our share, the share of the American people, will be no more than 25 percent. The other nations of NATO will have to kick in their proportionate share, also.

That is why I drafted this amendment. People don't understand the difference between the common budgets and the national budgets. We keep hearing from the Clinton administration that this is only going to cost us $400 million—as I pointed out, we already promised as much as $1.069 billion in loans and subsidies to Eastern and Central Europe—because they are talking about the common budgets, not about the national budgets of these countries. The Senator from Delaware is exactly right. My amendment seeks to say that no more than 25 percent of those would be paid for by the American taxpayers. I would think the Senator would support that.

Mr. BIDEN. If the Senator will yield. He wants written into law in the passage of the amendment to the Washington treaty a commitment that the United States national budget will now and forever not exceed 25 percent of all the money we decide to spend in the European theater. I can't imagine the Senator from Virginia supporting that.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, with all due respect, I don't think the Senator read my amendment.

Mr. BIDEN. I have read it in detail.

Mr. HARKIN. It is talking about the subsidy. It is not talking about what we spend ourselves in terms of our own military. It is talking about what subsidy we provide to these countries.

Mr. BIDEN. Is that not out of our national budget? Is that not out of our national defense budget?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes, out of our taxpayer dollars, subsidies to those countries. But it has nothing to do with our military expenditures for our nation's forces stationed in Europe.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, it clearly does. It says that if we want to ''take a tank off the shelf,'' as they say, which comes right now out of the Defense Department budget, and we want to give that tank to Turkey, or to Greece, or to Germany, it says that tank can't be given if in fact we have already met our obligation of 25 percent under the common budget because it would exceed 25 percent. So he is limiting—limiting in perpetuity—the amount of money we can spend out of our national budget.

Look, this is apples and oranges again. We say with NATO, here is the deal: We are going to pay 25 percent of all the moneys that directly relate to NATO. We do not say we are only going to keep 25 percent of the total amount of money we spent at 25 percent if, in addition, we decide we want to help, as we have over the last 30 years, Greece. If this had been the law in the last 20 years, the military aid that we have given to Greece and Turkey would have eaten up our share of what we agreed to do in the common budget. So in Aviano, Italy, the national budget of the country of Italy pays for that Air Force base. But if we are going to build a runway to land NATO planes on, or Italy comes back and says, wait a minute, even though that is on an Italian air base for which we pay for all the infrastructure, if you want to lengthen the runway to accommodate NATO planes, the other 15 members of NATO have to kick in to pay for it. If it costs $10 to extend the runway, we take out $2.50 and pay the 25 percent. But if we have already given $2.50 off the shelf to Greece, we don't have any money, we are prohibited by law from being able to do this.

This is hamstringing our national defense budget, unrelated to NATO. It is a little like my saying that we are not going to spend anymore money on education than what we now spend on title VII. So if we want to pass, as I do, and did, the subsidy for IRAs for private schools, that would have to come out of the ceiling for all title VII, which was a billion dollars. We would have to find $300 million out of that billion dollars, which means you don't have enough money to meet the obligation you have agreed to, separate and apart for decisions independent of NATO considerations. You know, the rest of NATO has not wanted to support Greece. We stepped in and said, OK, notwithstanding that NATO doesn't want to support Greece beyond the NATO common budget, we are going to step in and give them the following

subsidies, or the following military equipment off our shelf, out of our national budget, out of our pocket.

Now, if we deal with any NATO nation, and we conclude that we want to engage in foreign military sales with them, unrelated to NATO, if we want to convince the French—which we never could—to stop flying Mirage aircraft in their national air force and fly F–15s, we could not do that. And so this is a profound change in national defense policy that, with all due respect, has nothing to do with NATO. If you want to cap all U.S. spending as it relates from the Euros to the Atlantic at 25 percent, fine, do it; but understand that you are making a profound foreign policy judgment that has nothing to do with whether or not Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary are members of NATO.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I will get back to this amendment. I respectfully suggest that the Senator from Delaware, again, is making my point in two ways. What the Senator from Delaware has said is that the costs of the taxpayers of this country are going to increase in the future. We don't know how much, but that is what he said. It is going to increase. Listen carefully—

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, with all due respect, I did not say it is going to increase. It would be up to the Senate and the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HARKIN. After a treaty is signed. And keep in mind, treaties override the Constitution of the United States. Once those decisions are made, we are going to have to meet, as the Senator from Virginia said, our moral obligations.

Mr. BIDEN. Moral obligations—

Mr. HARKIN. If the Senator will let me finish, I never interrupted him.

Mr. BIDEN. The Senator is correct. I apologize.

Mr. HARKIN. Again, I think the arguments, if I might respectfully say so, of the Senator from Delaware are arguments that we would have heard on the Senate floor in the 1950s and the 1960s and the 1970s. The Senator's arguments pertain to a world that no longer exists in Europe. The Senator talks about Greece, that if this amendment had been in effect 30 years ago, 40 years ago, we could not have done in Greece what we did. The Senator is right. But this is not 40 years ago.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thought I heard the distinguished Senator say that treaties override the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HARKIN. Portions.

Mr. BYRD. Did I hear him correctly?

Mr. HARKIN. Portions.

Mr. BYRD. No, treaties don't override the Constitution of the United States. Under the Constitution, treaties are a part of the law of the land, the supreme law of the land. They don't override the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HARKIN. I will not argue constitutional principles with the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I hope the Senator will take that out of his written speech.

Mr. HARKIN. I will not argue constitutional principles with the Senator from West Virginia, I know that. But treaties under—I forget the article—treaties become the law of the land.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; but they don't override the Constitution.

Mr. HARKIN. Under the Constitution, they become the law of the land.

Mr. BYRD. They become part of the supreme law of the land. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. HARKIN. I appreciate the correction of the Senator from West Virginia.

Back to my point; the Senator from Delaware is right. If this amendment had been in effect 40 years ago, we couldn't have been in Greece. But that was during the cold war. That is when we were facing the Soviet Union. That is when we were facing, if I might say to the Senator from Delaware, facing a Europe that was on its knees, busted, broke, basically decapitated from World War II. There is no way that they could have done it on their own. That is why I say with this whole NATO argument that it just seems to me we are arguing about a world that existed 50 years ago. The Senator from Delaware in his impassioned pleas is arguing for a situation that no longer exists. Europe is powerful. Europe is wealthy, and the nations' GNPs are going up. There is no Soviet Union. There is no external threat like Greece was facing. Europe has been rebuilt. The cold war is over. Let's look ahead.

What I am saying is that I don't believe, in the context of a Europe that we see now and in the foreseeable future, that our taxpayers ought to be liable for the national costs anymore in excess of what they are liable right now for the common costs. That is what this amendment says. Very simply, it says very forthrightly, ''Any future United States subsidy of the national expenses of Poland, Hungary, or the Czech Republic to meet its NATO commitments, including the assistance described in subparagraph (c), may not exceed 25 percent of all assistance provided to that country by all NATO members.''

When it comes to tanks, planes, or anything else, of course, we can still sell them. They can still buy from us. But our subsidy to this national effort cannot be more than 25 percent of the total amount of subsidies by all of the countries for that national effort——

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes. But I am losing a lot of time; if the Senator would help me by yielding back some time.

Mr. BIDEN. Where you don't go back 50 years—for example, if the Senator's amendment had been in place, we probably could not have amended the conventional forces in Europe. In 1991, it became clear—the wall came down in 1989—we had to amend the conventional forces amendment. We renegotiated that agreement. The flank agreement in the Senate was an amendment. It was passed in Russia in the Duma as well. What we said was that we had to give up a number of pieces of equipment, thousands of pieces of equipment, but because Greece and Turkey were on the southern flank of NATO and because we still were concerned about instability in the region, we still wanted force structure there, we had to call for a cascading down. We took all of the equipment that we were giving up, thousands of pieces, and we just gave them to the Greeks and the Turks. It was in our national interest to do so.

Had the Senator's amendment been in place, the cost of all of those pieces of equipment would have to have been computed and added up, and then reduced from the 25 percent ceiling that was allowed to be spent by the United States on the common budget of the NATO. That had nothing to do with the cold war; it had to do with reality. It had to do with the arms control agreement. That arms control agreement would have done one of two things. It would not be able to have been negotiated and signed by us because we would not have been able to have that force structure on the southern flank, or we would have had to go in arrears to our commitment of saying 25 percent of the common budget of NATO.

That is a contemporary example. That went on from 1991 to 1996. It is a further example of how well-intended but dangerous this amendment is.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. HARKIN. Again, I respond to the Senator from Delaware. Again, what he is basically arguing for is giving a blank check to the American people. I disagree with the Senator on the point that he just said about conventional structure. We are talking about three countries. My amendment only mentions three countries. It mentions Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. It is just those three countries that we are talking about and about their national costs. There may be other arrangements in Europe. There may be other structures in which we are engaged that are not covered by this amendment.

Mr. BIDEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I am talking only about subsidies to the national military budgets, the national expenses of those three countries to meet their national commitments.

Mr. BIDEN. Just those three?

Mr. HARKIN. That is all.

Mr. BIDEN. This in no way limits our ability to give aid or assistance to any other country in NATO. So we are going to say that you three guys can come in, but we are going to promise that we are never going to give you assistance, but we will maybe give assistance to Greece, Turkey, Germany, France and England.

Mr. HARKIN. That is right. Exactly. Why is that? Because England, France,

and all of these countries' forces are modernized. They are fully integrated into NATO. Those are the three countries that are going to have a lot of money for interoperability, command, communications, force structures. That is where the money is going to go. I didn't want to say anything about the other countries. I don't think it is necessary for these other countries because we are not going to be involved in that kind of expenditure. That is why I limited it specifically to those three countries and why I respectfully demur from the Senator's comments that we could not be involved in other aspects of NATO beyond the 25 percent. We absolutely could. That is why I want to focus on those three countries only because that is where the money is going to be spent for force structure and modernization. I don't believe we ought to give a blank check.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Wouldn't we, if we accept the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, then be relegating Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic second class citizenship in NATO?

Mr. HARKIN. I don't believe so. I think all we are saying is that the other members of NATO have to be as fully involved financially in upgrading and modernizing their force structure as the taxpayers of this country. I basically would submit that this amendment is more inclusive. It is saying to our partners in NATO that we are in this together; don't just stick the American taxpayer with the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. One other question.

It seems to me, as we look at the numbers that the Senator is presenting, $125 billion versus $1.5 billion, and changing circumstances, I would remind the Senate that the $125 billion was predicated on the Congressional Budget Office based upon an invasion by Russian forces of Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic, and that it would require the full advanced positioning of the U.S. military. If that were to occur, those numbers are probably right. The much reduced number of $1.5 billion is a reflection, according to the GAO, of the current political situation and, therefore, isn't an accurate estimate.

But I would say this: I don't think we should hamstring now our ability as the Senate and as the Congress to respond to whatever things might occur. But it seems to me, we would be doing just that if we were to accept the Harkin amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I might, if I could restate what the Senator is trying to achieve with his amendment, is simply to say when NATO establishes the military requirements of three new nations, the costs associated with each of the nations and their ability to reach that requirement, the U.S. States taxpayer will pay no more than 25 percent of that cost, and 75 percent is then to be allocated among the remainder of the nations. It is as simple as that in clear English language.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator. That says it very clearly and very eloquently, and I think brings the point home again. I say to the manager of the bill that when you talk about $1.5 billion, that is one of the common costs. That is why we are trying to reach out and find out what these other costs associated with it are. These NATO's costs, as I have pointed out, we have already allocated over $1 billion ourselves of taxpayer dollars for this.

I also say in response to the comments of the Senator from Delaware about what happens in the future that, if there is an emergency or something happens where you have changed circumstances, I would respond with the same enjoinder that he gave to this Senator; that is, I believe it is important now to limit our taxpayers' exposure rather than a blank check. If there is an emergency in the future, if something does happen, yes, the Appropriations Committee will respond. The Foreign Relations Committee and the authorizing committee will respond. The Armed Services Committee in their capacity as authorizing committee will respond. The appropriators will respond. It is better to address it at that point rather than giving a blank check now and just sort of letting it go. I think from a budgetary standpoint, from the standpoint of protecting our taxpayer dollars better, we limit it now, and then, if there is an emergency, fine, we can come up with the money and finance the emergency.

Mr. BIDEN. If the Senator will yield. If in fact this logic makes sense, I don't know why we would produce an amendment that says right now we spend—I don't know the exact national budget. My friend from Virginia may know how much we spend on defense right now in the United States of America on our total defense budget. I will make up a number. Let's say it is $300 billion. Why don't we attach an amendment right now and say that we will not spend more than $300 billion on defense, period? Why don't we do that? It is the same logic. Let's tell the American taxpayers now we are limiting what they are going to spend on defense. We will do it now. We will limit it to that number, not just in Europe but all over the world. Tell them that right now. If there is an emergency, we can come back.

This is the same man, whom I respect enormously, who argued strenuously, and he argued on the same issue of a constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

Why not set a number? Defense spending cannot increase at all. We can pass it now, unless we come along and by a two-thirds vote in this body agree to spend more money on defense. That is what we are doing here relative to these three countries. That is what we are doing for Europe. Why don't we do it for the all of the national defense budget? If it doesn't make sense for the whole national defense budget, I respectfully suggest it makes zero sense to do it in Europe for these three countries.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I could clarify, the funds the Senator is talking about come out of the Department of State budget, not the defense budget.

Mr. BIDEN. Let's set the State Department budget.

Mr. WARNER. It is important in this debate that we begin to establish a few fundamentals with some correctness. The defense budget will be around $260 billion to $270 billion, but it does not contain the funds to which my distinguished colleague is now referring.

Mr. BIDEN. If the Senator will yield, let's set the State Department budget then, freeze that.

Mr. HARKIN. I didn't hear the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. If the categories all come out of the State Department budget, then let's say let's freeze the State Department budget. Nothing can go up in the State Department budget, period. Freeze it, just like we are going to freeze it here. Why not do that? And if an emergency comes along, we can change our mind.

It is not a way to do business, I respectfully suggest.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has 13 minutes 30 seconds.

Mr. HARKIN. I am sure the Senator will yield me some more off his time, because I have been so yielding to him.

I think the analogy that the Senator from Delaware uses is totally wrong. Let me provide, I think, a more correct one. This amendment in no way limits how much total defense dollars we can provide to these three countries—not at all. It simply says, whatever their national budget, we will only pay 25 percent. So the Senator's analogy that we are somehow going to cap defense spending is not right.

A better analogy, if I might say to my friend from Delaware, is this. We do have a defense budget in the United States. It is $260 billion. Let's say that for national emergency reasons, or whatever threat might come up, we have to increase it to $300 billion a year. But what we are going to do is tax the citizens of Delaware for half of it, and then we will spread the other half among the other 49 States of the Union. That is the more correct analogy as to what my amendment seeks to do.

Now, certainly we would not say to the citizens of Delaware, ''We are going to increase the defense budget. You have to pick up 50 percent of the total.'' No. We would spread it out, make everybody pay a fair, proportionate share. That is what my amendment says. My amendment in no way limits the total amount of defense money spent on these three countries.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I wonder if I might yield myself time from the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I will yield the floor and let others use their own time.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I wonder if, having discussed with the Senator from Oregon, I might yield myself time from his time so as not to deprive the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa yields the floor?

Mr. HARKIN. I am sorry. Mr. President, I yielded the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa has been very generous in yielding his own time. I wanted to make a brief statement and then pose two questions on what I take to be not just hypotheticals but real life probabilities.

I followed the discussion on a particular element of the budget, whether State Department or defense. I don't think that is right on point to what is being said here. I think the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is saying that American subsidy, as it were, of the national expenses of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to meet their NATO commitments should not be more than 25 percent of all assistance provided to each of those countries by all NATO members.

Let me lead into the questions that I want to ask the Senator from Iowa. The Senator from Iowa has said that his purpose in offering this amendment is to protect the taxpayers of America from incurring a liability greater than this 25 percent; that is, 25 percent of all assistance provided to each of these three countries by all NATO members. But I am concerned that there are some consequences in his amendment, perhaps unintended, which in fact not only do not protect the taxpayers of the United States but may hurt them, and certainly may hurt their security. And I want to describe two situations and then ask the Senator from Iowa if he would respond.

The 25 percent number is one that has some currency—no pun intended—in NATO circles about the American share. So it is not the 25 percent that I think troubles those of us who oppose this amendment. It is what the Senator from Iowa is including within the 25 percent in subsection (C) of his amendment, and I go particularly to this and I read from the amendment.

The assistance referred to in (A)(iii) above includes (1) Foreign Military Financing under the Arms Export Control Act.

So here is the circumstance I am concerned about being covered here. At sometime in the future—next year, 2 years, 3 years, 4 years—one of these three countries, the Czech Republic, Hungary, or Poland, decides that they, as part of their participation in NATO, their responsibility for their own defense, want to acquire certain modern military equipment systems.

My concern is that by squeezing foreign military financing under the Arms Export Control Act—which is to say the credits that our Government gives to facilitate the sale of weapons systems by American manufacturers to foreign purchasers—we are going to block our defense companies from having a chance to compete equally with other foreign defense manufacturers to try to sell to the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland. Because the credits will be included within the 25 percent, and the effect of that will not be to protect American taxpayers, it will be to hurt American defense workers, whose products will not be able to be sold to these three countries.

So, I ask my friend from Iowa, is it not true, if the amendment he has submitted is agreed to, that we will limit credits for foreign military sales to these three countries and therefore limit the opportunity of American defense manufacturers to sell to these three countries, meaning that they will be pushed to buy from other producers elsewhere in the world?

Mr. HARKIN. I will respond to my friend, if he will yield.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I do.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, again, this amendment does not preclude increased subsidies as long as we only pay our fair share. That is the point I was making prior to the Senator's comments.

But, again, is the Senator arguing that, again, this is going to cost a lot more than the $400 million that the administration has suggested—that this could really balloon in the years ahead? That is what I am concerned about. What is this going to cost? We are told it is only going to cost us $400 million. But now I hear the Senator saying maybe, if a country there decides to buy some expensive military hardware, we will want to jump in and subsidize our sales, so, therefore, we don't give it? I mean, nothing is given? It is not free; the taxpayers pay for it. And that bothers me. It doesn't preclude the sale of weapons; it just means it must be a fair share.

Again, I probably agree with the Senator that my amendment would preclude the kind of giveaway programs that cost our taxpayers a lot of money in order to maybe help one of these countries modernize to the point where they may not need it. But as long as it is free to them and costs our taxpayers, why not give it to them?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I appreciate the response of the Senator from Iowa, because I do believe the response confirms my concern that one of the effects of passage of this amendment will be to apply what I consider to be an arbitrary cap—which is to say a 25 percent cap—on all American expenditures related to the assistance provided to these NATO countries.

Here is why I am concerned about that and why it does bother me. There are two different categories of expense. One is the direct amount we are contributing—common expenses, if you will—the $400 million that the Senator from Iowa refers to, to enlarge NATO to these countries. I do not consider the credits given to facilitate the sale of American military equipment to these countries in that same category. These are not giveaways. These are, in a long-established program, quite similar to what we do through the Export-Import Bank in other areas, or OPIC in other areas, to facilitate American companies' ability to sell their products abroad, creating or sustaining more jobs for American workers here at home.

So, my initial concerns are confirmed. I think the effect of this amendment, if adopted, would be to limit the ability of American companies to compete equally with foreign manufacturers of comparable weapons systems to sell them to these three countries, and the losers in that would be the workers in defense companies all around America. So these export credits are not giveaways. Yes, it may take the budget, the possible spending, somewhat above the $400 million, but that is a different category. The $400 million, if you will, is a grant. This is a little bit like giving a bit of a subsidy so you can sell a multiple of many times more and create jobs for American workers.

Mr. BIDEN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I will.

Mr. BIDEN. The Senator from Iowa forthrightly responded, as he always does, that if we wanted to sell Poland, like we sell Greece or Germany or anyone else, a piece of American-made military equipment, as long as we did not subsidize more than 25 percent of what that was, then we could sell it.

I wonder, why in God's name would the French Government agree to come up with money for Poland to allow them to buy an American jet instead of a French jet? Why would they possibly do that? And does this not give a veto, a veto on the part of other NATO nations, over American foreign military sales? Because unless they come up with 75 percent of what any subsidy would be, why would they possibly do that?

Is it not true—the Senator is on the Armed Services Committee—is it not true that one of the core debates in NATO beyond burdensharing has been who gets to sell NATO the equipment, whether they fly Mirages—whether NATO planes are Mirages or whether they are American made aircraft? Every other European country in NATO has been saying, ''You Americans get too much of an advantage.'' Every time we talk about burdensharing, don't they come back and say, ''Yes, but you don't get it; you get to make all that money and get all those jobs because you are supplying the equipment that all the NATO uses''?

So why in the Lord's name would we give a veto power over the ability of American manufacturers and American employees to keep their jobs to the French and the Germans and the Brits?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. The Senator raises a very good question. For me, at least, there is no good answer to that. That is why I say I believe that this may be an unintended consequence of the amendment that the Senator from Iowa has put forward. There is very spirited competition among the member countries of NATO in arms sales and arms purchases by NATO.

For instance, right now there is a great issue about the Joint Stars Program, a remarkable air surveillance of ground activity system in which we had an original requirement of 19 planes; assuming that NATO would buy 6, we would pay for 13. Our military says these are extraordinarily valuable. They are going to be critical in future warfare. We have already used them in Bosnia before we thought we would have to. Our allies in NATO decided last fall that they didn't want to buy the six from us, they wanted to try to make them themselves. So there is very spirited competition that goes on among the NATO members for NATO acquisitions, let alone to other countries.

I do want to say one word additionally on this point. The credits that are given for foreign military financing under the Arms Export Control Act are not literally spending; they are more in the form of a guarantee. I don't have the exact information before me, because I didn't realize we were going to get into this point this morning. I don't believe that the taxpayers have actually spent very much money on these credits. They are a form of a guarantee to facilitate these sales.

Anyway, bottom line, I leave this part of the debate with a confirmed concern, which deepens my opposition to the amendment, that one of the unintended consequences—or consequences of this amendment, if it passes, would be to hamstring, to tie up, to put a cap on the ability of American companies and workers to compete with foreign companies and workers to sell these three systems that they may want to acquire in the future.

Mr. President, I would like to go on and pose a second question to my friend from Iowa. Let me describe a different kind of fact circumstance.

One of the reasons I am so strongly supporting the enlargement of NATO to these three countries is that it will help us—it will share our burden, to be as specific as I can. NATO, as we continue our historic mission of providing for the collective defense of the member states, will face threats, as it has both within their territories and outside. We have seen it in Bosnia. I suspect, as others do, that we will be threatened increasingly from the south of NATO, not from the east, because Russia is now our ally and our partner—Partner for Peace, as we say—in that specific program. And I am struck by what these three new members can add to NATO's military capacity.

First off, and most explicitly, they will add 200,000 troops. And not just the troops, but I think what we will find, because these new members will have the enthusiasm of new membership, perhaps even a greater willingness to be involved in sharing the burden that would otherwise fall exclusively on the United States of America in responding to threats to the security of NATO and its member states, including our own security.

Let me give a specific example. Hungary has been of great help to us already in Bosnia, giving us a base from which we can launch or source so much of our activity in Bosnia. But let me come to a much more specific and recent point. A short while ago, we were on the edge of military action against Iraq again, because the Iraqis wouldn't allow us, or the United Nations inspectors, access to their facilities, according to the post-gulf-war promises that they had made. And that conflict, for now—I am afraid not forever, but for now—has been avoided. But the record will show that during the period of time leading up to the possibility of military action against Iraq, these three countries—Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic—made unswervingly clear that they were prepared to stand by us.

Let me be very blunt about this, undiplomatically blunt. They were much more supportive of military action against Iraq, much more willing to commit forces and materiel, much more convinced of the common threat that an uninspected Iraq posed to them, as well as to us, than some of our longest term and foremost allies in NATO. There is no secret here. The French were particularly reluctant about military activity against Iraq.

So what I want to pose now is another fact situation. Let us say in the next half year—we all hope this does not happen, but we can feel it building in Iraq again. Mr. Butler, of UNSCOM, of the U.N. group charged with inspecting in Iraq to guarantee that weapons of mass destruction have been eliminated, has said in the last week or two that, yes, the inspectors gained access to Saddam Hussein's palaces, but as far as I interpret his statements, the Iraqis cleared out the palaces, let the inspectors in, the inspectors naturally found nothing—there was a lot of time that passed—the inspectors went out, and now the Iraqis say, ''That's it. Lift the sanctions.''

Mr. Butler, steadfast, honorable, independent, says, ''Hey, we don't have affirmative proof as required under the post-gulf war agreements that the Iraqis are not developing chemical and biological weapons.''

So let us go forward a few months, and the conflict grows, the disagreement grows, the Iraqis refuse to allow U.N. inspectors in, and we are on the edge of military conflict again, and as we hope it will not happen, in fact there is a decision to launch a military action, and in this we ask and receive the support of our allies in Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic.

I know I am speeding up the schedule a little bit because they will not in that timeframe have acceded to NATO membership. So let us take it forward a year or two or three. They want to help us in an international conflict. And the one in the gulf is most likely. To facilitate their aid to us, we have to invoke exactly the sections of law that the Senator from Iowa includes in his amendment under the 25-percent cap—transfers of excess defense articles under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, emergency drawdowns of our equipment to give to them no cost leases of U.S. equipment. All of this is not to throw it away but because they can share our burden. They can send troops to be with ours. But they may need some assistance, materiel assistance that we would normally draw down from.

So perhaps this has been a longer way than necessary to say that my concern is, these additional sections of this law would prevent the United States from, in a crisis such as the one I have described, or God forbid a larger one, where the soldiers, the military forces of these three countries were ready to share the burden of the United States in defense, in fact the 25-percent cap would say, you cannot do it, you cannot help them help us.

That is not only in the most limited and technical sense such a result in the interest of the taxpayers of the United States, it certainly is not in the interest of the security of the United States or in the interests of the well-being of the military of the United States, without assistance from countries like this, to have to shoulder more of the burden.

So I ask my friend from Iowa, is it not true that these sections of this amendment would limit the ability of the United States to draw down, to transfer articles, to enter into no-cost leases of U.S. equipment to these three countries in a time of crisis, in which we would very much want them to be helping us with our assistance?

Mr. HARKIN. If the Senator will yield.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I will.

Mr. HARKIN. Is the Senator then saying that the cost of this is going to escalate greatly in the future, that it is not $400 million, it is going to be something much above that because we are going to subsidize a lot of sales? Is that what the Senator is saying?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Senator. What I am saying is that from the best estimates I have seen, the American contribution to the common costs of NATO will be limited to the $400 million. But there will be other cases in our self-interest, such as the ones I have mentioned, where there is an international crisis and we will want to

draw down, to give no-cost leases to Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic to help us so we incur less damage and less direct costs ourselves that I am afraid this amendment would limit. I consider that a very separate category than in the contribution we make to the common costs of NATO enlargement.

Mr. HARKIN. If the Senator would yield further.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I will.

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator talks about prices. Again, with all due respect, when a crisis happens, Congress responds. Again, just from a budgeting standpoint, from being perhaps a little tightfisted with taxpayer dollars, and not giving sort of a blank check and saying, ''Fill it in,'' I think by having a cap on these costs, a national cost that I propose equivalent to what we do in our common costs, that it precludes a kind of runaway giveaway.

It is like, OK, Hungary wants to upgrade their capabilities in a certain area, so we say, ''Oh, wonderful. You need not the $1.98 version, you need the $100 version.'' But Congress says, ''We can't afford the $100 version.'' We say, ''Not to worry. We'll give it to you. That will be one of our grants. We will subsidize it, and you will get ours.''

Again, I must respectfully say to my friend from Connecticut, this is a whole new vineyard, this debate about jobs. I thought this was about democracy and markets and peacekeeping. Now we are talking about jobs. I find this debate now is veering off course a little bit.

To answer the question as forthrightly as I can, yes, I am saying that if one of these three countries want the $1.98 version, we could give up a 25-percent subsidy for that. We would not come in with a $100 version and say taxpayers are going to pay for the whole thing. Yes, that is exactly what I mean.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Senator from Iowa. I will say a brief word or two more and then yield to the Senator from Oregon.

What I fear from the amendment is that the effect of the amendment will be to limit our ability to sell cost-effective items to these three governments, not just the ones that the Senator may consider to be bloated in expense. And more to the point of the second example that I have asked him about, I think it will have the unintended consequence of shackling us in our attempt to benefit from the willingness of these three countries to assist us in a time of international crisis.

I want to make a final point about the comment that the Senator made in passing that this is about, the NATO enlargement debate is about principle, not about jobs in America. I respectfully, loosely paraphrase there.

In my opinion, as I tried to indicate yesterday, this debate really is about a principle, about the principle of freedom that was secured and won in the cold war and that we now, in my opinion, have a moral obligation to ratify that victory in the freedom won by countries like Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, countries that suffered during the cold war and the long years of Soviet Communist domination, to welcome them into this military alliance which is based on the principle of freedom, also on collective defense.

I know that there are some who have said that what drives this debate, what drives the move for NATO enlargement is the yearning by American military contractors for more sales in Central or Eastern Europe. I must say, I am on the Armed Services Committee and I have not had a single comment—I have contact on a regular basis with representatives of defense companies, and I have not had a single one of them say a single word to me about NATO enlargement.

But that having been said, and looking realistically, the potential sales here are quite modest as a proportion of overall military sales throughout the world, particularly within the United States with the Pentagon as the purchaser. But if these three countries want and need to purchase new military equipment, why would we want to limit the ability of American companies to sell American made products to them? So, no, the debate overall is not about American workers; it is about the principle of freedom and collective defense, and the promotion of peace and stability on the European Continent, which is what NATO has done so greatly for almost 50 years and will do more broadly in the years ahead if we enlarge it.

Way down on the list of effects is the possibility that there might be a few sales of American-made equipment to these countries. I fear that the unintended consequence of this amendment would be to limit those sales and, in that sense, to give an unusual and surprising competitive advantage to military contractors abroad, particularly in Europe, perhaps even in Russia or China, as well.

I thank my friend from Iowa for what I hope has been an illuminating dialog and for the directness and eloquence of his own participation.

I thank my friend from Oregon for yielding me this time. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I was once asked by a mother in a town meeting I had in Oregon why her son or daughter should put his or her life at risk for a Hungarian or Pole or Czech through the expansion of NATO. I think it sometimes helps to think in human terms like that. My answer to her was that the surest way not to put her son's or daughter's life at risk was, in fact, to expand NATO.

It is a very troubled area in world history. In a tough neighborhood, good fences make for better neighbors. I have fought to expand NATO because I think to leave the vacuum, to leave muddled ''international speak'' out there at the border was a mistake.

I think the answer I gave to that mother can also be given to my friend from Iowa. The Senator is concerned about the bill going up. I am concerned about that, too, but I think the surest way that the bill not go up is to expand NATO. I think if we did not expand NATO, and the worst kinds of scenarios you could construct actually occurred, we would be spending far more than $1.5 billion—whether Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic were in NATO or not because I don't think this time we would stand idly by. I certainly hope we would not.

So the surest way, I think, we can assure the American taxpayer that Senator HARKIN is rightly concerned that we won't spend $125 billion to expand NATO, is to define the terms of the future, not just react to them, make them, expand NATO, make this commitment, and I believe it means we will not be spending the kind of excesses that I also fear with the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 11 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I will respond with a couple of things.

First of all, I have to ask again the question: Can these three members, these three nations, can they afford membership in NATO or can they not? Can they afford to bear the burden or can they not? We have been told they can. One of the requirements for membership is they can pay the tab. These three nations have stated over and over they could afford it.

Now I am hearing, wait a minute, no, maybe they can't, because now we will have to give them a lot of subsidies to buy weapons systems. Well, if that is the case, then do they have the economic strength to join NATO? It seems like we cannot have it both ways. If they have the economic strength, why do they need all the subsidies? If they don't, are they really capable of joining NATO?

Secondly, yes, I am concerned about these types of giveaway programs and loans and grants. I say to my friend from Connecticut, we have—I have been on the Defense Appropriations Committee for several years now, and I have been in some aviation things going back almost 20 years, both in the House and the Senate. I say to my friend from Connecticut, we have always been faced with other countries subsidizing, in many cases more than we ever subsidized our arms manufacturers.

So how do we beat them? We beat them because we make the best products. We have the best quality. No one can match our aircraft. No one can match our weapons systems. No one can match not only the quality but the kind of support infrastructure that we can provide for those weapons systems. So other countries might have to subsidize theirs a little bit more, but only

because they cannot match us in those areas. So we have been quite capable of competing and winning in the world market our share of defense items in the past. I do not think that will change in the future.

So in the last decade we have written off or forgiven over $10 billion in default of loans on military-related items on this. I think, again, we have to be very careful about this. We are told it will only cost us $400 million, but now what I hear is no, that is only for the common costs. This could go up and up and up and up, subsidy after subsidy after subsidy.

Then we hear that is only if there is a crisis. Fine. If there is a crisis we will address it then. But even the administration has said any threat to Europe to these nations is not imminent and would take years to develop. So we are not facing something that might happen in the next few months or even in the next couple of years or so, even according to the administration's own admission.

Therefore, I submit once more, Mr. President, that to keep the costs down, to be honest with the taxpayers of this country, what my amendment says is what is good for the common costs—that is, we limit our involvement to 25 percent—that we should limit the 25 percent, for subsidies for all of those national costs, also. That is all this amendment does. My friend from Oregon, my amendment does not stop NATO expansion. It simply says no longer will our taxpayers simply pick up the tab.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, with all respect for my friend from Iowa, I believe the Harkin amendment attempts to strangle NATO's expansion because it cannot prevent NATO expansion. This amendment places unreasonable restrictions on expenditures by limiting our assistance to new NATO members to 25 percent of all assistance provided to these countries by current NATO members.

I urge my colleagues to read carefully the resolution of ratification that we have before us. Condition two requires the President to certify that the United States is under no obligation to subsidize the national expenses necessary for Poland, Hungary, or the Czech Republic, to meet those countries' NATO commitments.

Let me be clear on this point. In signing the Protocols of Accession with these three countries, the United States has not signed up to foot the bill for their membership in NATO, and Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic understand that it is ultimately their responsibility to make the necessary improvements to their military structures.

Now, my friend from Iowa knows that in the past, the U.S. Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for countries in Central and Eastern Europe to assist in their efforts to meet the criteria for NATO membership.

Approving this resolution, however, in no way restricts the congressional prerogative to make this decision on an annual basis. In other words, why draw an arbitrary line now? We are going to do this on a regular basis anyway as circumstances change.

If in the future years we determine that Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic do not warrant or do not need the U.S. assistance, we will not authorize and appropriate it. I trust that future Congresses will be able to make this decision based on the circumstances in their time and will not need artificial percentages to dictate how our assistance should be appropriated.

I also confess concern about the signal that would be sent if the Senate adopted the Harkin amendment. Does approval of this amendment mean that the United States would only need NATO 25 percent of the time no matter what our security interests may be? Does it mean that the United States is interested in only 25 percent of NATO's activities, exercises, and planning processes? Does it mean that the United States would participate in just 25 percent of NATO operations despite any potential threat posed to the alliance? I think these questions demonstrate why arbitrary ceilings simply do not belong.

Mr. President, I suggest that we allow the Congress to make funding decisions based on our foreign policy interests and that we reject any effort to tie our assistance to countries in Central and Eastern Europe to that provided by our NATO allies. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose the Harkin amendment, which I do today.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I want to briefly touch on an issue the Senator from Connecticut mentioned, and that is lobbying by defense contractors.

At the outset, I want to say that I have not been contacted by any either. I don't know that my staff has; at least they haven't told me that. I respond by reading from an article that appeared in the New York Times on March 30, which I obviously got off the Internet, in which the writer of the article went on to say that ''The chief vehicle of support for NATO expansion is a group called 'The U.S. Committee to Expand NATO'.'' The president of that innocent-sounding group is Bruce Jackson, director of strategic planning for Lockheed, a vice president for Lockheed for strategic planning.

Mr. President, again, a lot of these people have been championing NATO membership for these countries. He quoted me as saying that ''This may amount to 'a Marshall Plan' for defense contractors who are chomping at the bit to sell weapons and make profits.'' Well, I am a Democrat, and it says, ''A top Republican aide joked that the arms makers were so eager for NATO expansion, we will probably be giving landlocked Hungary a new navy.'' Those are just musings and comments by various and sundry people.

Again, this gets back to the question of whether or not we are going to ask the taxpayers of this country to provide subsidies over, above, and beyond what they kind of have been told in terms of NATO expansion as to what the costs would be. Yes, if these countries are going to upgrade their weapons system, sure. Do I want our defense contractors to be in there to provide them the necessary resources they need for defense? Absolutely. But do I want them there when the taxpayers say—as I pointed out to my friend from Connecticut, which we have seen so often in the past, for one of those countries may say that we need a certain system and it cost $1.98. Since there is no limit on the subsidies, one of our contractors could come in and say: You don't need the $1.98 one, you need the $100 version. Hungry, Poland, or the Czech Republic may say: We can't afford that. The contractor may say: Not to worry. You see, under the situation we have now, the U.S. taxpayers will provide the subsidy for it and you can go ahead and have it.

Once again, our taxpayers are stuck with it. I think that is the normal course. If there is a crisis, as has been stated many times, well, this would hamstring us in terms of a crisis. Again, I point out that no one is saying there is any imminent threat of any crisis at all. The administration says that for years ahead Russia is no threat. So if, in fact, a crisis comes up in the future—in the distant future—we have time to react, we have time on both the authorizing committee and on the appropriating committee to make changes, to make sure these countries have the adequate and necessary defense capabilities to defend themselves. But to just give a blank check now, I think, is wrong. I think it will cost the taxpayers of this country untold billions of dollars, unless we put the same cap on our subsidies for national expenses that we have on the common costs.

We have agreed with our fellow member nations in NATO that on the common costs we would provide about 25 percent. I see no reason why that same logic cannot prevail and be used to cap our exposure on the national costs. In fact, I have gotten an idea this morning that I may offer another amendment to this bill, and that is to get other member countries of NATO to also agree that their subsidies, their proportion of the national costs, would not exceed what their proportion is under the common costs. Now, we cannot force them to do that, but it seems to me that should be one of the negotiating principles that we would use with other countries when they want to expand and enlarge NATO. In fact, it kind of comes as a surprise to me that

we did not do that in the beginning. If we really want honest accounting, and we want the European countries that are quite wealthy now to bear their fair share of the costs, it seems to me that we should have insisted in the beginning that the same proportionality that pertains to the common costs should pertain to the national costs. To me, this is a gaping hole, and the first place to close it is here with this bill, by saying that the United States will provide no more than its 25-percent share of those national costs.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve my time.

Mr. LIEBERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I wonder if the Senator from Washington will yield up to 5 minutes.

Mr. GORTON. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I want to respond briefly to two points. One is on the question of the involvement of the American defense industry in this debate. The Senator from Iowa cited a news article indicating that a group called the U.S. Committee to Expand NATO, headed by a gentleman involved in the defense industry—honestly, I don't know the facts about that committee at all, but I have seen some advertisements they have placed. But what I want to do is suggest—and I know the Senator from Iowa didn't mean to say this in quoting the article—that the support for NATO enlargement is quite broad. It is enormous. It goes well beyond this one organization headed by this one man. There are a host of military and veterans' organizations that I think support this because they have learned the lessons. They feel enlarging NATO is one of the rewards, if you will, for their service over the long years of the cold war. It was one of the goals they aspired to—to free the captive nations and let them become part of the community of freedom-loving nations. AMVETS supports NATO enlargement, as do the American Legion Association, U.S. Army Jewish War Veterans, Marine Corps League, National Guard Association, Reserve Officers Association, Veterans of Foreign Wars Association, and, in addition, a host of civic policy and political organizations, including, interestingly, the Council of State Governments, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, a host of State legislative bodies, including my own State senate in Connecticut that spoke on behalf of enlargement;

A true rainbow coalition of ethnic organizations, American ethnic organizations, many of whom have members who have family ties to the people who have suffered for almost five decades, four decades anyway, under Soviet Communist domination, are now thrilled that their family and friends can enjoy the blessings of liberty and want to affirm that opportunity by membership in NATO;

Many business and labor organizations, including the AFL-CIO, support the enlargement of NATO. So this is a very broad-based organizational effort, much beyond one group;

A remarkable number of high-level officials have signed a statement of support of NATO enlargement; former Vice Presidents Quayle and Mondale; former Secretaries of State Baker, Christopher, Eagleburger, Haig, Rodgers, Shultz, Kissinger, and Vance. I believe that is every living former Secretary of State;

Former National Security Advisers Allen, Brzezinski, Lake, McFarland, and Powell;

Former Secretaries of Defense Carlucci, Cheney, Clifford, Perry, and Rumsfeld.

It is a remarkable, broad coalition, much beyond one person whose affiliation may be the defense industry and an organization that I presume is much larger than that.

The second and final point that I want to make is I want to draw on something that the Senator from Oregon said, and it helps me to make a point about what I believe to be one of the unintended, certainly undesirable, consequences if we should adopt the Harkin amendment, which I hope we will not. The Senator from Oregon has occasionally held town meetings in Oregon. He has asked about NATO enlargement. Do we want to send your sons? How will you respond to the question of why would you send your sons to defend Budapest or Warsaw or Prague?

One of the effects of enlarging NATO is in effect quite the opposite, which is to bring the military forces, 200,000 strong, into the common effort to defend NATO and its member states from security threats to it and them. That involves a scenario that I suggested earlier that may occur in the Middle East around Iraq and other trouble spots around the world. What I am confident of is there will be an enthusiasm and a steadfastness to participate among these three new members that we don't always find, frankly, among the other members who have been with us from the beginning.

The question could almost be turned. That is, expanding NATO holds the prospect that Hungarian soldiers, Czech soldiers, and Polish soldiers will be sent to trouble spots in the world and not require American soldiers to be sent, certainly not in the same numbers. I believe that one of the consequences of this amendment putting an arbitrary 25 percent cap on American involvement here will be to make it impossible for us to draw down supplies and equipment to offer assistance to those soldiers of these three countries when they share our burden and place less of a burden on our military and on those who wear the American uniform.

I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, 10 days ago in a column appearing in the Washington Post, Charles Krauthammer wrote:

> By ruling Central Europe out of bounds to Russia, NATO expansion takes one of this century's fatal temptations off the table. It is the easiest U.S. foreign policy call of the decade.

Why is it the easiest foreign policy call of the decade? Because the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for 50 years has preserved the peace of Europe and the peace of the United States. As a result of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Soviet Union literally ceased to exist. All of this was accomplished by a military alliance that never was required to fight or to sacrifice its young men and women in a military conflict within the bounds of that organization.

Why did the North Atlantic Treaty Organization come into existence in the first place? Because the first half of this century showed that both world wars began in Central Europe because of the weakness, the instability, the unsettled nature of the former empires and the then national states in that part of Europe, occupied almost wholly by the Soviet Union at the end of World War II. The West could only be defended by a military organization of which the United States was a part. Behind the magnificent defensive line, the parapets, built by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Western Europe became free, democratic, and prosperous.

During that 50 years, we and the Western Europeans invested not an inconsiderable amount of money in communicating those ideas of freedom to the people of Central and Eastern Europe through the Voice of America and other such organizations. It is clear now that nothing was desired by the people of the Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary more than to join the free and prosperous countries of Western Europe. Partly because of our efforts through NATO, partly because of our economic success, and partly from their growing dedication to freedom, they freed themselves—they freed themselves—from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union disappeared and became Russia, a country still unstable, a country with candidates for President in the year 2000 who would desire nothing more than the restoration of the old Soviet Union.

So the rationale of the expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is to say, no; these countries freed by their own efforts and our own efforts will stay freer. They will be to us as Germany and France and Normandy have been for the last half century. What history teaches us is that a political vacuum filled with weakness and irresolution is a temptation to an aggressor. Countries a part of the North

Atlantic Treaty Organization were not such a temptation, even at the height of the power of the Soviet Union.

Accession to NATO is as close to a guarantee as we can possibly come of the fact that our sons and daughters will not die in Warsaw or in Prague or in Budapest any more than they were required to do so in Oslo or in Paris in the course of the last half century.

Mr. President, this is the easiest foreign policy call of the decade. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization will lend strength to us, a contribution to our own defense, but most importantly the security of countries that have not been secure that want to join us in prosperity and in safety as they have in freedom.

The amendment of the Senator from Iowa is simply another attempt to make these members second-class members. We have already stated that we made no commitment at all, a zero commitment, to subsidize the national expenses for these countries. How much, if any, we subsidize them in the future is a decision that can and should be made in the future and not in the course of this debate.

Even more mischievous, in my view, Mr. President, are amendments to say that there will be no further expansion, that we will leave a vacuum unless certain preconditions are made. For more than 50 years the United States of America refused to recognize the annexation of the Baltic republics by the Soviet Union. When their cause was deemed to be a hopeless cause by almost everyone, they, too, have freed themselves. They, too, want at some future date to be a part of NATO. They, too, create a vacuum at the present time in the power structure of Central and of Eastern Europe.

To pass an amendment that is likely to be proposed by another of my colleagues that singles them out as being countries we will not want to defend or be a part of without special circumstances, in my view, is simply an engraved invitation to some future Russian Government to say: We're coming back in; we don't care about your desire for freedom. You're a part of us whether you like it or not. And, look, the Americans have in effect in the Senate said that's OK.

That is the essence of instability and of uncertainty, not only for the nations immediately involved but for all of us.

Certainty created through 50 years by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is the best guarantor of peace. I am convinced we should reject all limiting amendments, admit these three nations, and judge in the future what additional nations should be admitted to NATO—nations, in my opinion, consisting of all of those that become real democracies, real free market countries, with a real desire not only to be a part of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization but to contribute their own strength to it.

We should reject the Harkin amendment. We should grant the accession of the three countries before us at the present time without further conditions, and in the good faith that their accession will strengthen peace, strengthen their democracy, and strengthen our own security.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to address the Senate as if in morning business past the agreed upon time of 12:45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for the moment 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. BIDEN. 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. BIDEN. Mr. President, I realize we only have a minute or two before the unanimous consent order kicks in which ends discussion at 12:45, but let me say for the record that one of the aspects of the amendment that we are considering and will be voting on when we come back from our caucus luncheons, the Harkin amendment, deals with requiring excess military materiel transferred to any NATO country—in this case, the three new members—to be counted against our common budget.

I did not have these numbers before, but I want to put them in the RECORD now. The Senator from Iowa has contended that we provide aid only to the less well off countries in NATO, and he implied they are the only ones we have given this excess military equipment to. Most people don't know what we are talking about here, so let me make it clear. Here are the facts.

In fiscal year 1996, we provided excess defense articles to the following countries: Denmark, Germany, Greece, Portugal, and Turkey, for a total value of $55 million. In fiscal year 1997, these excess articles went to the United Kingdom, Norway, Spain, and Turkey; value: $113 million. And my friend from Iowa, if his amendment passes, would say we can continue to spend taxpayers' money for what we believe is in our national interest to give excess items to other NATO countries, not part of our NATO requirement but our individual judgment, but we could not do the same for Poland, the Czech Republic, or Hungary. I think that would a serious mistake. If he wishes to do that and ''save the taxpayers' money,'' why not have his amendment say no excess military arms could go to any NATO country? Why single out for this second-class treatment the three new countries?

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my friend from Delaware. His statement is a very important contribution to this debate on NATO, and I appreciate the fact that not only is he giving the Senate information but the great job the Senator is doing on this issue here for these many days. I am very appreciative.

Mr. BIDEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MCCAIN. There is no one more qualified, in my view, in the Senate than the Senator from Delaware, on this issue especially, but other foreign policy issues.

THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY'S CAMPAIGN OF DIVERSION

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, much has been said and written about the tobacco bill approved by the Senate Commerce Committee 19 to 1, three weeks ago.

The Senate will soon have an opportunity to debate, offer amendments and vote on tobacco legislation. I know the Senate can and must work cooperatively and without partisanship, as we have on the Commerce Committee, to improve the measure, and assure that it serves the public health interests of our nation—most particularly our children.

The Commerce Committee measure is a bipartisan bill that was developed in consultation with the attorneys general, the administration and the public health representatives including Dr. Koop, Dr. Kessler, and Matt Myers of the National Center for Tobacco Free-Kids.

It's a comprehensive bill aimed at dramatically reducing youth smoking. Every living Surgeon General has signed a letter to Congress urging us to pass comprehensive legislation this year to address what is our nation's number one public health problem.

The tobacco industry is now embarked on a campaign of diversion to change the subject from health and children. They are trying to take attention away from the facts, and use specious ''buzz word'' attacks to kill a bill they know might actually stop kids from smoking and reduce their ability to lock teens in as lifetime smokers.

So, Mr. President, this is about money—the tobacco industry's money—and the lengths they'll go to make more, including lieing to Congress, manipulating nicotine to hook customers and marketing to kids.

Mr. President, I would like to quote recent newspaper items responding to the industry's attacks and regarding new evidence of the prevalence of smoking among minority children as reported in the Washington Post. First, from USA Today:

> Some, ever eager for some raw meat, were sucked right in by the rhetoric. But before you believe it, pause a moment for one little bit of truth: Everything the industry is railing against today it agreed to in some form just 10 months ago. Here's the rundown:

Big tax boost. Half a trillion dollars. That's how much those greedy lawmakers want to take from smokers. And a disproportionate amount would come from poor people because they smoke more.

But wait a minute. Where were these brave champions of the downtrodden last June? Ooops. They were signing a settlement deal with a group of state attorneys general to dig $400 billion from smokers' pockets. The AGs and congress sought high prices to discourage smoking, particularly in the teen years when most smokers start. The poor? Flip the tax idea around. Imagine what the reaction would be to a plan that lowered their costs in order to lure them into a deadly habit.

Big government. Standing athwart the onward march of big government, tobacco executives now warn that ''Washington wants to create 17 new bureaucracies.'' Memories of Clintoncare dance in their heads.

Just don't pay any attention to the fact that 10 months ago these same executives were whipping big government on. The June settlement gave the Food and Drug Administration a 30% boost in its budget, the feds new powers to ban indoor smoking, and on and on.

Ad restrictions. Why those do-gooders in Washington even want to strip the industry of its First Amendment rights by sharply restricting advertising. No human images, no color ads, and so on. Yet somehow all this was perfectly fine with the industry last June.

Tobacco farmers. Congress' plan would put hundreds, if not thousands, of tobacco farmers out of work. The Senate bill does set aside some $28 billion in a trust fund to help growers and their communities dislocated by the cut in smoking rates. Guess how much the industry secured for these beloved farmers when cutting its June deal? Zip. Zero. Nada.

What changed between June and today is this: Congress started to give the appearance of closing loopholes the industry had artfully built into the June deal—a tactic it has exploited in the past. Penalties for failing to reduce teen smoking, for instance, were too small to matter.

Some observers have suggested that the industry quit negotiations now only to improve chances for a weak deal later. That remains to be seen, but one thing is certain. All Big Tobacco has done for two weeks is blow smoke.

As reported in the Washington Post:

The latest annual report by the surgeon general, David Satcher, showed what other studies have highlighted: that smoking continues to increase in allure to young people even as fewer adults smoke. Over the past six years, it said, youth smoking has risen by nearly a third, and some 40 percent of white high school students smoke. Smoking by high school-age blacks, who still smoke less than white counterparts, rose by nearly 80 percent from 1991 to 1997. The smoking rate among Hispanic students rose by 34 percent, the study found.

Here are the facts.

First the statistics on youth smoking are clear and alarming: 3000 kids a day start smoking every day; 1000 of them will die early from smoking related disease; and one out of every three adolescents uses tobacco by age 18. Mr. President, we're not talking about kids who sneak a cigarette out of their mother's purse. According to a Surgeon General's report: Seventy-one percent of youth smokers, use tobacco daily.

The Centers for Disease Control reports that youth smoking is on the rise, a trend that the American Cancer Society calls a ''pediatric epidemic.'' Ninety percent of lifetime smokers take up the habit before the age of 18—when it is illegal to buy tobacco products in every state in the union. We know from documents discovered in state suits against the tobacco industry that they have long understood the adverse health impacts and addictiveness of their products, yet actively marketed to children, including studying 5–7 year olds.

The cost of this problem is enormous!

Mr. President, 435 thousand Americans die from smoking related illness every year—the single greatest cause of preventable disease and death in America by far. Every year, taxpayers must foot the bill for $50 billion in health care costs to treat smoking related disease. According to the Department of the Treasury, smoking related injury, damage and economic cost exceed over $130 billion annually. To recoup some of these costs to taxpayers, 41 states have sued the industry.

Mr. President, the severity and urgency of the problem is beyond question. Now is the time for action. As I said, every living surgeon general of the United States has signed a letter urging Congress to pass comprehensive tobacco control legislation.

The bill passed by the Commerce Committee is comprehensive and mirrors the framework of the tobacco settlement reached between the industry and the attorney general.

The bill: Restricts tobacco advertising and marketing aimed at kids; sets aggressive but achievable youth smoking reduction targets, and holds the industry responsible for failing to achieve the reductions; increases the price-per-pack of cigarettes by $1.10 over five years to reduce youth consumption. Experts agree such a hike is a critical part of the overall effort to curb youth from smoking.

It provides the Food and Drug Administration with authority to oversee nicotine and tobacco product ingredients and marketing. It requires the industry to pay up to $516 billion over 25 years to compensate states for tobacco related costs to Medicaid and public health programs; to fund youth smoking reduction and health research initiatives; and to assist tobacco farmers.

The bill is about our kids, it's about accountability and it's about solving a national problem. The industry wants to change the subject with the tried and true tactics of diversion.

I understand they now intend to spend $100 million for print and broadcast media to maintain the status quo. Perhaps if the industry had spent some of their resources on legitimate anti-youth smoking activities, we wouldn't have the problem we do today.

The industry diversion play book consists of four themes.

DIVERSION ONE—SOLVING THE PROBLEM OF YOUTH SMOKING IS REALLY ABOUT TAX AND SPEND GOVERNMENT

Experts agree that a price increase is an essential component of the effort to stop youth from taking up the habit—the industry doesn't want a bill that will truly diminish the number of their ''replacement'' users.

The money raised by a settlement would be used to reimburse taxpayers for the $50 billion yearly tax that big tobacco places on American taxpayers in the form of tobacco health care—including a substantial drain on Medicare and Medicaid.

The funds would also finance: Youth anti-smoking initiatives; vital health research to find new cures and treatment for smoking related disease including, cancer, stroke and heart disease. It would assist farmers who will be affected by reductions in tobacco consumption—hard working middle class Americans who for years have been encouraged to grow tobacco by federal policies.

The bulk of the revenue raised—up to $195 billion—will be dispensed to the states to settle their cases against the tobacco companies and could be used for tax cuts at the State level.

It's more than slightly ironic that last summer the industry agreed to a substantial price increase in their settlement with the attorneys general. They further tax their own credibility by suggesting that an additional 10 cents more per year by the year 2003 is the difference between enlightened public policy and tax and spend government.

DIVERSION TWO—THE EFFORT TO STOP YOUTH SMOKING IS ABOUT BIG GOVERNMENT

The tobacco companys ads say that the bill approved by the Commerce Committee contains seventeen new boards and panels, and is government run amok.

Of the dozen boards, most of which were contemplated in the industry's agreement, eight of them are part-time or advisory and entail little or no cost; two are temporary, including one created to reimburse small business people for the termination of cigarette vending machines. And, one is to ensure that increased research dollars are not wasted.

Furthermore, the majority of these initiatives were contemplated in the June 20th agreement signed by the industry.

DIVERSION THREE—THE INDUSTRY WILL GO BANKRUPT

The Commerce Committee bill implements the President's request for $1.10 increase in the price per pack of cigarettes over five years.

The Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, Lawrence Summers, testified before the Commerce Committee that this increase would not bankrupt or render the industry financially unviable.

The President has stated that it is not the administration's intention to drive the industry out of business, but to get them to stop marketing and selling to kids.

If the industry truly believes the President's request creates a bankruptcy situation, it's incumbent upon

them to make their case to the Department of the Treasury, not simply walk away from the table, and threaten to go back to business as usual.

DIVERSION FOUR—PRICE INCREASES WILL CREATE A BLACK MARKET

Again, the administration has assured that the President's request will not stimulate a substantial black market.

It's important to understand that today there is a black market today in cigarettes, as there is in a variety of consumer goods.

If the industry has credible evidence that price hikes will create a substantial black market that poses a threat to public safety or health they should produce that evidence.

I don't believe, however, that most Americans would agree we should refrain from doing what's necessary to stop youth smoking based on unsubstantiated conjecture.

One answer to the omnipresent black market issue is to better enforce our laws against smuggling and sale of contraband.

Let me conclude by saying Congress and the administration must focus on enacting a fair, effective and responsible piece of legislation that will stop youth from smoking. The American people demand it.

They do not want a political football, or partisan politics.

Certainly, improvements in the Commerce Committee bill can be made, and I look forward to continuing to work with all Senators to achieve that end. Now is the time for all sides to lower the rhetoric, make their case and let the legislative process work.

Mr. President, I appreciate the indulgence of the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 1 o'clock having been reached, the Senate is in recess until 2:15.

Thereupon, at 12:59 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

Mr. ENZI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

The Senate continued with the consideration of the treaty.

EXECUTIVE AMENDMENT NO. 2310, AS MODIFIED

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at this time to modify the Kyl amendment with the modification that is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Executive amendment, as modified, 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 policy of the United States is that the core concepts contained in the 1991 Strategic Concept of NATO (as defined in (1)(F)), which adapted NATO's strategy of the post-Cold War environment, remain valid today, and that the upcoming revision of that document will reflect 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 hegemonic 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.

(iv) CORE MISSION OF NATO.—Defense planning will affirm 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. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 4:30 p.m. today, the Senate resume consideration of the Kyl amendment No. 2310, as modified, and there be 30 minutes equally divided for debate on the amendment. Further, I ask unanimous consent that following the expiration or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the Kyl amendment, and further that no amendments be in order to the Kyl amendment prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I further ask that following the vote on adoption of the State Department conference report, at 2:25 p.m., there be 2 minutes equally divided for closing remarks on the Harkin amendment prior to the vote on or in relation to the Harkin amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to legislative session.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS REFORM AND RESTRUCTURING ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 10 minutes of debate equally divided for closing remarks prior to the vote on the adoption of the conference report accompanying H.R. 1757, which the clerk will now report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1757), have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. I yield myself 2½ minutes. It is what, 5 minutes each?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes on each side.

Mr. HELMS. I yield myself half of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. Notify me when it is over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, rumors, they are aflying to the effect that the President of the United States has instructed the Democrats of the Senate to vote against this conference report and, if my intelligence sources are correct, it will get about three Democratic votes this afternoon. That compares with the vote of 90–5 for this very same bill, largely, that was passed by the Senate. If such game playing is going to happen, and if this conference report is defeated because of that sort of thing, then the President is going to have a difficult time about a lot of things.

Let me say it again. The pending conference report is the result of more than a year's hard work by Senator BIDEN and Secretary Albright and JUDD GREGG, ROD GRAMS, and many others to abolish two antiquated temporary Federal registries created in the 1950s and bringing reform to the United Nations. Now, if this conference report is defeated this afternoon, so be it.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, the chairman and I have worked very, very hard over the last 9 months to produce this bill. I will not reiterate all that each of us said last week at the end of the day. We have no real disagreement in terms of the substance of the bill. We have a disagreement on not even whether or not we should attach a provision relating to family planning and abortion in the bill. We don't even disagree on that. The chairman had nothing to do with that being in. He is a strong supporter of the family planning limitation that is in this bill, so-called Mexico City, although he did not ask for it to be put in this bill, but it is on the bill. We are faced with the reality, it is on the bill.

The question is, What do we do from here? I urge my colleagues, notwithstanding the agreement the Senator and I have in every other aspect of the bill, to vote against this conference report. I do so because, at the insistence of the House, the Mexico City provision, which is not related to the underlying legislation, is in the bill, and stopping the conference report, I hope—and I may be tactically wrong here; this is my objective—I hope we send a signal to the House that we will not yield to what I characterize—not the chairman, ''me''—characterize, as legislative blackmail on this or other controversial issues.

As indicated, it would be inappropriate, if the Democrats took back the House next time out—I have no idea whether that will happen, but if they did—for them to attach to one of the bills an education provision that no one on the Republican side liked and said, ''Take it or leave it.'' I think it is a mistake.

The underlying legislation is critically important to American foreign policy. It would pay off our arrearages to the United Nations and bring additional reform to that body and reorganize our foreign policy agency, and it begins to provide the funds, in essence, to restore our diplomatic presence worldwide. I believe the President will sign it promptly, provided we send him one without Mexico City attached.

Again, the only thing that the chairman and I disagree on, he believes, and he believed, and I believe he believes it, that what the House sent is at least a compromise on Mexico City. I view it as not a compromise at all on Mexico City.

So I urge my colleagues to reject this conference report so we can return to conference and produce a bill that the President can sign.

I reserve the balance of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BIDEN. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes 30 seconds.

Mr. BIDEN. I see the Senator from Texas is standing. After he speaks, I am delighted to yield my 2 minutes in closing to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. GRAMM. I want to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question, if I might, if he will yield for that purpose.

Mr. HELMS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GRAMM. Obviously, a great deal of compromise has occurred on our side of the aisle with regard to arrearages at the United Nations. That is now, obviously, a focal point of this bill. I have to assume that the President would have to understand that if this bill is defeated today, his chances of getting any arrearage funding for the United Nations in this Congress would be diminished substantially and probably would not happen.

I ask the chairman his views on that.

Mr. HELMS. If I have anything to do with it, there will be no action on arrearages or anything else that the President is interested in.

Now, he has waved that veto flag time and time again. Let him wave it this time, but he must bear in mind that this is it, this is the end of it, one way or the other.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. GRAMM. I thank the chairman.

Mr. BIDEN. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I will join, I hope with the vast majority of colleagues on this side of the aisle, to vote against this bill even though the bill is an important bill and it is one that I have worked on with the ranking member and chairman for a long period of time.

I know the chairman worked diligently to try to break this bill free of the Mexico City language and to try to have the capacity to move forward on the floor. I applaud him for his good-faith efforts to do that.

Let me say to my colleagues that this is a tragedy of enormous proportions. It is dangerous. It is damaging to the interests of the United States to tie the U.N. arrearages and larger policy questions to one issue, to one point of view, by a very narrow percentage of Members of the U.S. Congress who want to tie it in this way to the United Nations. It is a form of a kind of political blackmail.

The reality is that the United States of America is going to lose significant prestige, significant leverage, and our interests are going to be set back in the international arena. We are going to be hurt with respect to issues like Bosnia. If anybody mistakes it, all you have to do is look at the way in which the coalition fell apart over Iraq and the issue of holding Saddam Hussein accountable for weapons of mass destruction.

Talk to anybody at the United Nations and you can learn very quickly about the growing anger of nations who watched the United States, which has become a scofflaw within the United Nations, unwilling to live up to the rules that we helped to write, unwilling to fulfill our obligations under the United Nations, all because one point of view in the U.S. Congress can't have its way.

I think those who think about this should think hard about what interest is being served here—the interests of abortion versus the interests of world leadership of the United States in the United Nations. That is what is at stake here.

I think the President ought to veto this and we ought to hold those accountable who are unwilling to assert the interests of the United States, the world's leader, all nations of the world today looking to us for that leadership, and here we are, handicapping ourselves over a totally separate issue.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I would like to express my opposition to the measure we are about to vote on, H.R. 1757, the State Department Authorization conference report. Despite the fact that this bill contains many provisions which I support, such as a wide-ranging reform package that would ensure U.S. payment of dues to the United Nations, the entire measure is overshadowed by an egregious and misguided abortion provision included at the insistence of those who oppose abortion rights.

This provision would prohibit foreign organizations from receiving U.S. family planning funds if that organization, with its own funds, provides legal abortion services or advocates on abortion issues in its own country. Such providers, for example, would lose their U.S.

funds if they discussed at a conference that more than 20 percent of all maternal deaths throughout Latin America and the Caribbean are due to illegal abortion.

In my view, this provision is a thinly-veiled attempt to further erode our commitment to international family planning programs. I must say, Mr. President, I am always perplexed by those who oppose family planning and also oppose abortion. Study after study has shown that lack of family planning leads to more unintended pregnancies which leads to more abortions. Consider two countries: Russia has very little contraception available, and abortion is the primary method of birth control. The average Russian woman has at least four abortions in her lifetime! Alternatively, Hungary has made family planning services more widely available and the abortion rate has dropped dramatically.

The impact these family planning programs have on the health and well-being of women and children around the world cannot be denied. But there is another issue here that should not be overlooked—the important role population programs play in sustaining the global environment.

The earth now supports 5.7 billion human beings. In thirty years it is estimated the world's population will be 8.3 billion. We are growing by 86 million people per year. It is expected that 90 percent of this increase will be in the developing world. India has to feed an additional 16 million people per year. And so many of these people are children—forty percent of the population of the average less-developed nation is under the age of 15.

Mr. President, the United States plays a critical role in providing family planning services abroad. I feel strongly that we should continue our leadership role in this area. It is both humane and environmentally sound. This conference report contains provisions that would gut our commitment to international family planning, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, here we go again. As we have done so many times in recent years, we are sacrificing serious and legitimate national interests to the partisan and divisive abortion debate. Due to the global gag rule imposed on international family planning, I will vote against the conference report on H.R. 1757, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act.

I commend the President for his strong veto message to the Congress on this legislation. Passage of this conference report will not change current law. A vote in favor of the conference report will not ultimately result in the payment of the U.S. debt to the United Nations or the reorganization of the State Department. Passage may score political points but it will delay this important legislation and diminish U.S. standing in the international community.

This language is anything but a compromise as proponents of the new global gag rule claim in defending the conference report. It was not adopted nor debated on the Senate floor. Every single Democratic conferee to this legislation refused to sign the conference report. Labeling this language a compromise is misleading and untrue.

Passage of the conference report will unfairly disqualify many family planning organizations from receiving U.S. international family planning funds if they use their own funds in their own countries to point out the adverse public health consequences of medically unsafe abortion. The elimination of these non-governmental organizations from the program, considered to be one of the best and most cost-effective channels for U.S. foreign aid dollars, will have a devastating impact on this critical foreign aid program.

The language in the bill will condition an organization's eligibility for U.S. family planning assistance unless it agrees to surrender its rights to free speech and participation in the political process in its own country using its own funds. Proponents of the controversial language will describe it as a ban on abortion lobbying, such as a restriction would be unconstitutional if applied to American citizens and would undermine one of the primary objectives of our foreign policy—the promotion of democracy around the world. The Senate should reject this conference report and the restrictive family planning language added behind closed doors.

Enactment of the conference report will result in the reduction of family planning funding by $44 million. The funding cut would likely cause a subsequent increase in the number of abortions as couples lose or are denied access to contraceptive services. Any Senator who supports family planning as a means to reduce the incidence of abortion should oppose this bill.

Family planning saves lives, particularly in the developing world where a woman dies in pregnancy or childbirth every minute of every day and where more than 12 million children each year do not live to see their fifth birthday.

I urge the Senate to reject the Conference Report on the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 1757—The Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998.

As is the case with many of my colleagues who have already spoken on this matter, I believe that it is fundamentally wrong to be holding the payment of U.N. arrears and the structural reform of U.S. foreign affairs organization hostage to a single issue related to international family planning—an issue by the way which was never even discussed during Senate consideration of this legislation. I am speaking of course of the so called Mexico City restrictions on U.S. international population programs that have been included in the legislation pending before us today—Section 1816 of the bill. These restrictions not only prohibit foreign non-governmental organizations that accept U.S. funding from using their own funds to perform abortions, but also bar them from lobbying their own governments, with their own money, on abortion related public policy issues.

Without doubt, Section 1816 is going to result in all of the other sections in the bill, over 160 of them—not becoming law.

That means that nearly two years of work on this bill will have been for naught. That is unfortunate in my view, because many of the other provisions are meritorious and should become law.

Mr. President, how did we get to where we find ourselves with respect to this legislation? Mr. President, let's be clear about who is responsible. It was not the President who created the current dynamic—he and officials in his administration have worked in good faith for months with House and Senate conferees on the legislation before us today.

It certainly wasn't the Senate conferees who working together had come up with an acceptable package of compromises on the various difference between the House and Senate passed bills —a package that we all more or less agreed to and would have supported. A package that did not include Mexico City language.

The responsibility for putting U.S. leadership at the U.N. in jeopardy and delaying foreign affairs reorganization rests solely with the House Republican leadership.

The Republican leadership knew full well that this entire bill was being put at risk with the inclusion of Section 1816 in this bill—a provision which, incidentally, would never become law if it were to be applied to domestic non-governmental organizations because it is so fundamentally a violation of the first amendment constitutional protections of free speech.

I know our Democratic colleagues in the House warned them of what was likely to happen.

I know Senator BIDEN did as well. Certainly the President has made no secret of his fundamental opposition to the so called Mexico City language and most especially the ''global gag rule'' aspect of it.

Despite these warnings, the House leadership instructed House Republican conferees to include this provision in the final version of the bill. Not a single Democratic conferee from either the House or Senate supported the final conference report that we have before us today. I was one of those conferees who refused to sign onto this legislation.

I certainly agree with those who are strongly opposed to the codification of the Mexico City language into law. I

think it is reprehensible to attempt to restrict the free speech of foreign nongovernmental organizations and their members.

I happen to believe that these organizations do very important work—work that is making a real difference to the health and over all quality of life for hundreds of millions of women and children living in developing countries throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

But my objections with respect to this matter go beyond the substance of the provision to that of the tactics that are being used here and for an unwillingness to take into account U.S. national and foreign policy interests that may be at stake. Proponents of this measure have made no effort to balance these overarching interests against the narrower ones of wanting to score partisan political points by promoting a very controversial agenda that clearly does not have the support of the majority of the American people.

Mr. President, it is my hope that the Senate will vote to reject the pending conference report and thereby send a signal that, at least in the Senate, we aren't in the practice of ''legislative hostage taking''—that is not the way the Senate conducts its business. In doing so, we will also be sending a signal to the American people that we are here to do their business, the business that we were elected to look out for, and not to play games of ''partisan one upmanship.'' I would urge my colleagues to join me in sending such a message by voting no on this measure.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, this conference report contains many important provisions that deserve the support of the Senate.

It authorizes Congress, at long last, to pay our overdue debt to the United Nations. It clears the way for comprehensive UN reform. The bill also includes a much-needed, major restructuring of our nation's foreign affairs agencies.

In the years since the Cold War ended, the maps of the world have been redrawn. The reorganization plan in this bill would enable us to redraw our foreign affairs structure to match the new, post-Cold War reality. It is the product of careful and detailed negotiations, and enjoys broad, bipartisan support.

Despite these important provisions, I regret that I will vote against this conference report, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise. The reason I oppose this report is because, in addition to its positive provisions, it also contains an extreme and extraneous provision the Senate has considered and rejected many times in the past. This provision—the so-called ''Mexico City language''—would do serious damage to international family planning efforts—including efforts that have nothing to do with promoting abortion and that, in fact, help to prevent abortions.

It would do serious damage to one of the ideals on which our own nation was founded, freedom of speech and expression. The Mexico City language would bar any agency that receives international family-planning assistance from the U.S. from using their own funds to pay for abortions, or to lobby for abortions.

Let me repeat: This bill does not tell agencies it cannot use U.S. funds for these services. That is already prohibited under existing law. This bill tells agencies in other nations that they may not use their own funds to pay for, or lobby for, abortions, without losing all U.S. family-planning assistance. This goes far beyond what the current law prescribes.

This body has rejected this kind of restriction in the past because we agreed it is inappropriate to place such limitations on how organizations in other nations may use their own money. Mr. President, it is still inappropriate for us to do so. But it is important to note that the Mexico City language is not simply the language this body has previously rejected. In 2 important ways, it is even more extreme.

First, this Mexico City provision will cut funds for international family-planning services. The conference report mandates that family planning agencies in other nations may not receive one dollar in U.S. family-planning assistance unless and until they certify that they will not perform abortions with their own funds. It is true that the President may waive this restriction. But if he does so, U.S. aid for international family-planning programs for that year would be limited to $356 million—$44 million less than we are now spending.

Second, this new version of the Mexico City language includes a provision that not only prohibits funding for any organization that lobbies to change abortions laws in other nations, as the former version did. It goes far beyond that prohibition to forbid recipients of U.S. funds from making any public statements about abortion. They are forbidden, Mr. President, even from expressing concerns about the dangers of illegal abortions.

And the President has no authority to waive this provision. The Secretary of State has rightly labeled this restriction a ''gag rule.'' In no way would this provision improve the lives of women and children around the world, nor would it reduce the incidence of abortion. Instead, this gag rule would violate one of our country's most hallowed principles, the principle of freedom of speech.

What kind of message would we be sending to the rest of the world if violate our founding principles? That those principles are not inalienable after all? That they may have worked 200 years ago, but they are not applicable in a modern world?

Surely, at a time when struggling new democracies all over the world are looking for guidance and inspiration, these are not messages we want to send. But the greatest danger of these extreme and extraneous provisions is that they will not improve the lives of women and children anywhere, nor will they prevent abortions anywhere. In fact, they will have the opposite effect. They will make it more difficult for women to plan their own families.

U.S. support of international family planning programs have immeasurably improved the lives of women in developing countries. By helping women limit the size of their families, we have enabled women to make the educational and economic gains that are essential if they, and their children, are to live longer and healthier lives. The number of women of childbearing age is increasing by 24 million every year. Now is not the time for this nation to cut back on our commitment to programs that enable women to plan their families—programs that actually reduce the incidence of abortion.

And make no mistake, Mr. President, that would be one of the consequences if we pass this conference report. There would, inevitably, be an increase in the number of abortions. That is not something I want to see, and I know that every member of this body agrees with me on this point.

Finally, Mr. President, it is important to note the context in which we are considering this conference report, and the implications it has for another important piece of legislation the Senate has already passed—the supplemental funding for the U.S. contribution to the International Monetary Fund.

Last month, the Senate approved these funds overwhelmingly. The vote was 84–16. The size of that margin indicates the importance Senators attach to an adequately-funded IMF. Unfortunately, a small but vocal minority of members in the other body have expressed reluctance to vote on the IMF funding unless we give into their demands on the Mexico City issue.

They are, in effect, holding hostage an important bill with significant national security implications, a bill that has broad, bipartisan support in the Senate, in order to force their way on a completely unrelated issue. The IMF appropriation is an insurance policy for the world economy and for countless American exporting businesses and farmers whose livelihoods depend on strong markets in Asia, Latin America, and other regions of the world. It is inappropriate and dangerous to link passage of IMF with the Mexico City restrictions. The longer we delay passage of the IMF funds, the more we expose our businesses, workers, and farmers to the risks and uncertainties of world financial markets.

For all of these reasons, Mr. President, the Mexico City provision does not belong in either the State Department authorization bill, or the IMF supplemental. If the other body wishes to implement the Mexico City restrictions, it should debate those restrictions in the context in which they belong—in a comprehensive foreign aid

authorization bill. They should not hold hostage every high-priority piece of foreign policy legislation moving through the Congress.

It is imperative that the Senate defeat this conference report to demonstrate that we will not support such efforts at linkage either in this instance or in the future. I urge my colleagues to vote against the conference agreement.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise today to emphasize the value of our nation's international family planning program. I share the outrage expressed by my colleagues that the United States Congress would even consider the un-democratic and un-American provisions contained in the Foreign Affairs Reform Act. What Congress should really be focusing on as we debate the role of international family planning is the impact of these scarce federal funds on the lives of women and families throughout the world.

Currently at least one woman dies every minute from causes related to pregnancy and childbirth. In developing countries, maternal mortality is the leading cause of death for women in reproductive age. The World Bank estimates that improved access to family planning would reduce maternal death by 20 percent. In the United States, there are 12 maternal deaths for every 100,000 live births; in parts of Sub-Saharan Africa, this ratio is more than 1,500 maternal deaths for every 100,000 live births. That's over 100 times greater than in the United States.

By being able to plan their pregnancies, mothers are able to ensure they bear their children at their healthiest times and that pregnancies do not occur too close together. This reduces the risks to the lives of both the mother and her children. Data from developing countries shows that babies born less than 2 years after their next oldest sibling are twice as likely to die in the first year as those born after an interval of at least 2 years. Further analysis suggests that, on average, infant mortality would be reduced by 25 percent if all births were spaced at least 2 years apart.

Reduced maternal and infant mortality are just two of the benefits of family planning programs. Family planning education also helps prevent the spread of sexually transmitted diseases, including AIDS. Family planning can also reduce the number of abortions. A U.S. study found that for every $1 increase in public funds for family planning, there is a decrease of 1 abortion per 1,000 women. According to the Rockefeller Foundation, in just 1 year, cuts and severe restrictions of federal funding for family planning programs will result in an additional 4 million unplanned pregnancies, and 1.6 million of those pregnancies will end in abortion. These are only conservative estimates.

U.S. family planning funds are having a profound, positive impact on families throughout the world. Mothers and children are healthier; more women are using contraception; fewer women are having abortions. Let me share just a few examples of the positive role family planning has played in Latin America. In 1960 in Chile, less than 3 percent of married women were practicing family planning, and the abortion rate was 77 abortions per 1,000 married women of reproductive age. By 1990, 56 percent of married women were using family planning, and the abortion rate had dropped to 45 per 1,000. Data from Bogota, Columbia showed that contraceptive use doubled between 1976 and 1990, accompanied by a 40 percent decrease in the abortion rate during the same period. In Mexico City, use of contraception increased by about 24 percent between 1987 and 1992, and the abortion rate fell 39 percent.

Similar successes can be found in examples from former Soviet Bloc nations. In Almaty, Kazakhstan, the United States population program has provided funding to train doctors and nurses and to increase contraceptive supplies for 28 clinics. Between 1993 and 1994, the number of people receiving contraceptives from the clinics increased by 59 percent, and the number of abortions fell by 41 percent. In Russia, contraceptive use has increased from 19 to 24 percent after an affiliate of the International Planned Parenthood Federation opened in 1991. The abortion rate dropped from 109 per 1,000 pregnancies in 1990 to 76 in 1994. The total number of abortions fell from 3.6 million in 1990 to 2.8 million in 1994. In Hungary, abortion rates dropped dramatically from the late 1960's to the mid-1980's, largely due to the significant increase in contraceptive use.

The numbers are incredible, but what is truly important and who we can't forget are the women and their families represented in these numbers. One such woman is 30 year old Maria Elena Absalon Ramirez in Mexico. Her husband earns just $80 per month to support Maria and their four children. They cannot afford contraceptives and rely on USAID-funded family planning. These are Maria's words: ''What I fear most is becoming pregnant again.''

I urge my colleagues to recognize the valuable impact of family planning on the lives of millions of families throughout the world, and to oppose restrictions on the use of international family planning funds.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I want to comment on one aspect of the conference report before us today, the provisions relating to the consolidation of USIA into the State Department. Although the President has already signaled his intention to veto this bill should it pass, I would like to highlight a concern I share with others which was addressed to some degree in the conference report: the need to protect the integrity of U.S. public diplomacy.

There have been some indications that when the State Department incorporates the functions of USIA into its organization, there are some State Department officials who are interested in using the resources associated with USIA programs to boost the public affairs functions of the State Department. I would like to go on record in opposition to any shifting of resources or even worse merging of these two very distinct functions of public affairs and public diplomacy.

To give some background on this issue, since 1948 when U.S. government information programs were first authorized under section 501 of the Smith/Mundt Act, it has been understood that public diplomacy programs were directed to foreign audiences. As Under Secretary of State Philip Habib said in 1986:

> There is a distinction between public diplomacy and public affairs. The word diplomacy means ''outside'' and has nothing to do with what you are trying to do with the American people, which is altogether different. Gaining the support of the American people for U.S. foreign policy initiatives is entirely different from attempting to pursue the interests of the United States in the foreign arena.

Over the years, Congress and the courts have upheld and strengthened the distinction between public diplomacy, which is directed abroad, and public affairs, which is directed toward a U.S. audience. As USIA and its functions are folded into the State Department—and I do not necessarily oppose this and other cost savings moves—we must continue to uphold the distinction between these two functions. I support the need to provide a clear articulation of U.S. foreign policy to Americans, especially as the world and U.S. international interests have become increasingly complex. However, the State Department should not anticipate a windfall in resources for its public affairs function.

Public diplomacy, the presentation and advocacy of information about the United States, not just the advocacy of a particular foreign policy position, has been best presented independently and objectively without consideration of how that message would play at home. Educating the rest of the world about American society should not be hindered by the equally important but distinct function of explaining U.S. foreign policy to the American people.

Edward R. Murrow said it best almost 40 years ago:

> What we endeavor to reflect . . . is not only our policy, but our ideals. We not only seek to show people who we are and how we live: we must also engage others in the delicate, difficult art of human persuasion, to explain why we do what we do.

Mr. President, as we consider legislation to consolidate USIA into the State Department, whether it be in this session or in future sessions of Congress, I urge my colleagues to keep this important distinction in mind.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the conference report to H.R. 1757, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act.

My opposition is tinged with a measure of regret, for this bill contains

many provisions that I have worked on, first as Ranking member on the House International Operations Subcommittee for ten years and for two years as Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on International Operations. This bill consolidates our foreign policy apparatus by merging the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the United States Information Agency into the State Department—which will make our foreign policy machinery run more efficiently.

With regard to arrearages owed to the United Nations, I supported the provisions of this bill—which are similar to provisions in my own UN Reform bill—which linked payment of funds owed by the United States to the United Nations implementing certain benchmark reforms including a reduction in the dues charged to the United States for the United Nations regular budget as well as our share of peacekeeping assessments.

I have worked on six State Department authorization bills during my time in the Congress and know how difficult a process it is to assemble a consensus on the reorganization of the State Department. I was extremely pleased that this bill built upon the foundation the Foreign Relations Committee laid in the last Congress when I was Chair of the International Operations Subcommittee, I worked with Senator HELMS on these most important foreign policy issues. The work done by Senators HELMS and BIDEN on these matters is to be commended.

However, this bill also contains a provision that would reinstate the Mexico City Policy in a way that imposes unacceptable restrictions in international family planning efforts. And for that reason I cannot support it.

Mr. President, this issue is often referred to as the ''Mexico City policy'' issue because it was at the 1984 United Nations Population Conference in Mexico City that the Reagan Administration adopted for our international family planning programs a precursor of what became known as the ''gag rule'' for our own domestic family planning programs. Under the Mexico City policy, the Reagan Administration withheld international family planning funds from all groups that had even the slightest involvement in legal abortion-related services using their own private funds.

Before I address what I believe to be the most troubling aspects of the current version of the ''Mexico City policy,'' let me first emphasize that no United States taxpayer funds are being used to pay for abortions overseas. Since 1973 an amendment, authored by the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, prohibits the use of United States funds for abortion services. That needs to be made clear in discussing United States funding for international family planning efforts.

However, the current version of the so-called ''Mexico City policy'' contained in this bill is most troubling. Foreign nongovernmental organizations would still be barred from receiving family planning assistance if they, with their own funds, perform legal abortions. While the President can waive the ban on the performance of abortions, he is prohibited from using waiver authority granted him under section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to permit these groups to lobby on abortion matters.

As Secretary of State Albright noted, this lobby ban ''is basically a gag rule that would punish 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.''

Let me take just a moment to illustrate what the practical effect this lobbying ban would have on international family planning efforts.

If a foreign nongovernmental organization, or NGO, were to produce a paper that noted that a certain percentage of all maternal deaths in a certain part of the world are due to illegal abortion, it would lose their US family planning funds. The reason? This paper would be calling attention to ''defects'' in abortion laws.

If the president of an NGO were to give a radio interview and make a ''public statement'' giving an opinion about his or her nation's own abortion law, that NGO would lose its US family planning funds. The reason? A question about abortion law was answered on the airwaves.

These restrictions greatly concern me and they should concern anyone interested not only in the free exchange of ideas but the welfare of developing nations.

Ever since the 1974 United Nations Population Conference in Bucharest, Romania the United States has been the traditional leader in international family planning assistance. Many of the world's developing nations at that time perceived family planning to be a western effort to reduce the power and influence of Third World nations. By the time of the Mexico City Conference ten years later, most developing nations had come to understand the importance of widely-available, voluntary family planning to their own nation's development potential.

I believe that the absence of family planning assistance may well lead to more, not fewer, abortions being performed. If organizations such as the International Planned Parenthood Federation would be denied United States funds, we would be unable to support some of the most effective and capable family planning programs in the developing world. These programs are vital in preventing unplanned pregnancies, in reducing infant mortality and in promoting maternal and child health.

I am also troubled by the message that this ''gag rule'' sends to nations all around the world about American values that I cherish—freedom of speech and participation in the political process of one's country. Under the restrictions imposed by this bill, a foreign nongovernmental organization would be required to remain silent on this issue. This restriction on public debate is unhealthy for the democratic process and is something Americans would not tolerate if attempts were made to impose it here at home.

Finally, I am troubled by the fact that these restrictions would place the weight of the United States government behind efforts to tell NGOs what they can and can not do with their own, let me repeat that, their own, funds. These groups should not have to check in with the United States whenever they wish to issue a public statement, sponsor a conference, or distribute materials with their own money.

Mr. President, international family planning should not be held hostage to these restrictions. The benefits of population control are substantial. Funds invested in family planning yield savings in maternal and child health care costs. Lower population growth rates make it easier for developing nations to institute the types of free market reforms that offer them their best hope for long-term sustainable development. Lower population growth places fewer strains on these nations political institutions which means there is less of a risk to international stability and peace.

Lower population growth also places less of a strain on the environment. Reduced environmental trauma, improved standards of living, and reduced immigration pressures benefit every single living person on the planet.

This conference report endangers all of these potential benefits. For this reason I will oppose its adoption and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allocated to the Senator from Delaware has expired.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. All the President has to do is pull back that flag of veto. All the Democrats have to do is to vote for this bill, and then we can proceed to work in harmony, as we have previously, leading to a 90–5 endorsement on this bill on the first go-round.

I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished assistant majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. I compliment my colleague from North Carolina for his work on the State Department reorganization bill. He has worked on it for years. He has done good work. It will save taxpayers a lot of money and make the State Department more accountable and do a better job.

We have heard colleagues on the other side say, I will not support it because of the so-called abortion provision. The only thing in this bill that deals with abortion is that it basically says we don't want to have U.S. money used to lobby other countries to change their laws. What in the world makes

people think that we are so right on abortion, this administration's philosophy is so right on abortion, we should be lobbying other countries to change their position? Some countries are pro-life. They have it in their constitution; they have it in their legislature. Why should U.S. tax money be used to lobby those countries to change their laws? That is a serious mistake—a serious mistake.

I heard somebody say we haven't changed Mexico City policy. There is no restriction in here. These International Planned Parenthoods can use their money for abortions overseas. That is not even in this. The only restriction is, anybody that received nongovernmental entity can't use money to lobby other countries to change their laws and influence other countries on abortion. I don't think we should do that. We certainly shouldn't have U.S. tax moneys doing that.

I think this is a decent compromise. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass this.

Mr. BIDEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BIDEN. Does the Senator from Delaware have any time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. BIDEN. I ask unanimous consent for 60 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I know my friend from Oklahoma didn't intend to mislead, but there is already a law, the HELMS amendment, which says no U.S. money can be used for that purpose —no U.S. money.

What the Mexico City language in this bill says is that these nonprofit organizations cannot use their own money, the money they raise, in Mexico, in Argentina, in Italy, in France, in China, they can't use that money to lobby their government. No U.S. taxpayers' dollars are allowed under present law to be used to lobby for abortion, period, bang. That is already law. That is the HELMS amendment.

What we are talking about is using their money raised from sources other than a contribution from the U.S. taxpayer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 60 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, money is fungible. We had the law of the land under President Reagan and President Bush for 10 years, 12 years, a certain number of those years. No money should be used by these organizations if they take U.S. money to fund abortions or to lobby governments. Whether it be government money or their money, we said, ''No; if you are going to get U.S. money, you can't go in and take other money and use it to pay for abortions or lobby other countries.''

Money is fungible, so the net result is, what we are trying to say is, wait, if you are going to take U.S. taxpayer dollars, don't use money and shuffle money around in accounts and lobbying other countries to change their laws. They are representing our Government in many cases. If they are getting U.S. taxpayer money and they are lobbying and using that money to set up family planning, and they are also lobbying, a lot of other countries are going to think that is the U.S. Government or would think that is taxpayer dollars. That is a mistake.

This is a reasonable compromise. I urge my colleagues to pass it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. KERRY. I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds.

Mr. HELMS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 105 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Abraham	Faircloth	Lugar
Allard	Ford	Mack
Ashcroft	Frist	McCain
Bennett	Gorton	McConnell
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Breaux	Grams	Nickles
Brownback	Grassley	Roberts
Burns	Gregg	Santorum
Campbell	Hagel	Sessions
Coats	Hatch	Shelby
Cochran	Helms	Smith (NH)
Coverdell	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Craig	Hutchison	Stevens
D'Amato	Inhofe	Thomas
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thompson
Domenici	Kyl	Thurmond
Enzi	Lott	Warner

NAYS—49

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Graham	Moynihan
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hollings	Reed
Bryan	Inouye	Reid
Bumpers	Jeffords	Robb
Byrd	Johnson	Rockefeller
Chafee	Kennedy	Roth
Cleland	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Collins	Kerry	Snowe
Conrad	Kohl	Specter
Daschle	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	Wyden
Durbin	Levin	
Feingold	Lieberman	

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. CRAIG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

The Senate continued with the consideration of the treaty.

EXECUTIVE AMENDMENT NO. 2312

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement, there will be 2 minutes equally divided on the Harkin amendment No. 2312.

We will not proceed until the Senate is in order.

Who yields time? If no one yields time, time runs equally on each side.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Harkin amendment. Everyone should understand one thing. This has nothing to do with the expansion of NATO. Under the resolution we are passing, we say we are not going to do anything beyond what we now do to contribute to the common budget of NATO, which, on average, is 25 percent.

There are three common budgets. My friend from Iowa comes along and says: Look, we are not going to allow you to do what you were allowed to do now for Greece, Turkey, Germany. For example, when we passed the CFE agreement, we agreed we would get rid of a lot of materiel. That materiel was worth the sum total of about $185 million. We gave it to Turkey, Portugal, Germany, et cetera.

Under this amendment, we would not be able to do that kind of thing for any of the new countries if they come in. In addition to that, we would be limited to be engaged in any foreign military sales to these countries. Nothing to do with common budgets.

I urge you to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. The Senator from Iowa has 1 minute.

Mr. HARKIN. As former U.S. Ambassador to Russia, Jack Matlock warned:

> We're going to have a dilemma that we either encourage them—new NATO members—to divert resources they don't have or we end up fooling the American people about what it's going to cost them.

That is what this amendment is about, not fooling the American people.

My amendment does two things. It requires a full accounting of all U.S. contributions, all for NATO expansion by including the U.S. contributions to the national governments when calculating the U.S. share of enlargement costs.

Right now, we are limited to 25 percent for the common costs. That does not take into account the national costs. What I am saying with this amendment is, sure, we will provide our fair share, but why should we do more than 25 percent.

And please do not fall for the argument that we could not have done this

for Greece and others in the past. The cold war is over. Europe is rich. These countries have money. We should not just stick U.S. taxpayers with the total bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 76, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 106 Ex.]

YEAS—24

Ashcroft	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Harkin	Moynihan
Bond	Hutchinson	Murray
Bumpers	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Byrd	Johnson	Torricelli
Conrad	Kempthorne	Warner
Dorgan	Kohl	Wellstone
Feingold	Leahy	Wyden

NAYS—76

Abraham	Faircloth	Lugar
Akaka	Feinstein	Mack
Allard	Ford	McCain
Bennett	Frist	McConnell
Biden	Glenn	Mikulski
Bingaman	Gorton	Murkowski
Boxer	Gramm	Nickles
Breaux	Grams	Reed
Brownback	Grassley	Reid
Bryan	Gregg	Robb
Burns	Hagel	Roberts
Campbell	Hatch	Rockefeller
Chafee	Helms	Roth
Cleland	Hollings	Santorum
Coats	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Inouye	Shelby
Coverdell	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Craig	Kerrey	Snowe
D'Amato	Kerry	Specter
Daschle	Kyl	Stevens
DeWine	Landrieu	Thomas
Dodd	Lautenberg	Thompson
Domenici	Levin	Thurmond
Durbin	Lieberman	
Enzi	Lott	

The executive amendment (No. 2312) was rejected.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay it on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN, MR. JOHN PRESCOTT

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess for 2 minutes for the purpose of welcoming Deputy Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. John Prescott, to the floor.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent the privilege of the floor be granted to Sir Christopher Mayer, the British Ambassador to the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:21 p.m., recessed until 3:23 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KEMPTHORNE).

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

The Senate continued with consideration of the treaty.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the expansion of NATO. And how appropriate that our friends, colleagues, and allies from the United Kingdom have joined us on the Senate floor just as they have joined us in battle and just as they have joined us in keeping the peace, and we welcome them with affection, admiration, and gratitude.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate has returned to consideration of the ratification of NATO enlargement. I hope we will now have an uninterrupted debate. NATO enlargement deserves the dignity of serious consideration of this matter and to take such time as the Senate deems necessary.

Mr. President, I support NATO enlargement because it will make Europe more stable and America more secure. It means that the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe will share the burden of European security. It means that future generations might not have to fight and die in a European theater.

If NATO doesn't enlarge, the Iron Curtain remains permanent and the unnatural division of Europe will live on longer than the Communist empire did in the Soviet Union. NATO will remain, as President Havel has said, an alumni club for cold war victors. It will have little relevance to the realities of the 21st century.

Mr. President, as a Polish American, I know that the Polish people did not choose to live behind the Iron Curtain. They were forced there by the Yalta agreement and by Potsdam and because they and the Baltic States and the other captive nations were sold out by the West.

Many Members of the U.S. Senate have stood long for the freeing of the captive nations. Many of our colleagues have been strong supporters of Solidarity. I, as both a Congresswoman and then as a U.S. Senator, supported the Solidarity movement. I was a strong supporter of the Solidarity movement. I was with President Ronald Reagan in a wonderful evening he held at the White House where he hosted the Polish Ambassador to the United States who had defected when Poland had imposed martial law on its own people, there sitting with President Reagan and the Ambassador from Poland who chose to defect rather than uphold where the Polish Army had been forced to go against its own people.

We pledged that we would make Poland free. And now Poland is free, but we have to make sure that Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic are not only free but that they are secure. That is why my support is for the expansion of NATO. My support for NATO is not based on ethnic American politics nor is it even based on the past, but it is based on the future. What will the new world order look like?

I support NATO enlargement because it will make America and Europe more stable and secure. NATO enlargement means a future in which the newly independent countries will take their rightful place as a member of Western Europe. NATO played an important part in securing this freedom. It has been the most successful alliance in history. It is an alliance that helped us win the cold war. It deterred war between the superpowers and helped prevent confrontation between member states.

But if NATO is to survive, it must adapt to the needs of a post-cold-war world, or it will become irrelevant.

NATO has evolved since it was created in 1949. We have enlarged NATO on three different occasions. Each new member strengthened NATO and increased security in Europe. No expansion of NATO is easy. No expansion of NATO is done without thought. No expansion of NATO is ever without controversy. We can only reflect what the bitter debate must have been when we voted to include Germany because of their provocative role in World War I and World War II.

Today, we are facing difficult and different threats to security. We have civil wars, as in Bosnia; we have hot spots caused by ethnic and regional tensions, as in Kosovo; we have international crimes, drugs, and terrorism; and we have the spread of weapons of mass destruction. NATO must change in order to meet these new threats. Europe's new democracies will help us meet those challenges.

The countries of Central and Eastern Europe want to help us address these new threats. How many times has the Senate discussed burdensharing in Europe—and we want others to share the burden, not only in the financial cost, but of the risk to be borne in defending democracy. How often have we in the United States complained that European countries were not willing to pay their fair share for their own defense?

Now, we have countries that are asking to share the burden. They are asking to pledge their troops and equipment for a common defense. They are asking to share the burden of peacekeeping. In fact, they are doing it right now in Bosnia, where thousands of troops from Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic are helping to secure the peace. Hungary has made itself available, so it is our base camp to go into Bosnia. They have even committed to joining us and ending Iraq's

chemical and biological weapon programs, which is more than can be said of some of our allies.

These countries are not asking for a handout, nor are they asking for our protection without their own ability to maintain their own defense. They are asking to be full partners in the new Europe. By transforming their countries into free-market democracies, countries that have a democracy, a free-market economy, with civilian control of the military, transparent military budgets, wow, these new democracies are ready to join NATO.

These new democracies will contribute to America's security by making NATO stronger. They are adding troops and equipment. They will provide additional strategic depth to NATO. They will also provide the will to fight for democratic values. Their history and geography make them passionate defenders of peace and democracy. They know what it means to be occupied and oppressed by tyrants, occupied and oppressed against their own will. They will put our common values into action. They will join with us in defending our national security and our values, whether it means peacekeeping in Europe or preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction anywhere in the world.

Opponents of NATO enlargement have valid concerns, and I think we need to discuss them. First of all, opponents of enlargement point to cost. They say that NATO enlargement has a cost, and they are right. The new NATO members must modernize their military and make them compatible with NATO systems. The new NATO members have committed to pay this price.

There will also be a cost to the United States. Our funding of NATO's common budget will increase. NATO estimates that the total common budget will increase $1.5 billion over 10 years. The American share of that will be $400 million, or $40 million a year.

But what is the cost of not enlarging NATO? I believe it will be far higher. What will be the cost to European security, the cost to the new democracies of Eastern Europe, the long-term cost to America? And, most important, will the benefits of NATO enlargement outweigh the costs?

As a member of the Senate NATO Observer Group, working on a bipartisan basis, I met recently with the Foreign Ministers of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. I asked them those very questions.

The Polish Foreign Minister, Bronislaw Geremek, is a hero of the Solidarity movement. He said that Poland would feel abandoned once again by the West. He said that Poland will still pay to modernize their military. In fact, he said that the failure to include these three nations in NATO will cause them to spend more on their military budget. They also said they would form their own military alliance, which would be decidedly more anti-Russian than NATO. He went on to say that by refusing to enlarge NATO, we would give the hardliners in Russia a great victory. The antidemocratic forces in Russia would feel vindicated and proud. We would be handing them a victory that they could build on.

What would be the long-range costs to America of failing to prepare NATO for the 21st century? The cost would be instability in Europe and the increased chance of being pulled into yet another European war. And the cost of preventive security is always less than the cost of war.

I would like to discuss the benefits of enlargement, which I believe outweigh the costs. The strategic benefits of enlargement are most important. NATO enlargement will create a zone of peace and stability that does include Eastern Europe. It will extend NATO's stabilizing influence to more of Europe and reduce the chances of aggression or conflict in Eastern Europe. Enlargement will bring peace and security to Eastern Europe, just as it did for the West.

There are also economic benefits. Europe is America's largest trading partner, with $250 billion in two-way trade each year. Our new NATO partners will increase trading opportunities. They are building vibrant free-market economies. Poland's economy is growing at 6 percent, which is more rapidly than many of the others. NATO brings stability, and stability brings prosperity. We are creating a prosperity zone across Europe.

Mr. President, in the best tradition of the Senate, I could expand, but I know my colleague from Texas is waiting to speak as well. We are both involved in the supplemental. What I want to say is that the treaty ratification is one of the Senate's most fundamental duties. We are extending our Nation's commitment to collective defense. I certainly don't take this responsibility lightly. In the very best tradition of the Senate, we are addressing NATO enlargement as a national security issue, not a political issue. NATO enlargement is bipartisan, and it should be. It must be fully supported by members of both parties and the leadership of the Senate.

We have worked closely with the President and Secretary Albright. The Senate has been fully consulted at every step of the process, as has been required by our Constitution. Senator LOTT and Senator DASCHLE, our Republican and Democratic leaders, appointed a NATO observer group, chaired by Senator ROTH, which has engaged in all aspects of discussing NATO enlargement, as well as the appropriate committees. So now we have had discussion at the committee level. Now it is time to debate this on the Senate floor.

I am proud to support NATO enlargement. By ratifying this resolution, we are marking the end of the cold war and the beginning of a new century. We are building an undivided, peaceful, and democratic Europe for the new millennium. We are laying the groundwork for a new era of peace and stability.

Mr. President, a new century is coming, a new millennium is about to be born, and I do not want the repugnant and despicable wars that characterized the 20th century to be carried into and repeated in the 21st century. That is why I believe in the expansion of NATO with these three countries. I look forward to a full and ample debate with my colleagues, Mr. President. This is a moment that I think is a long time waiting. We appreciate the leadership of President Ronald Reagan, who brought the end of the cold war, and Mr. George Bush, who was willing to defend and fight against the weapons of mass destruction. And now, under President Bill Clinton, we look forward to expanding NATO and to keeping that momentum going.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I was going to make my floor statement, but Senator SMITH and I have an amendment and we have been encouraged to go ahead and put our amendment forward. I will yield to Senator SMITH for his introduction of the Smith-Hutchison amendment that deals with MIA. I yield the floor to him.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending Kyl amendment be temporarily set aside for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE AMENDMENT NO. 2314

(Purpose: To express a condition requiring full cooperation from Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic with the United States efforts to obtain the fullest possible accounting of captured and missing United States personnel from past military conflicts of Cold War incidents)

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH], for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON, proposes an executive amendment numbered 2314.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in section 3 of the resolution, insert the following:

( ) REQUIREMENT OF FULL COOPERATION WITH UNITED STATES EFFORTS TO OBTAIN THE FULLEST POSSIBLE ACCOUNTING OF CAPTURED AND MISSING UNITED STATES PERSONNEL FROM

PAST MILITARY CONFLICTS OR COLD WAR INCIDENTS.—Prior to the deposit of the United States instrument of ratification, the President shall certify to Congress that each of the governments of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic are fully cooperating with United States efforts to obtain the fullest possible accounting of captured and missing United States personnel from past military conflicts or Cold War incidents, to include the following:

(A) facilitating full access to relevant archival material; and

(B) identifying individuals who may possess knowledge relative to captured and missing United States personnel, and encouraging such individuals to speak with United States Government officials.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I will be very brief in my remarks regarding this amendment. First of all, I want to compliment and commend the Senator from Texas, Senator HUTCHISON, for her cooperation and support as we worked together to craft this amendment.

This is a very, very important amendment, which I will get into in a moment, regarding the cooperation of these new NATO nations—if they were to become NATO nations—that would require their full cooperation with the United States in order to obtain the fullest possible accounting of any military personnel missing from any of the wars, from World War II, Korea, Vietnam, to the cold war.

This amendment is supported by a number of veterans organizations—Vietnam Veterans of America, National Vietnam and Gulf War Veterans Coalition, MIA Families, Korean/Cold War Family Association, National League of POW/MIA families.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement in support of this amendment by each of those organizations be printed in the RECORD at this time.

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

VIETNAM VETERANS OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, April 13, 1998.

HOLD FORMER SOVIET BLOC NATIONS ACCOUNTABLE FOR PLEDGES MADE ON POW/MIAS

During the current Senate debate on the expansion of NATO, Vietnam Veterans of America strongly urges the United States Senate to hold the former Soviet Bloc counties of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic accountable for their pledges of cooperation on POW/MIA archival research made to the U.S./Russia Joint Commission in July 1997.

The Joint Commission on the POW/MIA issue was established by President Bush and President Yeltsin in 1992. One of its goals was to research the military, intelligence, security, and communist party archives for relevant information on the disposition of American POWs from the Vietnam War. The Eastern Bloc countries actively supported and were allies of the communist government of North Vietnam during this conflict.

The former Soviet Bloc countries had a significant presence in Asia and were aware of communist POW policy. Membership in NATO guarantees an American military presence. Before considering expansion of NATO to include these Soviet Bloc countries, they must grant access to their archives and provide relevant information on American POW/MIA's from the Vietnam War. Vietnam Veterans of America strongly urges the United States Senate, in their current debate, to focus on the unsatisfactory follow up actions by these countries, and to delay the expansion of NATO to include the Soviet Bloc countries until they have fulfilled their previous commitments.

Vietnam Veterans of America is the nation's only congressionally chartered veterans service organization dedicated solely to the needs of Vietnam-era veterans and their families. VVA's founding principle is ''Never again will one generation of veterans abandon another.''

NATIONAL VIETNAM & GULF WAR VETERANS COALITION,
Washington, DC, April 28, 1998.

Hon. BOB SMITH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Re NATO Expansion.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: The National Vietnam & Gulf War Veterans Coalition is a federation of approx. 90 veterans membership and issue organizations dedicated to the advancement of ten goals for the benefit of veterans of these two wars. One of those goals is for full POW MIA accountability.

The primary argument in favor of NATO expansion into Eastern Europe has been said to be a means of encouraging enforcing Western, democratic norms on these former Communist countries. Under the circumstances, we do not find it at all unreasonable to also require the emptying of the closets containing defunct Communist secrets concerning the disappearance of many of our servicemen, apparently alive and in captivity at some point, from hot and cold wars fought during half a century.

We therefore endorse your rider, requiring the President to certify full co-operation by the NATO membership applicants on the POW–MIA issue that continues to haunt us.

Sincerely,

J. THOMAS BURCH, JR.,
Chairman.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF FAMILIES OF AMERICAN PRISONERS AND MISSING IN SOUTHEAST ASIA,
Washington, DC, April 28, 1998.

Hon. BOB SMITH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: The lack of full and open cooperation by the governments of Vietnam and Russia to help account as fully as possible for Americans still missing from the Vietnam War has prompted our support for your efforts to seek such cooperation from the governments of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

We recognize that the initiatives of the U.S.-Russian Commission on POW/MIA offer promise to POW/MIA families who have long awaited answers. Although less promising than through the leadership serving in Hanoi, Moscow and Pyongyang, there is increasing evidence that the countries who were a part of the former USSR have relevant knowledge about Americans still missing and unaccounted for from our nation's past military conflicts.

For this reason, the League expresses our gratitude to you and your colleagues who recognize the need to seek full cooperation from the governments of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

Respectfully,

ANN MILLS GRIFFITHS,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF FAMILIES,
Bellevue, WA, March 16, 1998.

Re: NATO—A Resolution for Our POWs.

Hon. JESSE A. HELMS,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, DC

DEAR SENATOR HELMS: Within days, the Senate will vote to extend NATO membership to Poland, Hungry and the Czech Republic. The membership of the National Alliance of Families asks that during debate on this subject, a resolution is introduced requiring the United States to formally request that these nations release all archival information the above Countries hold on American Prisoners of War from the Korean War, The Cold War and the War in Southeast Asia.

During the Hearings before the House Subcommittee on Military Personnel, evidence was presented clearly showing Czech involvement with American and United Nation POWs during the Korean War. Evidence presented by the former Czech General, Jan Sejna, indicated POWs from the Vietnam War were transported to Czechoslovakia.

We do not wish to punish the present democratic nations of the former Eastern Bloc. However, we do not want to let a golden opportunity slip through our fingers. Each former Eastern block nation seeking NATO membership must be asked a series of specific questions relating to that Country's knowledge of American POWs. This mandate for questioning can only be achieved by a formal Senate Resolution.

Each former Eastern Bloc country should be asked to:

1. Search their records for the location of any Americans or former American citizens living in their country. Making said survivors available to U.S. investigators;

2. Open their archives, making all documents relating to American POWs or survivors. This should include all records of interrogations and medical experimentation; and

3. All records and documentation of the Country's involvement with American POWs on foreign soil.

These requests should be made with the understanding that no nation will be condemned or punished for involvement with American POWs or survivors.

Any nation coming forward with ''live'' American POWs (survivors) or information relating to POWs (or survivors) will be commended for their spirit of cooperation in this ''new age'' of democracy.

The Countries that once formed the Soviet Eastern Bloc, holds a wealth of information on American POWs. A resolution by the United States Senate, formally requesting this information assuring no reprisals or condemnation should encourage the cooperation of these new Democracies.

Senator, please do not let this golden opportunity to gain information about our POWs slip through our fingers.

Sincerely,

DOLORES APODACA ALFOND,
National Chairperson.

KOREAN/COLD WAR FAMILY ASSOCIATION OF THE MISSING,
Coppell, TX, April 27, 1998.

Re expansion of NATO.

Senator ROBERT SMITH.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: The proposed expansion of NATO to include the Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary presents a unique opportunity to gain information about the fate of the more than 10,000 American men who remain missing from the Korean, Vietnam, and Cold Wars. Although the governments involved might express the best of intentions at this stage of the admission process, experience tells us that promises made to gain

advantage are often broken when the incentive no longer exists. The window of opportunity to ensure significant cooperation is open to us during the admission process, and will be lost if not seized at this time.

As you know, the United States has considerable intelligence and other information that delineates a Soviet program during the Korean, Vietnam and Cold Wars to exploit American POWs. The governments of the former East Bloc countries most certainly had information about this covert program, and some intelligence suggests they participated in the effort to some extent.

The United States would be remiss if we did not set forth a clear expectation of full and good faith cooperation on the POW/MIA issue in the proposed NATO Treaties, as a condition of membership. The nexus between a military alliance and the POW/MIA Full Accounting is both clear and appropriate. As an integral part of their membership in NATO, the three countries under consideration at this time, and all former East Bloc countries that might be considered in the future, should come forward with whatever information they might have about missing American servicemen.

Cooperation on this important issue should go without saying for these countries. If we fail to require a demonstrable level of meaningful cooperation, these countries will be justified in presuming that the United States Government really does not want to know what happened to our missing servicemen. Surely, the Senate does not want to send such an unacceptable message to these countries, to the families of our missing men, nor to the American People.

We thank you for your ongoing support for our efforts to account for American POW/MIAs.

Sincerely,

DONNA D. KNOX.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I also thank Congressman SAM JOHNSON, who, as many of my colleagues know, was a POW, along with Senator MCCAIN, and others, during the Vietnam war. Congressman JOHNSON and I have traveled to Prague, Warsaw, and to Moscow together in search of answers, along with former Ambassador Malcolm Toon, as part of the U.S.-Russia commission to seek answers on our missing.

There is a great window of opportunity here in the old eastern bloc countries as well as Russia to get some answers as to what may have happened to these Americans. I think as we went out and searched the countryside and met in the capitals of these countries, we received some cooperation. I want to make that very clear. But, Mr. President, there is much more to be done. There are clearly answers in these archives. I think it is very important that, if we are going to say that our military—our men and women in uniform—is going to be asked at some point, if NATO expansion occurs, to shed their blood, possibly, or defend these countries, I think it behooves these countries to provide us the fullest possible accounting of any service personnel who may have crossed their borders during the time the Communists held, basically, and controlled these countries.

I wish that I could say that all follow-up action to our trip had occurred properly and that we had every satisfactory answer that we wanted, but that is not true. It is disturbing because of the reasons that I gave. At some point in the future, by having these countries part of NATO, we are going to ask Americans to face possible combat situations to defend these countries. So the least they could do is to provide us answers that they may have now of things that occurred during Communist control. It has been said by some NATO advocates that we have an opportunity to ensure the cold war never resurfaces. Yet we still can't seem to get the cooperation we need from this region to address vital questions about our missing Americans, especially from the cold war but also possibly from Korea and Vietnam. If their pledges were genuine, as I believe they were, then, frankly, I question why leaders of these countries can't convince the old cold war bureaucracies to allow us access to the archives and allow us access to individuals who could provide us answers.

We have had some cooperation. I am very grateful for that cooperation. We met with some very influential people in the governments of those three countries when I traveled there last summer. Since last summer there have been follow-up communications by our commission support staff at the Department of Defense and also by my own office with each of these nations urging them to follow through. But most important is the fact that, based on current leads available, our commission really still believes that there is relevant information, very relevant information, which likely exists in Eastern Europe, especially in the military intelligence security Communist Party archives of these three nations in question.

Again, this is a very complex situation that has developed. The Communist Party controlled these archives, controlled all of the government activities, controlled the activities of intelligence and military and security. Now we have a different government, a friendly government. But the access to those archives has not yet been provided to us. If they are friendly and we are going to bring them into NATO and defend them, then they owe us that information, pure and simple. They owe us that information. They owe us every opportunity to get and find that information wherever it may be. I regret to say we really have not had that kind of cooperation, even though we have had some very interesting meetings.

Let me just conclude on this point. We should remember and not forget that these eastern bloc countries, when they were eastern bloc countries, were allies of the North Koreans, were allies of the North Vietnamese, and the Soviets, of course, during the cold war. They had a significant presence in both North Korea and in Vietnam. They were privy to information about Communist policies toward our own American POWs. That is very important. I want to repeat that. They were privy to a lot of information about our POWs in Vietnam, our POWs in Korea, and indeed some of the missing cold war losses. This information has not yet been shared with us.

It is very important that we delve into this and find out whether any American POWs were transferred, either stopping there permanently or transferred through any of the capitals of these countries. I want to emphasize again, this is not meant to be a hostile statement. We met with those governments, and they were very cordial and very cooperative but somewhat standoffish by basically passing the buck by saying, Well, you know those were the Communist days, and I am not sure we can dig that out.

Again, if we are asking Americans to shed their blood in the future to defend free nations, then asking them to dig into their archives a little bit is not asking too much.

I want to emphasize again and appeal to leaders of the Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary to follow through on commitments that were made during our visits and help us to search for American missing service personnel from the cold war, from Korea, and from Vietnam and urge my colleagues on behalf of the veterans organizations that I have mentioned, on behalf of all veterans throughout America and the families, most especially the families of those who are missing, to please join with me in continuing to push for more progress on this humanitarian issue. We can do that and, I think, make a very strong statement here on the floor by voting for this amendment.

At this point I yield the floor for the purpose of allowing my colleague, Senator HUTCHISON, who has been a stalwart on this issue to speak. I am very grateful to her for her support.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank Senator SMITH for leading the effort on this amendment.

I want to tell you a story about how this came to be an amendment to this bill.

Pat Dunton is my constituent. She is the president of the Korean-Cold War Family Association of the Missing. Pat Dunton's father served in the Korean conflict. She has been trying to get information about her father for all of these years since the Korean war. She still gets choked up talking about not knowing where he is or what happened to him. She came to my office one day and we started talking about how hard it is not to know. We started thinking. Well, you know, maybe we could do something with the new members who have been invited into NATO because during the cold war, which is when some of the MIA incidents took place, maybe the governments of these countries who were allies with the Soviet

Union, some of whom were in Korea, might be helpful in going to these families and providing the information that they might have knowledge of. I just believe that this is something that should be done. I also believe that all three of the countries being considered for NATO membership would like to help in this effort.

I went to Senator SMITH, who has been the leading advocate in the Senate for not forgetting our POWs and MIAs. I said, Let's do something in the NATO agreement that would require any information to be opened to the families of POWs from any conflict. But most especially, of course, Korea is where we think these countries really might have some information that could be relevant.

I am pleased that Senator SMITH decided to take the lead and work with me on this because I think it can make a difference. It calls for the full cooperation of the Governments of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic in obtaining that accounting, and specifically calls for facilitating access to relevant archival material and for these Governments to identify any individuals that may possess knowledge relative to captured and missing U.S. personnel.

Mr. President, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic have all thrown off the chains of Communist domination. But not so long ago and throughout the cold war their military forces and their intelligence services were closely aligned with the very governments who hold the keys to a great deal of information which may help achieve the full accounting we seek. For example, from the end of the Korean war in 1953, representatives of the Czech and Polish military were stationed inside North Korea as part of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission at Panmunjom. Their military personnel had direct contact with the North Korean military and had at times a great deal of high-level access throughout North Korea. They met with their North Korean counterparts and may well have highly relevant information on the fate of Americans who were missing during the Korean war.

We also know that their intelligence services and their military often shared information with the intelligence services and military forces of the Soviet Union and that there are those who may have direct knowledge of events involving Americans who were missing during the Vietnam war as well as the numerous Americans who disappeared during military operations in other areas during the cold war.

As new NATO allies, it is certainly reasonable to expect that they would open their archives and provide access to our officials. I have already received assurances from representatives of the Polish Government that this access would be readily granted, and I am certain that the Czechs and the Hungarians would also be eager to work with us.

I have also been contacted by family members of the missing as well as by military personnel working in the area of POW-MIA recovery, and both groups have insisted that it would be helpful to make an official statement on behalf of Congress in the form of this amendment that this is an issue of national importance.

I think the amendment is necessary and important. It sends a message to the long-suffering families often forgotten that are still seeking information about the fate of their loved ones. We must take every opportunity to demonstrate that we understand their grief and their desire to find answers and that it is reasonable to expect any new allies to also respect our legitimate desire to learn all we can about those who are missing in the service of our country. The armed forces and the intelligence services of these same countries that seek to join NATO today were once on the other side of the bitter struggle of the cold war. So they would have information, and we hope that they would agree readily to help us in giving some comfort and perhaps providing answers, that final answer, to some member of a family who has been waiting maybe not patiently but certainly with hope in their hearts that someday they would know what happened to their father or their son who has served in our military and perhaps gave his or her life in service to our country. I think we owe them this amount of caring, this amount of assurance that we will go the extra mile to make sure they have that closure if it can possibly be given to them.

So I thank Senator SMITH. I hope the Senate will adopt this amendment when we have the vote.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I say to my colleagues, just 1 or 2 minutes. I wish to expound a little bit on what the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, just said in terms of the impact on families.

In the 1950s, there was a Captain Dunham who was shot down over Soviet territory—then Soviet territory—and as a result of the U.S.-Russian commission, of which Senator JOHN KERRY and I are members, we ran an ad in the Red Star newspaper in Russia that went all over; it was read heavily by former military people, veterans of the Soviet Union. And an individual read the article about this Captain Dunham who was missing. It turned out that this individual had been at the crash site and provided us the ring of Captain Dunham, his personal ring, which came back to his family, and as a result of following that up, we were able to find Captain Dunham's remains, missing since the 1950s, and returned just 2 or 3 years ago.

So I think this is a good example of what cooperation can really produce. Sometimes what might seem like a small, insignificant fact turns into a huge issue and a great relief to the family of a missing serviceman or woman. So this is very important, and I want to emphasize again that what this amendment does is very simple, Mr. President.

Let me just mention three things. It would require that prior to the deposit of the U.S. instrument of ratification, the President shall certify to Congress that each of the Governments—Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic—is fully cooperating with the U.S. in order to obtain the fullest possible accounting of any military personnel from the cold war, from Vietnam, or any military conflicts; that they facilitate full access to all relevant archival material; and that they would identify any individuals who may possess knowledge relative to the capture of missing personnel. That is it. That is all the amendment does.

I thank my colleagues, especially Senator HAGEL, who has been waiting. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. BIDEN. I will be very brief. Speaking for myself and my side and I think Senator SMITH of Oregon, who will say the same thing, we are prepared to accept the amendment.

Let me just make a few very brief comments. I think that the applicants for NATO accession have provided cooperation, as was indicated in the U.S. efforts to locate American POWs and MIAs in the cold war.

In July of 1987, the U.S.-Russian Joint Commission on POW/MIAs visited Poland; the Department of Defense Prisoner of War/Missing Personnel Office visited in December of 1997. Resulting from these visits, senior Polish officials pledged to search their archives thoroughly and open all relevant information to the United States. U.S. officials met with the Polish National Security Bureau, the Ministry of Defense, the Ministry of Intelligence Services, the Office of Central Security, Central Archives. All, in the minds at the Pentagon, are fully cooperating. I can say the same relative to the Czech Republic and with regard to Hungary.

So although I, quite frankly, do not think it is necessary, I have no objection to the amendment. And let me say to my friend from New Hampshire, all you have to be is the brother, sister, mother, father, son, daughter, nephew, or niece of an MIA to understand everything the Senator says.

My mother lost her closest brother in World War II, shot down in New Guinea. They never found his body. To this day, my mother—and that was 1944—wakes up after dreaming that he has been found. To this day, he is a constant—''constant'' would be an exaggeration—he is a regular source of

painful memories for my mother. The idea that there is no closure, the idea that there has never been the ability to say his name was Ambrose J. Finnegan, God love him—his nickname was Bozy to everybody in my mom's family. My mother, when I was a kid, literally would wake up at night screaming from a nightmare. She would scare the hell out of us, dreaming that her brother was in the most extreme circumstance.

I do not mean in any way to suggest this is not important by saying we will accept it and that I do not think it is necessary, because it is being done, because it is true, the pain lasts. My mother just turned 80 years old. It is like yesterday for my mother.

So I appreciate what my friend from Texas and my colleague from New Hampshire are doing. Again, I do not think it is necessary, because I anticipate they will fully cooperate. But I see no problem in accepting the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I would like to associate myself with the words of the Senator from Delaware and just tell my colleagues, the advocates of this amendment, I support it. I believe the Poles, Hungarians, and Czechs would support it, too. These are nations that know something about prisoners of war and missing in action, gulags, and all the horrors that go with totalitarianism, and I fully expect that they would want us to accede to this.

I appreciate the Senators offering this amendment. I think it helps. And part of the reason to expand NATO is to heal these countries. Part of the healing comes from addressing issues like this. We will find they will do this with us and without any resistance to it.

I thank the Senators who are offering this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. If I could just respond to the Senator from Delaware for a moment, I listened to his story about the personal episode in his family. I might say, we have found in the last 4 or 5 years, aircraft—I am almost certain that we located an aircraft in New Guinea and other areas where aircraft had been lost during World War II. I think it says a lot about our own Nation that we would still send teams out there in those jungles, searching for people who were lost. Maybe at some point, maybe—I know it was your relative, I did not hear, what relative?

Mr. BIDEN. My uncle. My mother was one of five children. It was her brother and her soul mate. It is amazing how, like I said, she is 80 years old, God love her, and it is still there.

The only reason I bothered to mention it—I never mentioned it before on the floor in all the debates we had about POWs and MIAs. I compliment my colleagues in their diligence to continue to pursue accounting for POWs and MIAs, and I didn't want them to think that, because I slightly disagree with their assertion of what these three countries have done—I agree with my friend from Oregon. I think they are clearly interested in helping. If there are any countries that are fully aware, as my friend from Oregon said, it is the Hungarians and the Czechs and the Poles, who have had people dragged off to those gulags, never to be heard from again.

These democratically elected officials, now—I would be dumbfounded if they did not fully cooperate. But I understand the motivation. That is my point, to my two colleagues. I am happy, from our side, to accept the amendment, as well as my friend has indicated he is willing to accept it.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I appreciate my colleague's willingness to accept it. It seems to be the consensus of those of us who are sponsoring it, we seek a recorded vote on it because of the significance of the issue.

With that in mind, I will ask for a recorded vote at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Obviously that is the Senator's right. I do not challenge it. I just am reminded, I remember one time when I first got here—and I know he has been here a long time. I went up to Russell Long, the Chairman of the Finance Committee, and indicated to him I wanted help on an amendment to a Finance Committee bill. Senator Long, the senior Senator and Chairman of the Finance Committee, said, ''Fine.'' He accepted it.

Then I thought later it would be good to have a recorded vote. I stood up and said, ''I have decided I want a recorded vote.'' He said, ''In that case, I am against it.'' We had the recorded vote and he beat me. So I learned, from my perspective anyway, that when someone accepts an amendment, I am always happy to do it.

But I understand the Senator's motivation. I will not change my position, but maybe he would reconsider whether we need the vote. But that is his judgment. I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I had great confidence that you would not do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to support the ratification of NATO expansion. I have had the good fortune, over almost the last year and a half that I have been in the U.S. Senate, to serve on the Committee on Foreign Relations. That has given me a unique opportunity to examine the NATO expansion protocol. I attended, start to finish, each of the eight full hearings we had in the Foreign Relations Committee on this issue. I also was appointed by the Senate Majority Leader to serve on the NATO Observer Group Task Force. I attended almost all of the 17 meetings that our distinguished colleagues from Delaware, Senator BIDEN and Senator ROTH, held. That does not give me a particularly unique perspective on this issue, but it gives me some grounding on understanding the complications of NATO expansion.

As I have listened to the debate the last 2 days, and in previous weeks when this Chamber debated this issue, and during committee hearings, I have come to the conclusion that, yes, a number of the questions and points raised by my colleagues are not only relevant but are important and they should be fully aired and fully debated. It is based on those observations that I have made, as I have listened to this debate, that I wish to offer some of the following points.

Aside from the obvious defense purpose of the expansion of NATO, there are other issues involved. The obvious defense purpose of expanding NATO is to help assure stability and security in Europe, all of Europe. There has been some debate on the floor about this issue, this fourth expansion—and, by the way, a not unprecedented expansion. We have expanded NATO three other times, to include West Germany, Greece, Turkey, and the third expansion was Spain and Portugal. So this would be not an unprecedented action we take, that we include three new countries. But I find interesting that there has been some reference made to ''we would split Europe.'' I say just the opposite, just the opposite. We would, in fact, do much to unify Europe. Why would that be? That would be because stability, security, economic development, development of democracy and market economies, would extend across the continent of Europe and no longer would there be the Iron Curtain that fell at the end of World War II. NATO expansion would help assure that.

I also find the argument interesting from the perspective of—I thought, when the Berlin Wall fell in 1989, that meant something. It was beyond symbolism. It was a witness to history that authoritarian, totalitarian government does not work, under any name—Nazism, communism, it doesn't work.

Here we are, almost 10 years after the fall of communism, with the Berlin Wall, talking about, ''Well, I don't know, should we do this? We might offend our Russian friends.'' Certainly any important decision must factor in every dynamic in the debate and every dynamic of our national security interest—relationships, future relationships, and in this case it certainly does factor in our relationship with Russia. But, my goodness, why did we fight, for 40 years, a cold war? And we won it. Only 10 years later, to some extent, to be held hostage to what the Russians want?

You see, I don't see an awful lot of sense in that. Yes, it is important to understand the Russians. Yes, it is important to engage the Russians. But not allow Russia, or any other nation to dominate the final analysis and decisions of our Nation's security interests, nor all of the collective security interests of Europe.

There is another consequence of this that has not yet been fully developed and that is we would be helping provide role models for Central and Eastern Europe by these three new nations, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, coming into NATO, complying with—not as a handout, not as a gesture, but complying with all of the requirements established 50 years ago to belong to NATO. We just didn't invent these. They didn't ''happen.'' They are the same requirements for Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary as we had for the previous three expansions of NATO.

Other nations of Central and Eastern Europe can look to these three nations as role models, for help, and not just in the national security dynamic. Let's face it, I have heard, also, a lot of talk about the European Union—why not allow these nations to be brought into the European Union first? Mr. President, you cannot separate economics here. You can't separate economic stability from military stability. They are integrally entwined.

There is no question the world is a global community underpinned by a global economy. Of course—of course—these nations will benefit economically. And that will invent and give opportunities to other countries, and more opportunities as well. Now, this is not just—not just—a national defense issue and a security issue for the United States. This is an investment for the United States.

This is an investment because it is connected. And if we invest, yes, some money—my goodness, isn't that something? We would actually have to pay some money, not wild exaggerations that we have heard on the floor of the Senate, but some real dollars to invest, to expand the security and stability umbrella of NATO eastward.

It is an investment for us for a couple of reasons. One, it will help assure this country will not be sending its children and its grandchildren to fight another World War or a war in Europe. Democracies do not attack other democracies. Democracies do not go to war. So it is an investment in national security and peace for us.

It is also an economic investment. As these nations that had been under the yoke of Communist dictatorship for almost 50 years are now in a position to develop democracy and flourish economically as they develop their democratic governments and their freedoms, they are as well developing market economies.

What does that mean to us? That means markets, that means some stability, that means connection.

I also have found some of my colleagues, particularly on my side of the aisle, comment about, ''Well, but this President, this administration, wants to take NATO expansion beyond the boundaries of what the mission is of NATO.'' I remind my colleagues on this side of the aisle, my Republican colleagues, who might have some concern about this present administration, 10 Republican and Democratic administrations have presided over America's involvement in NATO, 10 administrations, Republican and Democratic.

This debate should not get confused with the underbrush of detail or who is in the White House today. This debate is about the future and how we are preparing for the future as we go into the next century—not about Bill Clinton, Madeleine Albright, Bill Cohen. They are players on the scene for a very brief time, just like 10 administrations have been on the scene, essentially for a brief time.

Missions and organizations change, believe it or not. Missions and organizations change. Times change. Dynamics change, challenges change, circumstances and situations change.

To my colleagues who say, ''Well, prove to me that NATO is going to be important. Prove to me every dollar that's going in. Prove to me we need NATO,'' well, as brilliant as many of my colleagues are, no one can give them that answer, you see, because no one can predict the future. But that is what NATO expansion is about. That is why we established NATO 50 years ago, because the future was uncertain and was unstable. If we did not have NATO today, we would have to invent NATO.

To those of my colleagues who say, ''Well, why rush? We're rushing into this. What's so important about doing this now? This year? Next year?'' I say, I suppose you could have asked that question after World War II—there was relative peace in Europe after World War II—''What's the rush?'' And for every one of the previous three expansions into NATO, you could have said, ''Why West Germany now? Let's wait until about 1980,'' or for any of the other nations. But, my goodness, doesn't it make a little more sense to develop strong, bold, dynamic, futuristic policy now—now—when we can think clearly, when we can understand the dynamics of the issues rather than, well, let us wait for some country to be invaded and then we will show them what we are going to do? Come on, it does not work that way. It does not work that way.

Let us not squander the time we now have to plan as best we can for a surely uncertain future.

Another dynamic that gets lost in this debate, Mr. President, is another certainty—the diffusion of power in the world. The face of this globe will not look the same in 25 years. It will not look the same because the geopolitical, economic and military power structures of the globe of this 5.2 billion-people world are changing. Like life changes, everything changes.

It is in the best interest of this country and the world for us to lead as best we can to prepare for those new challenges and to prepare for that new diffusion of power, as it will surely come, as it is coming today.

Yes; yes, Europe is only one part of that. But look at the numbers—a rather significant part. Any measurement you take of the importance of Europe, any measurement you take—people, gross domestic product, exports—and do we really believe Europe still and will still be untouched into the next century with no war, no conflict?

Who would have predicted Bosnia? Who would have foreseen that in 1990 and 1991? Kosovo. These are deadly, real examples of how fast things can come unraveled even in—even in—Europe.

Another question that is asked, and appropriately so, is our force strength. It is a very good question. Over the last 10 years, we have been asking our military to do more with less—more deployments, longer deployments. We now have a force structure, in real dollar terms—in real budget terms—that is down as low as any time since 1940. Less than 3 percent of our gross domestic product goes for our national defense. That is below dangerously low. And if we in fact are going to ask our military to take on new responsibilities, like NATO expansion, which I support, and NATO and the Persian Gulf, and a hundred other nations where we have troops, then we are going to have to pay attention to our military. And we have not been doing that.

Another debate for another time surely, Mr. President, but one that is appropriately talked about in this debate and asked because if we are going to ask our military to do more, we are going to have to pay attention to the budget and to rebuilding our military. We are soon becoming a hollow military, and that is in any measurement you wish to take. In the President's own budget for fiscal year 1999, he cuts another 25,000 uniformed men and women from the services. We cannot have it both ways. But, as I say, part of the debate should be part of that debate, but that debate should come at a different time.

I conclude my remarks, Mr. President, by saying that we have a unique opportunity, as the most dominant nation on Earth, at a most unique time in history—not a time seen probably since Rome during the Roman Empire—when one nation has so thoroughly dominated this globe.

There is a bigger question for this country and a bigger challenge that will require a bigger debate than NATO. But it is part of the debate. And that is, yes, a great nation is required to do great things, to take on great burdens, and to give great leadership. It is an awesome responsibility the United States has. And our challenge, our debate is, do we wish in fact to go into the next century as that dominant

great nation and carry that great burden of leadership? This is part of that debate.

We have an opportunity, unique in history, to help build strong democracies, help to build structures that will give more people more freedom than the history has ever known, more market economies, better standards of living, better health, less conflict, less war. That is why NATO expansion is important. It is not the only issue, maybe not the most important issue, but surely it fits into the grander debate that we will have.

New alliances are being formed, new alliances will continue to be formed in the next century. We want to be part of that. As we rely on more nations and more relationships and more alliances, in the end that will mean less burden for us, less burden for us because we are helping develop strong democratic nations with resources, with economies that can defend themselves. That is in our interest. In the end, it is in the world's interest.

That, more than any other reason, is why I strongly support NATO expansion. I ask that my colleagues in this body who are still undecided, for legitimate reasons, listen to this debate closely, because in the end this debate is about our future and what is in our best interest.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, it is true the Delaware which touches New Jersey is owned by Delaware, but I am from Delaware. I would be proud to be from New Jersey, but I am prouder to be from Delaware.

Mr. President, I understand we are going to go to the Kyl amendment very shortly and I cosponsor and agree with the Kyl amendment. I think the manager supports the Kyl amendment, too. But while we wait for Senator KYL to make his opening statement in support of his amendment, I would like to reiterate a point I made yesterday with Senator SMITH, in the few minutes while we are waiting for Senator KYL to come to the floor.

Yesterday there was a good deal of talk here about whether or not this expansion of NATO was good, bad or indifferent. The distinguished Senator from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Senator WARNER and others, were taking issue with the expansion of NATO. I referenced why I thought the Poles thought this was in their interest because the comments were basically made that the Poles—Senator SMITH of New Hampshire said we support the Poles anyway.

I made the point that that kind of promise had been made to Poland before. In 1939, France was considered to have Europe's strongest army. It had built the massive defensive fortification called the Maginot Line which was widely thought to be impregnable.

Hitler's generals warned against an attack on France. In late August of 1939, of course, came the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany which—difficult though it may be to understand today—astonished the world then.

Little more than a week later, on September 1, 1939, Hitler's forces launched a surprise attack on Poland. Here we come to two critical points.

First, Great Britain and France had cobbled together an alliance with Poland earlier that year after Germany had annexed the rest of Czechoslovakia.

But that last-minute alliance, of course, can in no way be compared to today's powerful integrated military command of NATO. France and Britain had no capability to project forces eastward to defend the Poles. Furthermore, Poland was then ruled by authoritarian colonels, while Britain and France were democracies. Therefore, appeasers could and did proclaim that they would not ''die for Danzig.''

Hitler saw all this and correctly anticipated that France and Britain would not actively oppose his attack on Poland. And they didn't.

Secondly, Hitler's generals needed the attack on Poland to perfect their new tactic which was dubbed the ''Blitzkrieg'' or ''lightning war.'' The panzer attack on the Polish cavalry, as was pointed out yesterday, an incredible undertaking where Poles on horses were taking on armored divisions of the German Army, which the Senator from Virginia recalled earlier in the debate, was a metaphor for the effectiveness of the German's new kind of rapid, mobile warfare.

I said yesterday that France and Britain, after formally declaring war on Germany September 3, 1939, did nothing. In fact, Mr. President, for more than 8 months nothing happened on the Franco-German frontier. Commentators labeled this the ''phony war,'' a term which students of history will call and readily recall.

Meanwhile, after carving up Poland with Stalin, the Germans were freed to redeploy offensive combat units for use in the West. On May 10, 1940, Hitler invaded France and the Low Countries using the Blitzkrieg tactics perfected against the Poles, now against France. Going through Belgium and Holland, the Germans simply bypassed the vaunted Maginot Line, and soon they were in Paris.

So I repeat, Hitler's road to France went through Poland. We should ask ourselves what lessons can be learned from this sad tale and acknowledge Poland is east of Germany. How did it get to France? Had they not gone into Poland first they would not, in all probability, have been nearly as successful as they were in 1940. The road to France was through Poland.

First, the lesson we should learn from this sad tale is the alliance only means something if it has a deeper purpose. Today, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic are democracies with Western values—not as Poland was then, a very different country. By the way, only extreme isolationists, I submit, would repeat a ''I won't die for Danzig'' slogan in 1998.

Second, the alliance must have military muscle to back up a paper agreement. NATO clearly has the military structure in force to make collective defense credible.

The third lesson, is NATO, through its Partnership for Peace Program, is actively cooperating with non-NATO countries, including Russia, to lessen tensions and make future conflicts highly unlikely.

So for all these reasons, Mr. President, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, passionately want to become members of NATO. All three countries have successfully completed a demanding set of reforms in order to qualify.

History need not repeat itself, Mr. President. But history is always instructive. That is why I mention the connection between Poland and France in 1939 and 1940. I hope this explanation is helpful to my colleagues. I hope we keep it in mind.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I wonder if I might engage our distinguished colleague, who just presented his views, in a bit of a colloquy.

First, I ask my colleague, did he make the statement that NATO is for the defense of all of Europe, or some broad, sweeping statement to that effect?

Mr. HAGEL. No, I didn't say it is for all of Europe. I said we would have a Europe, as we expand NATO eastward, that gives Europe an opportunity from east to west, all of Europe, to be democratic, opportunity to develop market economies, the potential to be a free continent, and that NATO could help do that.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my colleague. I am just going back to read the charter, article V, and this is the heart and soul of NATO.

It says that parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all, and consequently they agree that if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense, recognized by article V of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including use of armed force to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Now, it was very clear when this was written that we envisioned the Soviet Union as the threat. That was the purpose of it. And now with the demise of the Soviet Union and the threats now being fractured into many places and of many types, we are trying to determine what is the future mission of NATO.

One of my great regrets is that we are proceeding with this matter of including three new states at a time when NATO itself has not determined exactly what is to be the mission subsequent to the 1991 statement to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator of the previous order.

Mr. WARNER. For the benefit of the Senate, the Chair should state the order.

EXECUTIVE AMENDMENT NO. 2310, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is to be 30 minutes of debate on amendment No. 2310 offered by Senator KYL of Arizona to begin at 4:30 p.m.

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for about a minute and a half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. I direct my comment to the distinguished Senator who is proposing the amendment, Senator KYL, which will now be the subject of further debate. In particular, on page 1 entitled ''common threats,'' it says, ''NATO members will face common threats to security in the post-cold war environment, including . . .''—and on page 5 it says—I guess that was 4. It says, ''. . . conflict in the North Atlantic area stemming from ethnic and religious enmity, the revival of historic disputes, or the actions of undemocratic leaders.''

I find that far afield from the NATO charter itself. Indeed, it is somewhat far afield from the 1991 restatement of the mission of NATO. Speaking for myself, I have grave concerns about NATO incorporating in any future document the fact that it stands ready to stamp out ethnic and religious enmities and the revival of historic disputes. That is the very thing we are involved in now in Bosnia. I just don't have time to get into it, but I would like to have a clearer explanation from the proponent of this amendment as to what he intended by the inclusion of this paragraph in this amendment. Basically, I wanted to support the amendment, but I cannot support a document that says NATO is going to take it upon itself to put out civil wars and religious enmities and ethnic disputes. I am concerned about the future of American servicepersons and that the men and women who will proudly wear the uniform of the United States and be an integral part of NATO would be subject, under NATO commanders, to go into these areas and meet such conflicts.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I will be delighted to answer the question of my distinguished colleague from Virginia. I will begin, first of all, by setting forth the essential concept or idea underlying this amendment.

The future course of the NATO alliance, its core purposes and its strategic orientation in this post-cold war era, will be decided by allied negotiations upcoming on the so-called revised strategic concept of NATO. The new document is going to be agreed upon in a little bit less than a year—next April. Senate advice and consent to the NATO enlargement issue here presents a unique opportunity for the Senate of the United States to speak on this issue, an opportunity we would not otherwise have. We, therefore, can help to lay out the strategic vision of NATO from the standpoint of the United States and thus influence the outcome of these negotiations.

In my view, the current resolution focuses too much on what NATO should not be and should not do. The resolution does not attempt to lay out a comprehensive set of principles to guide development of the strategic concept. And so this proposed amendment will establish the Senate's vision of the future of NATO and, I hope, help to lay the foundation for American positions on the strategic concept.

Here is the background that will lead up to the answer to the Senator's question. I hope it is the only expression of concern about the amendment because I would certainly like to have his support for what I think is an amendment that will be overwhelmingly supported by both proponents and opponents of expansion. Our principal objective here, I say to the Senator from Virginia, is to ensure that NATO remains an arm of U.S. power and influence. NATO, not the WEU or the OSCE, must remain the principal foundation for the security interests of its members. This means NATO must be prepared militarily to defend against a range of common threats to our vital interests. We have tried to identify what they all are.

Now, some of us may not like what some of them are and may not like the fact that we will have to respond to them. For example, a radical Islamic terrorism threat in the North Atlantic region may require that we defend against that. That didn't used to be a big problem for NATO. What I have done is insert the words ''in the Atlantic area''—words that were not in the underlying resolution of ratification that came out of the committee. So what I have tried to do is both to, yes, acknowledge a threat that we all acknowledge that could arise, but to limit the nature of our response to that in the Atlantic area by the specific language of the section that the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Texas are concerned about.

This amendment underscores that collective defense will remain the core alliance mission. But it acknowledges that new threats have emerged in the post-cold war era that will require NATO to adapt its military forces and defense planning mechanism.

Mr. WARNER. May I have one word of clarification?

Mr. KYL. I am happy to try to answer the question.

Mr. WARNER. The mix of NATO is the collective security of member nations and the collective security of the continent that they occupy. That has been the traditional mission. Now, you are recognizing these are threats, and I agree they are becoming more and more threats—religious and ethnic strife. But do you intend, by this document, to say that that should be written in as a mission of NATO, to stand ready to intervene in these types of conflicts? Or are you just recognizing them as potential threats and subsequently, depending on the magnitude of the threat, the NATO commanders, and the NAC, North Atlantic Council, can determine if in fact it threatens the collective security of a nation or the nations?

Mr. KYL. That is an excellent question, Mr. President, and it is, of course, the latter—something that I think the Senator from Virginia and I support. I point to the specific language to confirm my point. In paragraph 5, ''common threats,'' it says: ''NATO members will face common threats to their security in the post-cold war environment, including. . .'' Then we list threats. We hope they will never arise. That is the context in which this particular provision is listed.

If I could just close my comment here, Mr. President, because the Senator from Delaware wishes to comment. This amendment merely conditions Senate advice and consent to its understanding of U.S. policy as it relates to the revising strategic concept of NATO. It acknowledges the principles that have animated our participation in NATO from the very beginning and also identifies the threats that we may face. It states that the Senate understands that the core concepts contained in the 1991 document remain valid today.

I say to my friend from Virginia, in essence, that the 1991 strategic concept provides a foundation on which to build the revised statement of NATO strategy and sets forth the 10 principles which the Senator understands will be in the new document.

I urge my colleagues who support and oppose the expansion of NATO to support this amendment and to put the Senate on record as defining the NATO of the future. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, collectively, with the Senator from Texas—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from Delaware controls the time. Who yields time?

Mr. BIDEN. How much time do I control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. The Senator from Texas and I wish to discuss the capacity to respond to common threats. NATO's continued success requires a credible military capability to deter and respond to common threats. And when you look at the definition of common threats, it includes historic disputes, religious enmities, ethnic and

the like. I fear that, although the Senator in his statement seemed to clarify that this is not to be a mission, somehow the language, I believe, is somewhat tangled. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I have just been looking at the amendment with the Senator from Virginia. I like every other part of the amendment. I like every other part of the amendment. But it seems that the words define what a common threat is, and included in the common threat are ethnic divisions or uprising, and then it says that one of the missions of NATO is to respond to common threats. I just wondered if there could be a clarification, or perhaps a clarifying amendment that would assure that is not going to be a responsibility of NATO to come into a situation in which there is a border dispute or an ethnic dispute. In fact, that is one of the amendments I would offer later, which is to avoid having the United States get into an ethnic dispute.

If the Senator from Arizona can clarify it, I think the Senator from Virginia and I would like to support the amendment. But if it needs some work to assure its intent, then perhaps we could work on that as well.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. On my time, let my take a crack at that, if I may. I am a cosponsor, although I cannot take credit for the drafting. It is totally a product of my friend from Arizona, and it is an admirable job. The Senator from Oregon and I were just talking about what a good amendment this is. I am glad to cosponsor it. But let me maybe help.

I have in my hand the alliance's Strategic Concept of 1991, the last one that occurred. It is the present operating doctrine for NATO. My friend from Virginia pointed out that the North Atlantic Assembly committee gets together and they decide whether this should be updated periodically, what it should say, and what article V of the Washington treaty means. Article V of the Washington treaty, the NATO treaty, was read earlier by my friend from Virginia.

It starts off, the parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all, consequently, and it goes on from there. Let me read from the strategic concept, the alliance's strategic concept, which is the operating strategy of NATO, as we speak, the one that was, in effect, redone in 1991 to respond to the changed circumstances, meaning no longer the Soviet Union, the Berlin Wall is down, and all these nations. We are talking about independent republics and nations themselves. OK. That is the concept in which the strategic document came about.

On page 4, under ''Security Challenges and Risks,'' paragraph 10, the present strategic doctrine of NATO reads as follows:

> Risks to allied security are less likely to result from calibrated aggression against the territories of the allies, but rather from adverse consequences of instability that may arise from serious economic, social, or political difficulties, including ethnic rivalries and territorial disputes . . .

—border disputes, and ethnic rivalries. Excuse me. Let me be clear that I don't want to misquote. Go back to the quote:

> . . . political difficulties, including ethnic rivalries, and territorial disputes.

Parenthetically inserted by me was border disputes, and what is going on in Bosnia now.

Back to the quote:

> . . . which are faced by many countries in Central and Eastern Europe . . .

Not members of NATO.

> . . . the tensions which may result, as long as they remain limited, should not directly threaten the security and territorial integrity of members of the alliance. They could however lead to a crisis inimical to European stability and even to armed conflicts which would involve outside powers, or spill over into NATO countries having a direct effect on the security of the alliance.

Nothing to do with the expansion of NATO—zero, zero to do with expansion. Presently, NATO interprets article V to represent—is interpreted and laid out tactically in the alliance's strategic concept as interpreted by the 16 NATO nations. It authorizes and allows, and they in advance acknowledge that NATO will deem, under article V, instability as a consequence of ethnic rivalries, or boundary and territorial integrity. They will interpret that. They may interpret that to be a threat to the security of any of the member nations; ergo, you are then allowed under NATO strategic doctrine, if all NATO countries agree, as they do in this doctrine, to use force.

What is happening in this debate, unintentionally, as I said to my friend from Virginia yesterday, and what we are really debating in the biggest debate that has occurred is what the greatest differences have been over NATO strategy as it now exists.

That is really what people are arguing about. They are really arguing not about what these three additional countries will do to impact on strategy. They are basically arguing, as they should, as they should, whether or not this outfit we put together almost 40-some years ago still is relevant today, whether we should still have it. But the strategic doctrine today put in place in 1991 says, and I will repeat, ''Risks to allied securities are less likely to result from calculated aggression against the territory of the allies but, rather, from adverse consequences of instability that may arise from serious economic, social and political difficulties including ethnic rivalries, territorial disputes which are faced by many countries in Central and Eastern Europe.''

Now, my friend from New York, who is opposing the expansion, is probably the single most qualified man in the Congress, having written about and predicting the kind of chaos that would come from the male fist of communism being lifted off of the sectarian rivalries that have been subsumed under that heavy hand in the Communist rule—he predicted in a book he published several years ago, that I recommend to everyone, that there would be crisis in Europe. It would not be Soviet armies invading.

So my friends who keep saying: Look, we ought to reflect reality, NATO should reflect the real world, as Senator SMITH from New Hampshire kept saying yesterday, NATO did just that in their strategic doctrine of 1991. They said the risk—paraphrasing—is not from Soviet divisions; it is from ethnic rivalries, economic, social, and political instability. That is where our risks lie and we must respond to those risks.

So nothing new is being stated by my friend from Arizona. He is not breaking new ground. He is reiterating a basic principle of the strategic doctrine that exists now. And if we vote down these three countries, it will still exist. To the extent you have a fight, an argument with that section of his amendment, which I cosponsor, you do not have a fight about expansion. You have a fight about why don't you introduce an amendment that says the strategic doctrine of NATO should not be what my friend states it should be and, in fact, is.

So, again, we tend to——

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think we could settle this with two sentences. Do I understand from the sponsors—and you being a cosponsor of the amendment—that nothing in the amendment expands beyond what is stated in the 1991 doctrine, paragraph 10, which the Senator from Delaware just read? If it is to be interpreted as saying that remains as the goal, then I am comfortable with the amendment. But as drawn, largely due to the defining language, I have a problem with it in its present form.

I agree with the Senator from Delaware, if that is to be the mission in the future, a consistent one with paragraph 10.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, if I may respond, since I am not the author but only the cosponsor, I do not want to take the liberty of suggesting what the Senator from Arizona meant, but that is my understanding. It is my understanding that the words as drafted now in paragraph 5—and I apologize. I am searching for the language—say each of the threats are self-evidently covered by present NATO doctrine: ''Re-emergence of hegemonic power confronting Europe,'' i.e., Russia. That is part of our existing doctrine today. ''Rogue states and non-state actors possessing nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons and the means to deliver these

weapons by ballistic or cruise missiles,'' et cetera. That, as I read paragraph 10, is contemplated within the ''serious economic, social and political difficulties.'' It says, ''including ethnic rivalries and territorial disputes'' but not limited to those two items.

No. 3, ''Threats of a wider nature, including the disruption of the flow of vital resources'' obviously would affect the economic security and the stability of the NATO nations. No. 4, ''Conflict in the North Atlantic stemming from ethnic and religious enmity.'' That is covered. So as I said——

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator is a little swift in saying that is covered. Look, in paragraph 10, in referring to such disputes as ethnic and religious enmity, they say this response: ''These tensions which may result as long as they remain limited should not directly threaten the security and territorial integrity of members of the alliance,'' and therefore NATO stays out.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, to respond, that is exactly what this amendment says. The amendment says, as my friend from Arizona has drafted it, it is a decision self-evident. In this amendment, it is a decision for the NAC to make whether or not it is an armed conflict that will spill over. There have been a number of ethnic conflicts in Central and Eastern Europe which we had concluded not to get involved in because the NAC concluded they were not directly threatened, they did not directly threaten the security of those countries. They did conclude that the ethnic rivalries and the war in Bosnia did—did—threaten their security. They made that judgment internally within the NAC, within that governing body of NATO.

So I reserve the remainder of my time. I have 2 minutes, I am told.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 7 minutes.

Who yields time?

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous the following Senators be listed as cosponsors to my amendment—HELMS, ROTH, BIDEN, and SMITH of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I thank the Chair. I thank Senator KYL. The Senator just took away some of the business I wanted to do.

I am very pleased to be added as an original cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. President, I think the Clinton administration made a serious error in allowing the other NATO countries to reopen the strategic concept issue. The current document agreed to in 1991 needs no alteration. The approach taken under President Bush's strategic concept has served NATO well for the past 7 years and would have served equally well for the next 7. That said, what is done is done. The administration failed to prevent the French and others from opening a Pandora's box.

Negotiations on the strategic concept for the purpose of amending it will commence this summer, and I expect that a document will be agreed upon by early next year. Senator KYL's amendment establishes a vision for NATO's future. It does so by emphasizing those aspects of the current NATO policy which the United States finds most important. For instance, the Kyl amendment makes clear that NATO, not the European Union, not the OSCE or any other United Nations-type organization, must remain the principal foundation for collective security in Europe.

It also takes note of the broad range of threats that will face the United States and our NATO allies in the post-cold war world and calls upon NATO members to ensure that their forces can be rapidly deployed and sustained during combat operations.

Taken together with paragraph B of the current condition 1 of the resolution, which calls upon NATO military planners to put territorial defense above all other priorities, this amendment makes clear that the United States expects every NATO member to pursue the capability of operating with the United States in any contingency under any circumstance.

Finally, it reaffirms the key tenets of current NATO nuclear policy. I find this paragraph of the Kyl amendment particularly important.

In conclusion, Senator KYL has identified the 10 most important aspects of NATO's current strategic concept which must be preserved. His amendment sets forth the Senate's expectations that any future revisions to the strategic concept must reflect these principles. I welcome his contribution to the resolution of ratification. It provides a much-needed vision for the future course of the NATO alliance. The administration can expect that I for one will hold it to the policies established under the Kyl amendment during the course of future negotiations of the strategic concept.

Again, my thanks to Senator KYL. I think his amendment is forward looking. It is visionary. Unlike so many amendments offered here today which are sort of in the category of ''thou shalt not,'' this is in the category of ''thou shalt do.'' So I thank Senator KYL for that and his leadership. I am proud to be a cosponsor with him.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. I would be delighted to yield for a question from the Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Would it be correct to say that the statement, ''Conflict in the North Atlantic area stemming from ethnic and religious enmity, the revival of historic disputes or actions of undemocratic leaders'' does not represent any expansion of the 1991 doctrine?

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from New York that I am in total agreement with the Senator from Delaware. That is the case, that this was not intended to be an enlargement of existing NATO policy.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank my friend from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I make that statement in order to assure my colleagues who are concerned about enlarged missions that it is not our intention to try to expand the mission of NATO. But what we are concerned about is helping the administration of the United States define very clearly to our European allies our strategic vision of NATO as a defense alliance. Unfortunately, some Europeans have a different point of view. They would limit NATO solely to the mission of collective defense against an armed attack, elevate the WEU to the principal military organization for responding to all other threats to NATO security, and cuts the United States out of decisionmaking on issues affecting our vital interests. Some undermine our ability to shape NATO as a viable 21st century military alliance, and that is why I offered this amendment, to help make clear an unambiguous U.S. policy on the future direction of the alliance using the fundamental principles which have existed since 1949 when these concepts were first enunciated and which in the Foreign Relations Committee report at that time said that, of course, each party would have to decide in the light of circumstances surrounding the case and the nature and extent of the assistance whether, in fact, an armed attack had occurred and article 5 thus brought into play—armed attack relating to different kinds of situations that might not be a direct invasion but might, from other kinds of causes nevertheless, pose a security risk to the states within NATO.

So I really believe we have not expanded the current policy, but I hope we have clarified for our friends in Europe the limits of the U.S. policy, the vision, the strategic vision that we have. I appreciate the questions raised by the Senators from New York and Virginia to help us clarify that point.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we thank the Senator and with that assurance I will give you my support. But the amendment is to restrict in some way the expressions in the resolution that is before the Senate.

Mr. KYL. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. Would the Senator state that for the record?

Mr. KYL. Yes. Mr. President, that is correct. We explicitly, for example, insert ''in the North Atlantic area'' which is not in the underlying resolution of ratification.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. KYL. I am happy to yield. I think I am out of time.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Would the Senator agree that in 1949 the issue facing Western Europe and the United States was not ethnic and religious conflict, it was international communism in the form of the Soviet Union, which had declared ethnic and religious conflict to be a premodern phenomenon, long since sent into the dustbin of history?

Mr. KYL. The Senator is correct that the concern at the time was the great conflict between the West and communism from the Soviet Union. I suggest the Senator probably knows better than any of the rest of us about the longstanding disputes, some ethnic and religious in origin, which were, perhaps, always under the surface. But at that time, of course, the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am not one for shilling for books, but for those of you who are interested in this subject and the religious and ethnic conflicts that have erupted after the mailed fist of communism has been lifted in Central and Eastern Europe, I strongly recommend—and I mean this sincerely—Senator MOYNIHAN's book entitled ''Pandaemonium.'' It is worth, as they say, the read, and is incredibly instructive. I mean it sincerely. It is incredibly insightful, and those of you who have an interest should take a look at it.

I yield the floor and yield the time, and I am ready to vote.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDNG OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 107 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Abraham	Coats	Feingold
Akaka	Cochran	Feinstein
Allard	Collins	Ford
Baucus	Conrad	Frist
Bennett	Coverdell	Glenn
Biden	Craig	Gorton
Bond	D'Amato	Gramm
Boxer	Daschle	Grams
Breaux	DeWine	Grassley
Brownback	Dodd	Gregg
Bryan	Domenici	Hagel
Burns	Dorgan	Harkin
Campbell	Durbin	Hatch
Chafee	Enzi	Helms
Cleland	Faircloth	Hollings
Hutchinson	Levin	Rockefeller
Hutchison	Lieberman	Roth
Inhofe	Lott	Santorum
Inouye	Lugar	Sessions
Jeffords	Mack	Shelby
Johnson	McCain	Smith (OR)
Kempthorne	McConnell	Snowe
Kennedy	Mikulski	Specter
Kerrey	Moynihan	Stevens
Kerry	Murkowski	Thomas
Kohl	Murray	Thompson
Kyl	Nickles	Thurmond
Landrieu	Reed	Torricelli
Lautenberg	Reid	Warner
Leahy	Robb	Wyden

NAYS—9

Ashcroft	Byrd	Sarbanes
Bingaman	Graham	Smith (NH)
Bumpers	Roberts	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Moseley-Braun

The executive amendment (No. 2310), as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for Senate ratification of the Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty on accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. I have been privileged to participate in the historic debate on the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Since last October, the committee has held 8 hearings on this issue and heard testimony from 37 witnesses with a variety of opinions on NATO enlargement.

I will take this opportunity to thank the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina, and the committee's ranking member, Senator BIDEN, for the balanced manner in which these hearings were conducted and for their support for expeditious consideration of this important matter.

As we all know, Mr. President, NATO has been the most important factor in maintaining peace in Europe since the devastation of World War II. As we prepare to mark the alliance's 50th anniversary next year, it is appropriate to look back on its successes and look forward to see what role NATO will play in the next 50 years. The world will be a much different place in 1999 than it was in 1949 when this alliance was formed as a buffer against Soviet aggression and as a means of protection for nations whose people had just emerged from one of the costliest wars, in both human and financial terms, in our history.

But to fully understand and appreciate what the security of NATO represents to the people of Eastern Europe, we must first remember what they have endured in the years since we celebrated V-E Day. At the same time the people of Western Europe were working to found an alliance that would ensure security and were fighting to rebuild their countries and the economies after the fall of the Third Reich, a new threat was emerging on the other side of the continent.

The Soviet Union, which had been our ally against Hitler, was about to become our foe in a cold war that would last almost a half century and result in the sacrifice of lives, traditions, and religious liberty throughout Eastern Europe. The people of Eastern Europe barely had time to recover from the devastation of a world war when they were faced with Soviet tanks. Foreign subjugation was, of course, nothing new for the people of Eastern and Central Europe.

For centuries, Mr. President, this part of the world had been a battleground where people and territory seemed little more than spoils in a seemingly endless series of bloody fights. Bit by bit, the Soviet Union redrew Europe's map until it swallowed up the entire eastern and central region. Under the reign of the Communist Party, people lived in fear that they would be accused of being disloyal to the party. Religion was outlawed, and the myriad beautiful places of worship in the Soviet Union were left vacant; many were destroyed.

In spite of the treatment they were forced to endure at the hands of the Soviet regime, the people of Eastern Europe never lost their will to be free, as demonstrated by events such as the Prague Spring and the Solidarity movement. By the mid-1980s, the Soviet Union was beginning to crumble and the people of Eastern Europe yearned to satisfy their hunger for democracy and freedom. Beginning in 1989, the people of Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia peacefully ousted their Communist governments and replaced them with democracy. It was, in the words of Vaclav Havel, a ''velvet revolution.''

Because of modern technology, the world community has had a front-row seat for the transformation of Eastern Europe. We literally watched the Berlin Wall fall and marveled at cranes dismantling statues of Lenin and laying low the hammer and sickle.

Today, nearly a half a century after World War II, the Iron Curtain is gone and the Soviet regime is no more. The changing face of Europe is marked by newly-independent countries eagerly embracing democracy for the first time in more than two generations. But the people of these former Soviet satellite countries still live in the shadow of the history of Soviet domination. These nations and their people seek to rejoin the West, and seek a means to ensure that they will never again fall victim to a Soviet-style regime.

The lingering memory of Soviet domination was evident at the Winter 1998 Olympic Games, where a player on the Czech Republic's hockey team wore the number 68 to mark the February 25, 1968, invasion of his country by the Soviet Union. When the Czech Republic's hockey team beat the Russian team for the gold medal, many Czechs felt that the victory represented more than athletic excellence. It also symbolized their country's freedom from the Soviet domination of the past.

Now, there is a new, democratic Russia, and the nations of Eastern Europe,

which have become our friends and trading partners, are caught, both literally and figuratively, between this new Russia and the West. This is a critical time for the newly-independent states of Eastern Europe to establish themselves as countries in their own right, finally free of the yoke of Soviet domination.

It is only natural that these Eastern European countries would seek to join NATO, an alliance which shines as a beacon of democracy and security on the European continent. The proposed enlargement of this alliance represents a crossroads in American foreign policy, and, indeed, in the fragile balance of power in Europe. Some opposed to enlarging this alliance have said that it would create a new series of dividing lines in Europe, between NATO, Russia, and those countries which are caught in the middle—neither members of NATO nor under the sphere of Russian influence. Others have argued that all countries meeting the criteria for membership in NATO should be allowed to join. Opponents fear that this would lead to a different dividing line—one between Russia and the rest of Europe.

Many of my constituents, and indeed many people around the world, have a special interest in the debate over NATO enlargement due to their ethnic heritage or their memories of the iron fist of Soviet rule in Eastern Europe. I share their commitment to a Europe which will never again fall victim to such oppression.

The proposed enlargement embodied in the protocols currently before this body leads to many questions: How many countries? How many rounds of enlargement? What about Russia? What about those that may be left out?

It is my view that the newly-independent countries in Europe should not be forever caught between Russia and the West. It is also my strong view that the United States must proceed carefully so that we do not damage our relationship with a democratic Russia. Unfortunately, parts of the debate over NATO enlargement have taken on an ''us versus them'' quality. We must not forget that the Russian Federation is not the Soviet Union, and that we should encourage democracy wherever it takes root. Instead of the ''us versus them'' of the Cold War era, this debate should be about the new landscape of Europe. We must not make Russia feel as if it is being ganged up on by the West. We must encourage democracy there as we do elsewhere on the globe, and we must encourage the newly-independent states to take control of their own futures.

That is why the Administration helped to successfully negotiate the NATO-Russia Founding Act. And that is why the language in the resolution of ratification currently before this body encourages the continuation of a constructive relationship between NATO and Russia.

I support the fundamental goals of NATO enlargement, and believe it is in America's national interest to pursue this first round, as it has. However, I do have some concerns, that I know are shared by many other Members of Congress, about the commitment—financial and otherwise—the United States will undertake as it pursues enlargement of the alliance.

On that point, Mr. President, I would like to speak for a moment on one of my concerns about this debate: the disparity among the various estimates on the financial commitment the United States would be undertaking if NATO enlargement were to proceed. There have been at least three major studies conducted on this subject, each of which has taken a different approach with respect to the basis for their estimates. While I understand that it is impossible to account for all of the different variables that will be included in this endeavor, each study assumes a different set of costs, and thus reaches very different cost projections for the U.S. share of this undertaking—anywhere from $2 billion to $7 billion.

I am pleased that I was able to get clarification on this issue through the hearings we held in the Foreign Relations Committee, and I am pleased that the members of the Committee devoted so much time to this important aspect of NATO enlargement. The Committee based its evaluation of the estimated cost of NATO enlargement on the following four assumptions that can be found in the Department of Defense and NATO studies:

First, because there is no immediate threat to NATO, the alliance will continue to operate in the current strategic environment for the foreseeable future.

Second, NATO will not station substantial forces on the territories of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic.

Third—and this is a key point for me—NATO's standard burdensharing rules will apply to the costs of enlargement.

Fourth, the modernization of the United States military is considered to be a strictly American project that will not be funded through the NATO common budget, and, thus, NATO enlargement will not require the United States to undertake any new force modernization initiatives beyond those already planned.

Mr. President, I believe that these four assumptions are at the heart of the debate over the cost of NATO enlargement. While, in my view, the enlargement of the alliance is in the best interest of the United States, I remain committed to ensuring that the federal government achieves—and maintains—a balanced federal budget. The Committee's careful analysis of the costs involved in NATO enlargement addressed many of my concerns in this regard. I agree with the language included in the Committee Report which states that the Committee ''stresses the importance of all current and future allies to meet their commitments to the common defense. Anything less will result in a hollow strategic commitment.'' At the same time, I will look carefully at any of the amendments before us that seek to control the costs to the U.S. taxpayer of this enlargement.

Because of the necessity of all NATO members to meet their commitments to the common defense, I asked Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, at a February 24, 1998, Foreign Relations Committee hearing, if Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic would be prepared to take on these commitments. She told me that ''We are confident that Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic will take on the financial commitment involved in NATO membership. Indeed, to prepare for this commitment, all three have increased their defense budgets to fund necessary defense reforms, and to bring them in line with the standard outlays of NATO Allies. . . . Moreover, the cost of defense would undoubtedly be higher if these countries did not join NATO.''

In addition, I have been assured by both Secretary Albright and Secretary of Defense William Cohen that the United States share of NATO enlargement costs will not exceed $7 billion over ten years. They have insisted that the wide range of cost estimates can be attributed to the use of varying data and the fact that the original estimates assumed the admission of four new countries into the alliance. I respect the views of the Department of Defense and the General Accounting Office in explaining the differential, and will continue to monitor revised cost estimates as they become available.

The many cost estimates involved in this first round of NATO enlargement also lead me to wonder if we will have a clearer picture of the cost of future rounds, or if we will be faced with the same financial uncertainties that loom before us today. This is an issue the Senate will be looking at closely as the Alliance develops its policies regarding future enlargement. This is also the subject of at least one amendment to the resolution of ratification currently before this body.

I also have concerns about the impact of new U.S. commitments to NATO on America's general military readiness, especially at a time when so many of our forces are deployed around the world in Bosnia, the Persian Gulf, Korea, and other posts. I asked the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Hugh Shelton, about this concern when he testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations. He said, ''I see nothing in the NATO enlargement concept that will detract from our overall readiness. To the contrary, the additional troops, military equipment and capabilities that the three new countries bring to the Alliance can only reduce the demands on current members.''

I am encouraged by his answer, and I am also encouraged by the willingness

of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to participate in NATO's Partnership for Peace. All three countries were original members of this program, and all have provided troops and equipment for NATO missions. In my view, the willingness of these three countries to participate in NATO efforts will only strengthen the alliance.

As I stated earlier, I share the Administration's basic views on the merits of enlarging this alliance. The people of Eastern Europe must never again be subjected to the conditions they were forced to endure under Soviet rule. They see NATO membership as a means to ensure their future safety. My concern is about the extent of the commitment the United States will be making, and the uncertainty regarding the price tag that American taxpayers will be asked to pay in this time of fiscal restraint and personal sacrifice. But voting in favor of NATO enlargement should not be considered a blank check for military or other spending in the region. Should the Senate ratify the protocols we are considering today, I and my colleagues in both the House and the Senate will continue to monitor the new U.S. commitments to NATO—financial and otherwise—through the regular congressional budget and appropriations process.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution of ratification.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have been watching with a great deal of interest the debate that is taking place. It has been a very healthy debate. Certainly the Senator from Wisconsin raised some very good points. As I listened to his comments, I can only say that I agree with almost everything he said except for his conclusion. I look at the cost of this, and we do not know what to anticipate should we extend NATO to these countries. I am deeply concerned about the costs that would be incurred. The range has been incredible. You talk about something between $400 million and $120 billion. That range is not one that gives me much comfort.

I would like to remind my colleagues that the same group of people that are giving us their assurances now—that is, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the White House—that it is not going to cost over a certain amount of money, are the same ones that told us in November of 1995 that it would not cost more than $1.2 billion for our participation in Bosnia. We knew better. But, nonetheless, that is what they said. They said that is a guarantee. Yet here we are now. Our direct costs in Bosnia have exceeded $9 billion. I suggest that is less than half of the total direct and indirect costs. So I don't have a very high comfort level when it comes to being able to rely on what it might cost us to extend NATO to these three countries.

The second thing as I read article V, which is the security guarantee, is that I see this as a very expensive security guarantee, and it is open ended. It stipulates that, ''An armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered as an attack against them all.'' It doesn't say that we would come to the aid of someone who is attacked if we have any national security interests. It doesn't say that if it should impair our Nation, we are going to be in a position to defend them. It is not like many of the situations where we have become involved in helping countries such as Nicaragua and others because we know it is cheaper actually to help them than it is to have to fight these battles ourselves. This just says, ''as an attack against them all.'' That means that if there is an attack, we have to come to their aid. We always take a much greater share of the burden than our partners do.

The third thing is that I have no doubt in my mind that if we do this, this is just the beginning and that we will be extending it to more and more countries.

I would like to remind you, Mr. President, of a quote from Secretary Albright that the door is open, she said, to other countries with democratic governments and free markets. ''The administration is fighting an effort by WARNER and others to place a moratorium on admission of additional countries until it is known how well the first recruits are assimilated.'' After the first three recruits were invited last year, Albright 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.''

So with the increased costs as we make these extensions, we are looking at Romania, Slovenia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Albania, Bulgaria, Macedonia, and Slovakia, and many others. I don't see where there is an end it to. However, I remind my colleagues that this is not a partisan subject.

I was honored to serve on the Senate Armed Services Committee with the Democrat who is probably more knowledgeable than any Democrat has been—certainly in my recollection—on that committee, Sam Nunn. Sam Nunn was quoted as saying, ''Russian cooperation in avoiding proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is our most important national security objective, and this NATO expansion makes them more suspicious and less cooperative.'' He further said, ''The administration's answer to this and other serious questions are what I consider to be platitudes.''

I agree with Senator Nunn that this is opening the door to something that is very expensive, and also it could impair what progress we have made with Russia.

Just to quote the Duma, on January 23 they passed a resolution—this is in Russia, the Russian Duma—calling NATO expansion the biggest threat to Russia since the end of World War II.

All of these things have been talked about on this floor. One thing that has not been talked about is what I would consider to be the greatest exposure we would be inheriting by making this extension.

I can remember being here on the Senate floor back in November of 1995. We missed passing a resolution of disapproval to keep sending our troops over to Bosnia. We had no national security interest on a very expensive thing that now has caused the decimation of our entire defense system. We did that as a response to the strongest argument; that is, we must continue our commitment and our allegiance to NATO. So NATO is the reason that we are over in Bosnia today. Even though the administration said this would be something that would cost approximately $1.2 billion, it has cost directly $9 billion, and indirectly far more than that.

Mr. President, it wasn't long ago that we were talking about making some strikes on Iraq. We know there are problems there. We know they have not kept their commitment to the United Nations. They have not allowed our inspection teams to see what they had agreed they should be able to see, and it looks like those storm clouds may be there. If that happens, I don't know of one person who has a background in military strategy in the Pentagon or one person in the administration who can tell you that you can go in there and do surgical strikes from the air and not end up having to send in ground troops. Where are we if we should have to do that?

In the case of Iraq, we are talking about a theater that includes Bosnia. We are talking about the 21st COCOM located in Germany that was supposed to be offering the logistical support for any ground movement in any place within the theater. That would include Iraq.

Right now, you go over to the 21st COCOM in Germany, and you will find out that we don't have the capability of supporting any other ground operations in addition to Bosnia because they are at over 100 percent capacity right now trying to support Bosnia. They don't have the spare parts for their equipment. They don't have the equipment. They are using M–115 trucks that have 1 million miles on them. It is something that we can't afford. It is something that we can't afford in terms of using up our military assets and our capability. Yet we are not able to support any ground operation anywhere else in the theater so long as we are offering that support to Bosnia. And the reason we are there is this allegiance that we apparently have to NATO.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that in addition to all the other arguments we have heard, from the cost of the operation to our relationship with Russia and all the rest of them, that there is

another very serious problem we are facing, and that is how many more Bosnians are out there that we are going to be obligated to support as a result of increasing our commitment to NATO.

Mr. President, I would like to say that if you were in a position where most Americans think we are in right now, and that is where we are the superpower, that we are able to defend America on two regional fronts, then I would say maybe we should consider doing this. But right now we have a hollow force. We are in a situation very similar to what we were facing in the 1970s.

Mr. President, I think we can no longer afford the luxury of any more activities such as the Bosnian operation. I think we would be best served not to extend NATO to these three countries.

Mr. ROBERTS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues to discuss the issue of national security and the vital security interests to the United States and Europe, and obviously I am talking about the proposed expansion of NATO. To borrow a very well-known phrase, now we are engaged in a great debate, or at least a very good discussion, to determine and to test whether that alliance or any alliance so conceived and so successful in the past can meet the challenges of today.

We are in the amendment process, but I do want to offer some general comments and some concerns.

But for NATO and the collective security of Europe and the United States, the time has come. I must say that from the time of news accounts on old newsreels, or what we in my age can recall as the Movietone News or to CNN today, it has been quite a show for NATO. But it is time to turn off the movie projector, sweep up the popcorn, and turn out the lights. The old NATO show is over. Just as in that great 1971 movie, ''The Last Picture Show,'' when the camera pans back from the now-closed movie theater and pictures a deserted small, dusty town in Texas and tumbleweeds blowing down the street, we are not sure what the future holds but we know it will be different from the past.

We now face the uncertainty of NATO either enlarged or with the same 16 members. We don't know what it will be in the future, but we are certain it will be different than in the past and, quite frankly, peace and stability in Europe and throughout the world hang in the balance.

The debate on the addition of three new members will soon be over and the time for the vote will rapidly approach, perhaps as of this week.

The administration assures us that to fundamentally alter the most successful alliance in our history is a good thing. They tell us that we will be more secure with an expanded alliance, that the wrongs of Yalta will be corrected, the candidate countries will now be free to fully develop as democratic and market-driven societies. We are guaranteed that no new dividing lines between the West and the East will result from this or any kind of future enlargement, that the door is open to all, and that further rounds of enlargement are a certainty. The administration also predicts that although the Russians are upset, and they are, with the enlargement of NATO they will simply ''get over it'' and come to understand we have their best interests in mind with enlargement and Russia will also be more secure.

Now, we get all this for the amazing value of about $1.5 billion over the next 10 years. We are reassured that although the cost estimates have varied from $125 billion to $1.5 billion over the next 10 years, NATO's sharp-penciled budgeteers certainly have it right. Much to our relief, the burdensharing problems between our NATO allies that have plagued the alliance in the past will not be a problem now or in the future of an enlarged NATO, so the argument goes. The administration is confident the United States will not have to pick up any unexpected costs, although the allies have said they will refuse to pay one additional mark or franc for enlargement.

Now, I have spent considerable time looking into each of these controversial areas surrounding the enlargement of NATO, and one of the most amazing things about this debate is that in each concern for enlargement, the basis of the arguments, both pro and con, are fundamentally the same but the conclusions are the opposite.

Let me take a few minutes to lay out the pros and cons of NATO enlargement, if I might. First is the issue of cost and also burdensharing. Unfortunately, only time will truly show what the costs for NATO enlargement will be. With such a wide variance in the estimates, there clearly is not a single set of assumptions to gauge the true costs of enlargement. I do not know how we could. I can tell you the final costs will not be $1.5 billion over a 10-year period, but I cannot tell you what the costs will be, and I do not think anybody else can.

The opponents of enlargement say the $1.5 billion number is laughable, and the opponents breathe a sigh of relief that the agreed-to number is so low that no one could suggest we cannot afford the costs of enlargement. We are told the reasons for $1.5 billion being the correct cost include the fact only three countries are being invited as opposed to four or five, and the military infrastructure in the candidate countries is in much better shape than originally thought.

I am a little surprised at the infrastructure point. NATO has been involved in Partnership for Peace exercises and military-to-military contacts with those countries for more than a few years. We have a huge facility at Taszar in Hungary at a former Soviet air base. Didn't anyone in NATO or the United States notice the condition of the infrastructure during any of the exercises, and particularly in the three candidate countries?

Finally, another reason the cost has been reduced is that NATO has shifted some of what some thought to be shared costs to the three candidate countries.

I am concerned, regardless of the public statements by these countries, that they will not be able to fund NATO enlargement or, if they do, they will divert needed resources away from more important domestic issues and into military spending. If they are unable to meet their fiscal obligations for enlargement, will the costs be deferred or will NATO simply pick them up?

I might point out in terms of paying the contribution to NATO there are three accounts. The NATO Security Investment Program, formerly called the NATO Infrastructure Program, comes from the annual military construction appropriation. We do not have the money in that account to pay for this. The NATO civil budget money comes from the annual State Department appropriation ''Contributions to International Organizations,'' and that money is tight. The NATO military budget comes from the Department of Army annual appropriation, and that budget, too, is under very severe pressure.

Let's take up one other subject, if I might, Mr. President. What about the correction of the wrongs of Yalta? The candidate countries are proud, developing democracies and countries wanting very badly to become a part of the West. They have already made some great strides. We all understand they suffered terribly during the many years of Soviet domination. I applaud their efforts. I am confident they would be wonderful allies, capable at some point of carrying out their NATO responsibilities. I have been to Prague. I have been to Budapest. I have listened to the history. I have felt the pride of their accomplishments. A freedom-loving person cannot experience the strength of their conviction without reaching out to help them attain their stated goals of Western integration. But understanding and empathizing with their feelings and their desires are not reasons for the Senate to ratify a change in NATO membership.

The only reason to enlarge NATO is if it is in our vital national interest to simply do so. Proponents of enlargement do not see it that way. For example, General Shalikashvili in a recent Los Angeles Times article said, ''Meanwhile, there are urgencies to expanding NATO. It is nearly 10 years since the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the countries of Eastern Europe—including my native land, Poland—have waited long enough for a place at the table where they have yearned to be for so long.''

That is a common theme for the enlargement proponents, including the

Secretary of State. They have the right to join NATO, and that is good enough to alter the alliance. Others argue that enlarging NATO will show the continued interest and commitment of the United States in a stable and secure Europe. As a matter of fact, I think the distinguished Presiding Officer has made that very cogent argument.

It is still not clear why NATO must enlarge to demonstrate, however, in this Senator's opinion, U.S. resolve or commitment to Europe. There is no question in my mind a secure and stable Europe is in our vital interest, but I fail to see the connection between an enlarged NATO and that end goal.

It is interesting to note that Austria, a Central European country, is not seeking NATO membership. There is no cry of a security vacuum in Austria or a concern for the right to join the primer alliance, which is NATO. In fact, Austria took a good look at NATO and decided it was more important to seek its long-term security within the European Union and the Partnership for Peace and the Organization for Security for Cooperation in Europe, OSCE. This would have been the best approach, in this Senator's view, for security and acceptance into the West for the current candidate nations rather than immediate NATO membership. Unfortunately, that is not now an option. We have come too far. The administration has planted the flag of U.S. commitment and integrity—no small matter.

Let me share with you the results of a survey published in June of 1996 in an issue of The Economist. I am sure some will challenge these results, but I think it is worth reviewing these questions asked of citizens of the three candidate countries.

Would these countries support sending troops to defend another country? Only 26 percent of the people of Hungary, 43 percent of those polled in the Czech Republic, and 55 percent in Poland support sending troops to defend another country. Now, considering this is the best that the support will ever be, since the excitement of joining NATO will soon wear off, I suggest this is not a very good commentary on the weak support to carry out a core requirement of NATO. And that core requirement is the common defense and the commitment to send troops to defend an ally.

Let me ask another question: Would these countries support having NATO troops based on their soil? In The Economist, they reported that only 30 percent of the Czechs and 35 percent of the Hungarians support the notion of allowing NATO troops to be stationed on their soil. Although 56 percent of the people of Poland, obviously, supported the idea, it is still an idea that does not have broad support in any of the three of the candidate countries.

The next question: Would these countries support regular NATO exercises in their country, or regular flights over their country? Less than half of any of the candidate countries supported having NATO exercises on their soil or even allowing flights over their country, and those percentages range from 26 percent to 41 percent, representing, again, little support for the cost of simply joining the alliance.

Would these countries support spending a bigger share of their country's budget on military and social needs? The numbers in support for this question are very low, and it is a crucial question. In the Czech Republic, 8 percent; in Hungary, 9 percent; and 23 percent in Poland support spending a bigger share on defense. Unfortunately, there will be these costs associated with their membership in NATO. I know the agriculture problems they are having in those countries. A great deal of those expenses will have to be committed to the transformation from a collective farm system to a system more in keeping with the rest of Europe.

My only point in presenting these statistics is to show there are concerns in the candidate countries about the commitment to NATO. I am afraid the survey says NATO may no longer be a ''one for all, all for one,'' but rather it may become an ''all for me, but not for you'' alliance.

Let me say, in April of this past year the Roper Starch World Wide poll asked Americans the level of support for using armed forces in certain situations. I hope—and I do not believe that the American public has become so isolationist that they would never risk any American life in defense of freedom. But there is a clearly understandable concern about risking American lives in what some call a political war of gradualism where there is no clear and discernible vital national interest.

Listen to this. If the U.S. were attacked, 84 percent of those polled supported using force. This is in the Roper Starch World Wide poll. I would like to know where the other 16 percent are.

If our forces stationed overseas were attacked, 50 percent supported armed intervention. To safeguard peacekeeping within the framework of the United Nations, the support dropped to 35 percent, which explains a great deal in regards to what happened in the gulf. Finally, to stop invasion of one country by another, the support fell sharply to 15 percent. That is why it took George Bush and Jim Baker and Dick Cheney and others a whole year to rally support among our allies in regards to the gulf war.

One issue we should all be concerned about is the collective security commitment that NATO makes in the post-cold-war environment, and that commitment is contained in article V of the NATO charter. During the cold war, obviously, everybody understood that if the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries attacked Western Europe, the very survival of the free world was at stake and every NATO member would strike back with all of their military capability. But is that still true today with no threat to the survival of Europe? Would all NATO members automatically strike back if another member was attacked tomorrow?

Article V can be read either way, and in fact the proponents and opponents argue both ways. There is a considerable amount of disagreement on this topic. I believe that if a member of NATO had a vital national interest at risk in the country under attack, they would respond with military force. If there was no threat to their vital interests, I doubt they would automatically respond with the same kind of military force. They would respond with outrage. They might threaten military force if the belligerents did not stop. But I am not sure if they would respond militarily. I am confident, however, that the candidate countries think NATO would respond to an attack on them, just as they would have during the cold war—that is, with all of their military strength.

The construction of article V is such that both interpretations are possible. Some argue—and I believe they have a point—that this ambiguity is good and may be just the right amount of deterrence in the minds of would-be belligerents. This is a serious issue, since it is at the very heart of the commitment and success of NATO during the cold war. We need to fully understand what article V means in today's environment. We just had an amendment on the floor of the Senate to try to spell that out.

The confusion over article V is only one mission concern. There is a more fundamental concern: What is the mission of NATO in the post-cold-war? The distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator BIDEN, and the distinguished Senator from Oregon who was just the Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Arizona, had a lengthy debate over this and considered the Kyl amendment. Let me share part of former Secretary of Defense Perry's testimony before the Armed Services Committee.

> The original mission of NATO—deterring an attack from the Soviet Union—is obviously no longer relevant. The original geographical area of NATO's responsibility is no longer sufficient. The original military structure of NATO is no longer appropriate. And the way in which NATO relates to Russia must be entirely different from the way it related to the Soviet Union.

One would think, with that array of differences, and before the alliance was changed forever, that some agreed-to long-range strategy would have been developed. Unfortunately, this is not the case. Listening to the discussion on the Senate floor by my colleagues, I believe there are many possibilities for future missions of NATO. Some say the Kyl amendment opened the door to more possible missions, and the Senator from Arizona firmly says that he wants to go back to the original 1991 strategic concept.

Can anyone in the Senate say with certainty what NATO's mission is? Can

anyone articulate what mission, what role, against what threat we are rushing toward enlargement of NATO, to fundamentally alter this great alliance?

Let me say that simply to bring NATO expansion into focus, the President, it seems to me, should become engaged. In Warsaw, St. Petersburg, and in Bucharest, the President did address general European security concerns. But to my way of thinking, despite all of the hard work by the Secretary of State and others, he has not made a personal case to the Congress or the American people.

As a matter of fact, in remarks during the European trip, the President said, in a post-Soviet era—I am paraphrasing here—military matters are no longer primary, that terrorism, illegal drugs, national extremism, regional conflicts due to ethnic, racial, and religious hatreds do matter. I can assure you, using an expanded NATO to address these concerns raises some very important questions.

What means would be used? Warplanes, ground forces, and naval power are of little use in fighting ethnic hatred and racism. If NATO membership reduces the threats of ethnic rivalries, somebody should tell that to the Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland, the Basques in Spain, and the Kurds in Turkey.

Do we really want to change the most successful security alliance in history to a European United Nations? With 16 NATO members and 28 other nations inaugurating the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, it seems to me the protocol, rituals, and welcoming speeches will leave no time for any serious discussion. Exactly what force requirements are necessary to prevent a power vacuum? What is the strategy to ensure stability and security in Europe?

NATO's leadership understands there is some confusion in this regard and, as I have indicated, has directed a review of its 1991 Strategic Concept to see if it is in line with the changed world and threats—and we had a good debate on the Senate floor just earlier on this very matter.

Now the Secretary of State wants to ''spread NATO's security from the Middle East through Central Africa,'' but several of the current alliance members remain unconvinced of the utility of these so-called out-of-area operations for NATO. Again, let's quote from Dr. Perry's written statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee.

> The geographical area of NATO interests should be anywhere in the world where aggression can threaten the security of NATO members. . . .

Let me repeat that:

> The geographical area of NATO interests should be anywhere in the world where aggression can threaten the security of NATO members—certainly including all of Europe, and certainly including the Persian Gulf.

That is a quote. Just think of that, even with the current membership and the world's global economy, what corner of this universe could not hold interest for NATO members? Are we considering NATO as a global alliance? If we are, are we to consider global membership for NATO? Is this alliance to become the military arm of the United Nations? We should be seriously concerned that we are changing NATO before we are certain of its future mission requirements.

Now, the last but most frequently debated point associated with NATO enlargement is the impact on United States-Russian relations. Here both sides of the argument can list exactly the same points but come up with opposite results. It is a paradox of enormous irony.

Unfortunately, this is the one area that will have the most profound effect on our country in the coming decades. We must be certain of what we are doing.

The proponents argue that Russia understands that NATO is no threat to them. Opponents point out that some 350 Members of the Duma, some of which we have met with in the Senate Armed Services Committee, have formed an anti-NATO group. Let me inform the President there is not one—one—Member of the Duma that is pro-NATO publicly. The proponents say the Russians will get over it—in time. Opponents state enlargement will sour our relations with the moderate Russians. The proponents vigorously point out that in dealing with the Russians, we can't be seen as simply giving in to the ''hard-liners.'' Opponents say if we enlarge NATO, we will play into the hands of the ''hard-liners.''

Let me say, I think I know at least in part what some of the blood pressure and the motives are in regard to expanding NATO and Russia. And I quote an article from the Washington Post from Charles Krauthammer, who I think is an outstanding columnist most of the time due to the fact that he agrees with my prejudice. Obviously, I think he is a very learned columnist, but on this he tells the truth. He says here that:

> . . .NATO expansion nothing more than extending the borders of peace; building new bridges; strengthening an alliance directed against no one in particular, certainly ''not arrayed against Russia. . . .

Then he tells the truth.

> This is all nice and good. It is, however, rubbish. In order not to offend the bear, the administration must understandably pretend that NATO expansion has nothing to do with Russia. Those not constrained by diplomatic niceties, however, can say the obvious: NATO, an alliance founded in that immortal formulation ''to keep America in, Germany down, and Russia out,'' is expanding in the service of its historic and continuing mission. . . .

And that is to contain Russia. We are poking the Russian bear.

So it goes with a host of NATO enlargement topics dealing with Russia-and-United States relations. Keeping or encouraging Russia moving toward a complete system of democratic reforms, I submit, Mr. President, is in our vital national interest and, from a timing perspective, it is more important than the addition of these three candidate countries.

These are the key issues surrounding the debate on NATO enlargement: cost, mission and strategy, and United States-Russia relations. Unfortunately, there are still many unanswered questions remaining on these vital areas. I trust the Senate, with the various amendments we will be considering and the very good debate that we have had, will answer these concerns. The show is over, and we must address this enlargement of NATO on the floor now with the facts we have before us.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in closing, Mr. President, an article by John Lewis Gaddis, who is a professor of history at Yale University. The information was provided to me by the granddaughter of Dwight David Eisenhower. Susan Eisenhower has played a very important role in this debate.

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

[From the New York Times on the Web, Apr. 27, 1998]

THE SENATE SHOULD HALT NATO EXPANSION

(By John Lewis Gaddis)

NEW HAVEN—The decision to expand NATO to include Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic has produced some strange political alignments. There aren't many causes that Bill Clinton and Jesse Helms can both support, or that Phyllis Schlafly and the editors of The Nation can join in opposing.

Even stranger, to a historian, is the consensus that seems to be shaping up within our community. Historians normally don't agree on much, whether it is about the origins of the Peloponnesian War or the end of the cold war. And yet I've had difficulty finding any colleagues who think NATO expansion is a good idea. Indeed, I can recall no other moment when there was less support in our profession for a government policy.

A striking gap has opened, therefore, between those who make grand strategy and those who reflect on it. On this issue, at least, official and accumulated wisdom are pointing in very different directions.

This has happened, I think, because the Clinton Administration has failed to answer a few simple questions:

Why exclude the Russians? One of the few propositions on which historians tend to agree is that peace settlements work best when they include rather than exclude former adversaries. Within three years after the defeat of Napoleon in 1815, the victors had brought France back within the concert of Europe. Within six years of their surrender in 1945, Germany and Japan were firmly within American-designed security alliances. Both settlements survived for decades. The post-World War I settlement, however, excluded Germany. The lessons of history on this point seem obvious.

Who, then, will we include? The Administration has made it clear that expansion will not stop with Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. It has mentioned the Baltics and Romania as possible future members. The State Department's Web site claims support for NATO expansion from groups like the Belorussian Congress Committee of America, the Ukrainian National Association and the Armenian Assembly of America.

The State Department assures us, though, that the Russians view this process with equanimity and that we can expect relations with Moscow to proceed normally while we sort out just who the new members of NATO will be. Perhaps it will next try to tell us that pigs can fly.

What will expansion cost? The Administration's estimate for including Poland, Hungary and the Cezch Republic comes to only $1.5 billion over the next 10 years, of which the United States would pay $400 million. That sounds like a bargain, but the estimate assumes no change in the current security environment. Has it occurred to the Administration that the act of expanding NATO, especially if former Soviet states are included, could itself alter the current security environment? It doesn't take a rocket scientist—or even a historian—to figure out that actions have consequences.

What's the objective? Alliances are means to ends, not ends in themselves. NATO served brilliantly as a means of containing the Soviet Union, but the Administration has specified no comparably clear goal that would justify expanding the alliance now that the cold war is over. It speaks vaguely of the need for democratization and stabilization, but if these objectives inform its policy, shouldn't they apply throughout Eastern Europe and in Russia as well?

I heard a very different explanation from influential government and academic figures when I visited one of the proposed new member countries last month. NATO expansion, they boasted, will demonstrate once and for all that the Russians never have been and never will be part of European civilization. Yet Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that she wants to erase ''the line that once so cruelly and arbitrarily divided Europe.'' It is not at all clear how this policy will produce that result.

Isn't it too late now to change course? Some argue that eve if the decision to expand NATO wasn't the most thoughtful, historically aware way to make policy, the decision has been made and going back on it would be a disaster far greater than the problems NATO expansion itself will bring. This sounds a little like the refusal of the Titanic's captain to cut his ship's speed when told there were icebergs ahead. Consistency is a fine idea most of the time, but there are moments when it's just plain irresponsible.

Only future historians will be able to say whether this is such a moment. But the mood of current historians should not give the Administration—or those senators who plan to vote this week for NATO expansion—very much comfort.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I simply close in quoting the last two paragraphs:

Isn't it too late now to change course? Some argue that even if the decision to expand NATO wasn't the most thoughtful, historically aware way to make policy, that the decision has been made and going back on it would be a disaster far greater than the problems NATO expansion itself will bring.

That is a good argument. As a matter of fact, I think that may be a persuasive argument. I have listed a lot of concerns that I have. I think the adjectives and adverbs that I have used and the language I have used would indicate, if somebody is watching, ''Well, Senator ROBERTS, he is going to vote no.'' I am undecided.

Again, what the professor has indicated that ''the decision has been made and going back on it would be a disaster far greater than the problems NATO expansion itself will bring.

Then he goes on to say this:

This sounds a little like the refusal of the Titanic's captain to cut his ship's speed when told there were icebergs ahead. Consistency is a fine idea most of the time, but there are moments when it's just plain irresponsible.

That is the other view.

Only future historians will be able to say whether this is such a moment.

Professor Gaddis goes on to say:

. . .But the mood of current historians should not give the Administration—or those senators who plan to vote this week for NATO expansion—very much comfort.

I thank you, Mr. President, and I thank the indulgence of my colleague from Illinois. I apologize to him for going on a little bit longer than I told him, and I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the great State of Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank my colleague from Kansas for his remarks. It is always a great education to listen to his statements on the floor. Though we may not agree on any particulars, I certainly do respect him very much and have enjoyed our service together both in the House and the Senate.

I stand this morning not to give a long speech, even by Senate standards, but I would like to say I hope all Members of the Senate will put this debate into its historical context. This may be one of the most important foreign policy debates of the decade. It is to determine the future of the U.S. relationship with a new Europe, a Europe after the cold war.

Since 1949, the United States understood, particularly through the NATO alliance, our relationship with Europe. We defined that relationship in specific terms and committed not only the United States on paper but, in fact, at one point stationed some 300,000 Americans in Europe, in an effort to make certain that that sector of the world will continue to be safe from any type of aggression or invasion.

When I think back on my own life and all of the concerns of the cold war, it focused primarily on the possibility that the Soviet Union might expand through some manner through its Warsaw Pact nations into the a NATO alliance and force us to respond. It was a concern that cost us lives, it cost us money, and it really was the focus of our foreign policy for many, many decades.

With the tearing down of the Berlin Wall, the end of the Soviet Union, as we knew it, and the emergence of countries in Eastern and Central Europe, formerly part of the Soviet orbit, we now are in a position to redefine the U.S. position in the world. There are some people who naturally tend toward the American tradition of isolationism. We are pretty far away from these countries. ''Perhaps we shouldn't be concerned about them,'' they will say. ''Let them worry about their own future, we have our own concerns here.'' But, we have heard that response many times in our past, and the Americans, by and large, have rejected it. We understand we are part of the world community. In fact, we are viewed by most nations of the world as a major leader, an example, in many instances, of democracy and a country which most nations choose to emulate.

I found it interesting, when the wall came down in Berlin and the Eastern and Central European countries started emerging as democracies, how many of the new leaders made a point of coming not to London, not to Paris, but to Washington, DC, in the hopes that they might address a joint meeting of Congress. To them, it was a validation that the new Czech Republic and the new Poland was going to embark on a democratic experiment, and coming here to this building in Washington, DC, was really shown to be a break from the past; that they would separate themselves from the past and their connection with the Eastern powers, with communism, with the old Soviet Union, and dedicate themselves to democracy.

Now we have the natural evolution of their emergence as democracies and our natural evolution as a leader in today's world. We are debating on the floor of the Senate the question of enlarging the NATO alliance to include newcomers, to include nations which just a few years ago were perceived as potential enemies and now we see as allies. What a refreshing change in this world that a nation like Poland, which we identify with certainty in my home State of Illinois and the city of Chicago very closely, that a nation like Poland now has a chance to join us as close allies.

I listened carefully as some of my colleagues talked about the attitudes in these nations about the possibility of NATO membership. Make no mistake, if you visit these countries, that is all they talk about—the possibility that at some point in time, they will be part of the NATO alliance.

This is an exciting prospect for them, not so much because they anticipate some military invasion or the need for military defense, but rather because they see this alliance with the United States and with other NATO allies as an assurance that they are committed to many things, to democracy, to a free market and, most importantly, to the principles of NATO.

It is interesting, this alliance, in our world's history, is a unique one because for 50 years this was not an aggressive alliance, this was a defensive alliance. We basically said we respect others' boundaries as we expect them to respect ours and we are not setting out to invade and claim territory but merely to protect our own. It was a defensive alliance. It has been throughout history. And that is its future as well.

As other countries come in—Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic—they accept the premise. The premise is, you are on board as an alliance to protect our borders and to try our best to maintain stability in this new and developing world. I think that is the bottom line here. It is no longer a fight against ideology or even the aggression of some superpower but rather the stability of the region.

Is that stability important to the United States? I think it is critical to the United States. In just a few months we are going to see the creation of the Eurodollar, or the Eurocurrency, which is going to be perhaps one of the more dominant currencies in the world. We will see the European nations by and large coming together as an economic unit as a major competitor to the United States, and at the same time we will see opportunities in Europe for American firms.

If we are going to engender this relationship, this free market economy and this new democracy, it is entirely consistent for us to build an alliance with these countries through NATO.

I hear some of my colleagues arguing against the expansion of NATO, and as I listened carefully, they are actually arguing against the existence of NATO. I hope they are not. To pause on reflection, it has been one of the most successful military alliances in our Nation's history, perhaps in the history of the world. And it is important for us to maintain NATO and to expand it.

I watched carefully the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL, just an hour or two ago. I read it carefully, and I thought, does this amendment, which seeks to spell out the parameters of the expansion of NATO, in any way preclude the possibility that one day Russia would join NATO? Well, it does not, because it speaks in terms of principles and goals and values.

I think when we talk about the nervousness in Russia about the expansion of NATO, we should put it in historical context. The Russians have gone through a major transformation in a very short period of time. Once considered a superpower and a major leader in the world, they are now struggling to redefine themselves in the 21st century.

I know this causes angst and pain among many Russian leaders who can recall, I am sure with fondness, days of empire. But the fact is, it is a new world and a new opportunity, and they have a chance for a new relationship. A new and expanded NATO is no threat to Russia. A new and expanded NATO is an invitation to Russia to join us in the same principles and values. I think that should be our view, our vision of the new world.

When I hear about this Russian concern and nervousness, I really hope they will take the time to consider the history of this alliance, which has been a peaceful alliance, a defensive alliance.

Let me speak for a moment before I close about the Baltic States. I always confess my prejudice when I come to this issue. My mother was born in Lithuania. So when I speak of the Baltic States, it is with some particular personal feeling. I have visited Lithuania on four our five different occasions and have also visited Latvia and Estonia.

I did not believe in my lifetime that I would see the changes that have taken place in those three tiny countries. When I first visited Lithuania back in 1978 or 1979, it was under Soviet domination, and it was a rather sad period in the history of that country. The United States said for decades that we never recognized the Soviet takeover of the Baltic States. We always believed them to be independent nations that were unfortunately invaded and taken over by the Soviets.

When I went to visit them in 1979, I saw the efforts of the Soviet Union to impose upon the people in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia the Russian culture. They expatriated so many of the local people and sent them off to Siberia and places in the far reaches of Russia; and then they sent their own populations, the Russian cultural population, those speaking the Russian language, into the Baltic States in an effort to try to homogenize them into some entity that was more Russian than it was Baltic.

But it did not work. The people maintained—zealously maintained—their own culture, and they kept their own religion, their own language, and their own literature and their own dreams. I did not imagine in my lifetime that I would ever see these Baltic States once again free, and yet I lived to see that happen.

In fact, at one point I was sent as a member of a delegation by then-Speaker of the House Tom Foley to witness the first democratic election in Lithuania. The Soviets refused to give me a visa. I sat in Berlin day after weary day waiting for a chance to get in. And finally I was only able to be there the day of the election, that evening for the celebration. But I was there for an important moment, and I am glad I saw it.

Today these three nations are trying their best to become mature economies, to watch their democracies flourish. And they have ample evidence of real progress. The fact that they would entertain the possibility of being part of NATO should not be a source of concern to us but one of great hope and great optimism, because as countries like Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and so many others that were either part of the Warsaw Pact or even Soviet republics become part of NATO, they really show this transformation and this progression into a democratic form and a new democratic vision in Europe.

One of the resolutions being offered by one of my colleagues wants to single out the Baltic States as if they are the real concern of Russia. If you took a look at a map of the world and saw the huge expanse of Russia today, and then took a look at these three tiny nations, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, it is almost laughable that the Russians would look to them as any threat to their future or to their security. They are small nations with very small armies and virtually no sophisticated military forces. What they are asking for is a chance to flourish, and I think they should have that chance.

So I close by saying that I hope my colleagues in the Senate who have followed this debate will understand its historic importance and understand that those of us who are privileged to serve in the Senate and have a chance to vote on this question of NATO enlargement may be casting a vote on foreign policy that is going to be viewed for generations to come as a milestone—the end of the cold war, the new vision of the world, the new definition of an alliance involving the United States and freedom-loving democracies in Europe that led to stability and to growth. That is my vision of the world. That is my vision of NATO enlargement.

I hope that a majority of my colleagues will join me in supporting President Clinton and supporting virtually all of these nations that are asking for NATO to be enlarged to reflect this new vision.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. SNOWE. I rise to express my intention to vote for the admission of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

In taking up this decision, the Senate takes up one of its basic constitutional mandates. A nation's most sacred obligation is to protect its citizens and its territory from hostile forces. The NATO alliance has been the cornerstone of our efforts to do so on behalf of free citizens for nearly 50 years. It has emerged as the most successful enterprise of common defense in human history. Any changes in the membership of the Alliance that we contemplate must undergo careful consideration.

I have done so and am confident that this enlargement is in our national security interests and will ensure that NATO continues to do in the 21st century what it has done in the latter half of the 20th for the United States, and the people of Europe—guarantee their security, freedom and democratic forms of government.

Mr. President, last year, I was asked by the Senate Majority Leader and the Senate Democratic Leader to join a bipartisan group of 28 Senators to study the issues associated with NATO enlargement. I was honored to join in such a task. The NATO alliance has been for nearly 50 years the greatest force for maintaining peace and security in the world. When it was funded, the United States had just emerged from fighting the most destructive war in history on the European continent and was just beginning to lead the fight against imperial Soviet communism—a Cold War against a totalitarian foe who was committed to imposing another form of tyranny first in Europe and then around the world.

The nations of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland, therefore, faced the bitter prospect of exchanging one form of tyranny for another. I knew that if NATO was to continue to protect freedom and democracy in Europe, it needed to face the changing circumstances posed by the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Warsaw Pact and communist ideology. The Alliance had to change in form to preserve the principles that it had safeguarded in modern times.

Today, the United States and the other 15 members of the Alliance hope to move the frontiers of NATO eastward at a time when there is not a visible threat to the security of any of its members. When the Alliance expanded between the 1950s and the 1980s to add Greece, Turkey, West Germany and Spain, the grim shadow of Soviet power menaced Europe and the West.

I believe that the parallels with the decision to expand NATO in the 1990s are in some ways similar to those which existed at the end of World War II. At that time, the strategic security situation on the continent of Europe was also in flux. The threat from Nazi Germany had collapsed, but no protective machinery had yet been set up to prevent the emergence of a new tyranny. As the great statesman Winston Churchill noted, ''From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended upon the continent [of Europe].''

Unlike the era beginning at the end of World War I, when we retreated from victory to a fateful isolationism, the United States realized that our own security depended upon the building and maintenance of a free and democratic Europe.

President Harry Truman, with the able leadership of Senator Arthur Vandenberg, began the shaping of what became known as the ''containment'' policy. The United States and its friends in Europe would resist the westward march of communism. Harry Truman and his generation were determined to block the Soviet Union from leveraging the political fate of a continent that had drawn millions of Americans into war by ensuring that its expansion not go any further.

At first it was thought that economic assistance to Europe was sufficient. The Marshall Plan, named for the then Secretary of State George Marshall, was first articulated in 1947 and approved by the Congress in 1948. Just as today some believe that membership in the European Union is enough to ensure the security of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, it was hoped in the 1940s that economic aid alone would suffice in strengthening Europe to resist the designs of the Soviet Union. However, that was not to be the case. Both the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia, and the 1948 Berlin blockade, convinced the United States that more than economic aid was needed to protect freedom and democracy in the Western world.

As a result, on April 4, 1949, the United States and eleven nations of Western Europe signed the North Atlantic Treaty in Washington. NATO was born, and for the first time in history, a military alliance was created for the sole purpose of defending freedom and democracy. And without firing one shot in 40 years, it gave ready firepower to the policy of containing Communism until that system collapsed under its own contradictions.

Our commitment to security in the North Atlantic Treaty is spelled out in Article V. The words ''an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all'' signify the commitment of this country to forego isolationism and to play a critical role in helping to guarantee freedom and security in Europe.

Today of course, there is no immediate threat to the security of Western Europe. The United States and the other 15 members of NATO face an incipient Russian democracy. Communism as a system and a power has receded from the tormented heart of Europe. The mighty Red Army of the 1940s is now a force that is in military decline. Today, we live in a different world—but not one without dangers or threats. Today, we face our own set of challenges—and we must create our own set of solutions.

The end of the Cold War has not meant that freedom has suddenly become free-of-charge. While the Soviet Union has disintegrated and the threat of invasion from a much weaker Russia has receded, this development by no means signals that NATO's mission has evaporated. To the contrary, just as NATO protected and guaranteed the freedom of the United States and Western Europe during the latter half of the twentieth century, it can, and must, continue to do so for all of Europe as we prepare to enter the new millennium.

For forty years, NATO could protect only the Western half of Europe—the other half was trapped behind the Iron Curtain of communism. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, three of those nations—the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland are now poised to enjoy the freedoms that the totalitarians so long withheld and to take fresh responsibility for their political pluralism as members of a voluntary alliance.

I know that some of my colleagues in this chamber, whose opinions I respect, assert that it is more important for Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to achieve membership in the European Union and to enjoy the economic benefits that it offers as a prelude to joining NATO. This proposal brings the echoes of history to the Senate if we recall that some advocates of the Marshall Plan thought economic health was sufficient for the protection of freedom and democracy. Unfortunately, it was not true then, and it is not true today.

The European Union is not a substitute for the NATO alliance. If that were the case, then the nations of Western Europe would not need the benefits of NATO membership to ensure their security. They realize that the two entities each serve their purpose and reinforce rather than substitute for each other. The European Union is an economic entity that will shepherd the prosperity of Europe well into the next century. I have little doubt that Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic will eventually become members. However, membership will only be part of the way they help fulfill their desire—for the first time in over fifty years—to determine for themselves how they will ensure their security.

NATO was and is more than a defensive military alliance. It reflects the civic values underpinning trans-Atlantic security through the cultivation of peaceful ties among governments that rest on the consent of the governed. It is a tangible symbol of the resolve of democratic nations, united in a common purpose, to promote freedom and democracy. While the threat in the Cold War was from a large conventional army led by the Soviet Union that could sweep across Germany, today the threat is far more subtle but just as real. Today we all face threats from terrorism, weapons of mass destruction in the hands of rogue states and nationalistic passions liberated from Cold War restraints. The Gulf War showed that the United States and the European members of NATO face threats far from their borders. Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic must deal with these same threats, and they can overcome them as members of the NATO alliance.

Already, we have seen a preview of some of the potential security benefits of having these nations—all of which are now strong democracies that have worked to strengthen civilian control of the military—as NATO members:

All three have contributed to the success of the SFOR mission in Bosnia. Hungary's base at Taszar has been host to over 95,000 U.S. military personnel rotating in and out of IFOR and SFOR duty. And if there had been a need to fight Iraq, our new NATO members would have been ready to assist. Poland has chemical weapons experts

ready to support us if necessary. The Czech Republic would also supply chemical weapons experts. Hungary's Foreign Minister would have urged his nation's parliament to open its airspace and airports to U.S. aircraft if military action had been needed.

The spur to all of these actions was prospective membership in NATO, and the assumption of a fair share of responsibilities as full fledged members of the Western community. This enthusiasm should make us realize how important NATO is and how established members often take the Alliance and its benefits for granted.

It would be unjust to deny the Poles, Hungarians and Czechs a role in safeguarding the freedom of the European-American community—a freedom, incidentally, we rhetorically upheld for these nations over the past four decades. It would be morally wrong to create an artificial dividing line in Europe just a decade after another such line was erased.

Mr. President, what would happen if the Senate were to reject NATO expansion? I believe that we would signal the willingness of the West to confuse the tranquility of today with the potential turmoil of tomorrow for which history warns us to prepare. If we reject expansion now, we would also reject the enduring link, shown by our experience in NATO, between democratic institutions and the defense of peace.

The incentive of NATO membership has furthermore stabilized democratic forces in all three candidate nations. Poland instituted civilian control of the military and formed a joint battalion with the Danes and Germans. Hungary and Romania, the latter a possible future member of NATO, signed a treaty respecting the rights of the Hungarian minority in Romania. If NATO membership did not provide the framework for these actions, the Poles, Czechs and Hungarians could still be struggling with the social and military legacies of authoritarianism.

Mr. President, if we were to reject the logical first step of NATO membership for these three states, then the progress made by these nations might be reversed. All three nations could and would be entitled to feel that NATO and the West do not care about them. We in the Senate would be sending a message that while the United States and Western Europe are entitled to the benefits of freedom and the confidence that a military alliance will sustain them that NATO is an exclusive club which will not admit those willing to make it even better. All three nations might then form another military bloc.

Such an organization might turn inward or Eastward to make security arrangements without the participation of the West. But I would rather see Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic work within the NATO alliance to address the concerns of the Baltic states and other regional parties.

Another aspect of this issue which has concerned me and I know, many Senators, is the cost of this expansion. It is a legitimate concern. The General Accounting Office produced a report just last month concluding that the Defense Department's assessment of the NATO cost of expansion was reasonable if the current environment of a diminished military threat to the continent will continue for years into the future. New members, in turn, will sustain their own internal budgets for critical defense modernization. It is also up to them to meet their formal treaty commitments to the commonly-funded budgets of the Alliance.

The governments of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic have agreed to specific 10-year obligations on payments for the integration of military systems and command structures with existing Alliance members. I commend our prospective new partners and the Defense Department for developing this blueprint for enlargement. They must also expect that NATO as well as Congress will hold them accountable for it.

Mr. President, Secretary Albright summed it up well last year when she said: ''Let us not deceive ourselves. The United States is a European power.'' We fought two world wars because much of Western Europe was threatened, invaded and occupied. The Cold War was fought because some of these nations were again threatened and others forced to endure Communist tyranny.

The enlargement of NATO will mean that more of Europe is part of an alliance designed to protect freedom and democracy. That makes conflict and the defense of our security interests much greater.

NATO will be stronger with the addition of more territory and more armed forces—200,000 in fact—a valuable addition if we account for the reductions in Western military forces since the end of the Cold War. Peace through strength may be a slogan to the cynics, but to me, it summarizes the invaluable lesson that we learned on the post-war ashes of a Europe leveled by aggression.

One of the Senate's most illustrious members, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, said at the time of NATO's founding in 1949 that ''[NATO] is not built to stop a war after it starts . . . It is built to stop wars before they start.''

The admission of these three applicants will strengthen NATO's ability to prevent war. I cannot imagine that the United States and the other members of NATO would do nothing if the territorial integrity of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic were threatened—even if they were not a part of NATO. But by having them become members, we would bring into the democratic family a region that has hosted the century's bloodiest conflicts.

Furthermore, by formally extending NATO's territorial jurisdiction further east, the Alliance will be even better placed to prevent any security threat to all of its members. NATO's role has evolved from deterring an invasion of the West by the Soviet Union to preventing armed conflict on the continent of Europe, and admission of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic will augment this shift in mission.

Others will argue that NATO expansion will cause problems in relations with Russia; that expansion undercuts efforts to build democracy in Russia; that we are still treating Russia as a Cold War adversary, instead of a nation building a democracy and a free-market economy or that expansion will anger Russia at a time when we need to work together on issues such as Iraq and the danger of weapons proliferation. Mr. President, I do not agree with these arguments.

Even if NATO had never promised to expand, the United States and Russia would continue to have international policy differences. There is also no evidence that the prospect of NATO expansion has hurt efforts to ratify arms control treaties or to address concerns over the need to control nuclear weapons of all varieties.

I also do not believe that enlargement will harm efforts to build a secure and strong democracy across the 11 time zones of Russia. The stability an enlarged NATO will bring to Eastern Europe will provide a more secure environment in which democracy's roots can grow stronger. NATO is furthermore not building a military force which can threaten Russia, as demonstrated by its intention not to station either nuclear weapons or substantial forces in the territories of the new members.

Finally, the United States and NATO have worked hard to address Russian concerns over expansion through the Founding Act and the creation of the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council. The Permanent Joint Council allows NATO and Russia to talk directly about ways to promote and enhance Europe's security. It offers a means to discuss matters of concern to either or both parties. If Russia chooses to work with the Permanent Joint Council in a cooperative manner, then this Council can help take NATO-Russia relations to a level of cooperation that benefits all of Europe. The Permanent Joint Council, however, will never substitute for or supersede any NATO policy making organs. Russia does not have a veto over NATO actions and must never be allowed to obtain one.

It is not possible for NATO to remain static and at the same time effective in the post-Cold War environment of Europe. NATO is, and must remain a military alliance that will guarantee the security of its members. However, it does face a different set of challenges as the 21st century approaches. Because the threat to NATO's territorial integrity today is significantly diminished, the Alliance has the opportunity to vanquish the dangers posed by unbridled nationalism and great power policies and to replace them with free-

market democracies that can grow and prosper.

Mr. President, when Secretary of State Madeleine Albright testified before the Foreign Relations Committee, she quoted an individual who appreciates what freedom means and that is not to be taken for granted. Czech President Vaclav Havel stated that ''Even the costliest preventive security is cheaper than the cheapest war.''

By admitting the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, NATO will be taking a giant step toward insuring that the freedoms won by Eastern and Central Europe at the end of this century will survive and prosper in the next. By expanding NATO, the West will ensure that the freedoms it preserved through the darkest days of World War II and the Communist threat of the 20th century will survive and prosper through the millennium.

In conclusion, NATO enlargement will enhance our national security and the stability of Europe. As my former Senate colleague and current Defense Secretary Bill Cohen stated, ''a stable Europe is necessary to anchor America's worldwide presence.''

The addition of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to NATO will mean a stronger NATO, and our approval of this enlargement will show that the United States is ready to do so in the 21st Century what it did for the latter half of this one: be a force, with other democracies, for the protection of freedom today and for the generations to come.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALCOHOL AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, as April draws to a close this week I want to remind my colleagues of Alcohol Awareness Month. I think the tireless efforts of many types of groups have raised our awareness about alcohol consumption. This includes efforts made by federal and state governments, citizen action groups, and the beverage alcohol industry itself. More than ever, Americans deplore the devastation of drunk driving. More than ever, Americans understand the consequences of failing to deal responsibly with alcoholic beverages.

Americans also need to understand that alcohol is alcohol. A standard serving of beer, wine, and distilled spirits contain the same amount of alcohol. Some fear that teaching alcohol equivalence would be paramount to promoting alcohol consumption. But I think it can actually have the opposite effect, promoting a rational approach to this topic and encouraging moderation The U.S. Departments of Health and Human Services, Transportation, Agriculture, and Education, as well as the Dietary Guidelines for Americans all define a drink as 12 ounces of beer, 5 ounces of wine, and 1.5 ounces of distilled spirits. And the federal government is not alone is recognizing alcohol equivalence. Many leading organizations involved in this debate do as well.

Yet as recently as 1996, one survey found that only 39% of Americans understand that a 12 ounce can of beer, a 5 ounce glass of wine, and a mixed drink with 1.5 ounces of distilled spirits contain the same amount of alcohol. We owe it to Americans to do a better job of disseminating this information and providing basic facts on this topic. In recognition of Alcohol Awareness Month, it is the very least we can do.

WE THE PEOPLE—THE CITIZEN AND THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, on May 2–4, while their friends are celebrating the 124th running of the Kentucky Derby, some students from my home state will be answering questions about the Constitution, here in Washington, in a mock Congressional hearing. These students will be competing in the national finals of the We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution program. I am proud to announce that the class from Louisville Male High School will represent Kentucky. These young people have worked long and hard to reach the national finals, winning local competitions to get here.

I would like to recognize these students for their achievements. The members of this class representing Kentucky are Angela Adams, Perry Bacon, Katherine Breeding, Will Carle, Eric Coatley, Courtney Coffee, Brian Davis, Mary Fleming, Matt Gilbert, Amanda Holloway, Holly Jessie, Heath Lambert, Gwen Malone, Kristy Martin, Brian Palmer, Lauren Reynolds, Shane Skoner, LaVonda Willis, Bryan Wilson, Darreisha Wilson, Beth Wilson, Janelle Winfree, Treva Winlock, and Jodie Zeller.

I would also like to recognize their teacher, Mrs. Sandy Hoover, who clearly deserves a lot of the credit for the class' success. The district coordinator, Dianne Meredith, and the state coordinators, Deborah Williamson and Jennifer Van Hoose, also contributed their time and effort to help the class reach the national finals.

The We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution program is the most extensive educational program in the country developed specifically to educate young people about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The three-day national competition simulates a congressional hearing. Students are given the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge while they evaluate, take, and defend positions on relevant historical and contemporary constitutional issues. The simulated congressional hearing consists of oral presentation by the students before panels of adult judges.

The We the People . . . program is run by the Center for Civic Education. The program has provided teaching materials to upper elementary, middle, and high schools for more than 75,000 teachers and 24 million students across the nation. Members of Congress and staff also contribute by discussing current constitutional issues with program participants.

This special program is designed to help students understand and appreciate the values and principles that unite us as Americans. The program also promotes the notion of citizenship—that the rights and benefits are tempered by the responsibilities of participation in effective government.

I wish these young people the best of luck testing their constitutional knowledge in the upcoming national finals of the We the People . . . program. I also congratulate them on reaching this level of competition.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, April 27, 1998, the federal debt stood at $5,507,607,026,200.10 (Five trillion, five hundred seven billion, six hundred seven million, twenty-six thousand, two hundred dollars and ten cents).

Five years ago, April 27, 1993, the federal debt stood at $4,234,899,000,000 (Four trillion, two hundred thirty-four billion, eight hundred ninety-nine million).

Ten years ago, April 27, 1988, the federal debt stood at $2,500,616,000,000 (Two trillion, five hundred billion, six hundred sixteen million).

Fifteen years ago, April 27, 1983, the federal debt stood at $1,247,506,000,000 (One trillion, two hundred forty-seven billion, five hundred six million).

Twenty-five years ago, April 27, 1973, the federal debt stood at $456,773,000,000 (Four hundred fifty-six billion, seven hundred seventy-three million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,050,834,026,200.10 (Five trillion, fifty billion, eight hundred thirty-four million, twenty-six thousand, two hundred dollars and ten cents) during the past 25 years.

THE MURDER OF BISHOP JUAN JOSE GERARDI

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in one of the most outrageous, cold-blooded killings I can recall in a region where such despicable acts have been commonplace, Guatemalan Bishop Juan Jose Gerardi was murdered this past Sunday when his assailant crushed his skull with a cement block.

The way he died is horrifying enough. But what senators should also be aware of is that Bishop Gerardi had just completed an extraordinarily courageous investigation of the thousands of atrocities committed against Guatemala

citizens during thirty years of civil war. He undertook his inquiry after it became clear that the Guatemalan Clarification Commission would not seek to identify those responsible for even the worst atrocities. Bishop Gerardi's investigation, not surprisingly, attributed the overwhelming majority of human rights violations to the military and the death squads and paramilitary groups allied with them.

Mr. President, the United States bears more than a little responsibility for the slaughter in Guatemala that devastated that country in the years after the CIA-backed coup of 1954. Our government trained the Guatemalan armed forces, remained silent when they tortured and killed thousands of innocent people, withheld information about the atrocities, and justified our complicity as the necessary response to a guerrilla insurgency. In fact, during this period of political violence which is apparently not yet over, the principal victims were Guatemala's Mayan population of rural peasants who have been the target of discrimination and injustice for generations.

According to a statement by the Guatemalan Embassy, the Guatemalan Government ''condemns and repudiates'' this crime and has opened an investigation. Let us hope that this investigation can withstand the inevitable pressure from the forces who would intimidate anyone who seeks real justice in Guatemala. The Arzu Government deserves considerable credit for bringing the peace negotiations to a successful conclusion. But few weeks pass that I do not receive a report of a political crime in Guatemala, most of which go unsolved. Justice remains elusive for those who need it most.

How the Guatemalan government handles this investigation will either embolden or deter those who seek to undermine the peace accords, and, as the Ranking Member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee I can say that as far as I am concerned it will also be important in determining our future assistance relationship with Guatemala.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Office laid before the Senate message from the President of the United States submitting one treaty and sundry nominations which were referred to Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:40 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276h, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group: Mr. KOLBE, Chairman and Mr. GILMAN, Vice Chairman.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provision of 22 U.S.C. 276h, the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group: Mr. HOUGHTON, Chairman.

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 Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. REED, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. SPECTER):

S. 1993. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the formula used to determine costs limits for home health agencies under medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. SANTORUM):

S. 1994. A bill to assist States in providing individuals a credit against State income taxes or a comparable benefit for contributions to charitable organizations working to prevent or reduce poverty and to protect and encourage donations to charitable organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. COATS, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. SANTORUM):

S. 1995. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the designation of renewal communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. COATS, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

S. 1996. A bill to provide flexibility to certain local educational agencies that develop voluntary public and private parental choice programs under title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. FAIRCLOTH):

S. 1997. A bill to protect the right of a member of a health maintenance organization to receive continuing care at a facility selected by that member; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 1998. A bill to authorize an interpretive center and related visitor facilities within the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. ASHCROFT, and Mr. MACK):

S. 1999. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the marriage penalty by providing that the income tax rate bracket amounts, and the amount of the standard deduction, for joint returns shall be twice the amounts applicable to unmarried individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. REED, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr, DASCHLE, and Mr. SPECTER):

S. 1993. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the formula used to determine costs limits for home health agencies under medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE MEDICARE HOME HEALTH EQUITY ACT OF 1998

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, America's home health agencies provide invaluable services that have enabled a growing number of our most frail and vulnerable senior citizens to avoid hospitals and nursing homes and stay just where they want to be—in their own homes. Today, home health is the fastest growing component of Medicare spending, and the program grew at an astounding average annual rate of more than 25 percent from 1990 to 1997. As a consequence, the number of Medicare home health beneficiaries has more than doubled, and Medicare home health spending has soared from $2.7 billion in 1989 to $17.1 billion in 1996.

This rapid growth in home health spending understandably prompted Congress and the Health Care Financing Administration, as part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, to initiate changes that were intended to make the program more cost-effective and efficient and protect it from fraud and abuse. However, in trying to get a handle on costs, we in Congress and the administration have unintentionally created problems that may restrict some elderly citizens' access to vitally needed home health care.

Critics have long pointed out that Medicare's cost-based payment method for home health care has inherent incentives for home care agencies to provide more services, which has driven up costs. Therefore, the Balanced Budget Act called for the implementation of a prospective payment system for home care by October 1, 1999. Until then, home health agencies will be paid according to what is known as an Interim Payment System.

Under the new IPS, home health agencies will be paid the lesser of: their actual costs; a per-visit cost limit; or a new blended agency-specific per beneficiary annual limit based 75 percent on an agency's own costs per beneficiary and 25 percent on the average cost per beneficiary for agencies in the same region. These costs are to be calculated from cost reports for reporting periods ending in 1994.

I spent some time going over the formula because it is important to understand what the importance of that very

complicated formula is for many of our home health agencies.

At a recent hearing of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, on which I serve, we heard testimony from a number of witnesses who expressed concern that the new Interim Payment System inadvertently penalizes cost-efficient home health agencies by basing 75 percent of the agencies' per patient payment limits on their FY 1994 average cost per patient. This system effectively rewards agencies that provided the most visits and spent the most Medicare dollars in 1994, while it penalizes low-cost, more efficient providers. Let me repeat that point, Mr. President. The agencies, usually the nonprofits, that have provided services at the lowest cost, are penalized by the new payment system.

Home health agencies in the Northeast are among those that have been particularly hard-hit by the formula change. As the Wall Street Journal recently observed,

> If New England had been just a little greedier, its home-health industry would be a lot better off now . . . Ironically, . . . [the region] is getting clobbered by the system because of its tradition of non-profit community service and efficiency.

Moreover, there is no logic to the variance in payment levels. As the same article goes on to point out, the average patient cap in Tennessee is expected to be $2,200 higher than Connecticut's, and the cap for Mississippi is expected to be $2,000 more than Maine's, without any evidence that patients in the Southern states are sicker or that nurses and other home health personnel in this region cost more. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this article be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this system also gives a competitive advantage to high-cost agencies over their lower cost neighbors, since agencies in a particular region may have dramatically different reimbursement levels regardless of any differences among their patient populations. And finally, this system may force low-cost agencies to stop accepting patients with more serious health care needs.

That is exactly the opposite of what we should want. I simply do not think that this is what Congress intended. To rectify this problem, today I am pleased to introduce legislation along with Senators CHAFEE, JEFFORDS, LEAHY, FEINGOLD, SNOWE, DURBIN, HARKIN, REED and SANTORUM. The Medicare Home Health Equity Act will level the playing field and make certain that home health agencies that have been prudent in their use of Medicare resources are not unfairly penalized. The legislation will also ensure that home health agencies in the same region are reimbursed similarly for treating similar patients.

Instead of allowing the experience of high-cost agencies to serve as the basis for the new cost limits, the bill we are introducing today sets a new per beneficiary cost limit based on a blend of national and regional average costs per patient. This new formula will be based 75 percent on the national average cost per patient and 25 percent on the regional average cost per patient. Moreover, by eliminating the agency-specific data from the formula, the Medicare Home Health Equity Act will move us more quickly to the national and regional rates which will be the cornerstones of the future prospective payment system, and it will do so in a way that is budget neutral. This is a matter of common sense and fairness. It is also a matter of ensuring that there is a fair system for reimbursing these vitally needed home health agencies that are providing services that are so important to so many of our senior citizens. I urge all of my colleagues to join as cosponsors of the Medicare Home Health Equity Act, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill as well as a section by section summary be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the items were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1993

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 ''Medicare Home Health Equity Act of 1998''.

SEC. 2. REVISION OF HOME HEALTH INTERIM PAYMENT FORMULA.

(a) RESTORATION OF COST LIMITS.—Section 1861(v)(1)(L)(i)(IV) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(v)(1)(L)(i)(IV)) (as added by section 4602 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997) is amended—

(1) by striking ''105 percent'' and inserting ''112 percent''; and

(2) by striking ''median'' and inserting ''mean''.

(b) CHANGE IN ADDITIONS TO COST LIMITS.—Section 1861(v)(1)(L)(v) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(v)(1)(L)(v)) (as added by section 4602 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997) is amended to read as follows:

''(v)(I) For services furnished by home health agencies for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 1997, the Secretary shall provide for an interim system of limits. Payment shall not exceed the costs determined under the preceding provisions of this subparagraph or, if lower, the product of—

''(aa) an agency-specific per beneficiary annual limitation calculated based 75 percent on the reasonable costs (including nonroutine medical supplies) of the standardized national average cost per patient in calendar year 1994, or best estimate thereof, (as published in the Health Care Financing Review Medicare and Medicaid 1997 Statistical Supplement) and based 25 percent on the reasonable costs (including nonroutine medical supplies) of the standardized regional average cost per patient for the agency's census division in calendar year 1995 (as so published), such national and regional costs updated by the home health market basket index and adjusted pursuant to clause (II); and

''(bb) the agency's unduplicated census count of patients (entitled to benefits under this title) for the cost reporting period subject to the limitation.

''(II) The labor-related portion of the updated national and regional costs described in subclause (I)(aa) shall be adjusted by the area wage index applicable under section 1886(d)(3)(E) for the area in which the agency is located (as determined without regard to any reclassification of the area under section 1886(d)(8)(B) or a decision of the Medicare Geographic Classification Review Board or the Secretary under section 1886(d)(10) for cost reporting periods beginning after October 1, 1995).''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1861(v)(1)(L)(vi) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(v)(1)(L)(vi)) (as added by section 4602 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997) is amended to read as follows:

''(vi) In any case in which the Secretary determines that beneficiaries use services furnished by more than 1 home health agency for purposes of circumventing the per beneficiary annual limitation in clause (v), the per beneficiary limitations shall be prorated among the agencies.''.

(2) Section 1861(v)(1)(L)(vii)(I) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(v)(1)(L)(vii)(I)) (as added by section 4602 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997) is amended by striking ''clause (v)(I)'' and inserting ''clause (v)(I)(aa)''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply as if included in the enactment of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

SEC. 3. CBO ESTIMATE OF HOME HEALTH PAYMENT SAVINGS.

(a) ESTIMATE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the prospective payment system for home health agencies established by section 1895 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395fff) is in effect, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office (referred to in this section as the ''Director'') shall estimate the amount of savings to the medicare program under title XVIII of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) resulting from the interim payment system for home health services established by the amendments to section 1861 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x) made by section 4602 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—If the Director determines that the amount estimated under subsection (a) exceeds the amount of savings to the medicare program that the Director estimated immediately prior to the enactment of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 by reason of such interim payment system, then the Director shall certify such excess to the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this subsection as the ''Secretary'').

(c) ADJUSTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Director certifies an amount to the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b), the Secretary shall prescribe rules under which appropriate adjustments are made to the amount of payments to home health agencies otherwise made under subparagraph (L) of section 1861(v)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(v)(1)(L)) (as amended by section 4602 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997) in the case of outliers—

(A) where events beyond the home health agency's control or extraordinary circumstances, including the case mix of such agency, create reasonable costs for a payment year which exceed the applicable payment limits; or

(B) in any case not described in subparagraph (A) where the Secretary deems such an adjustment appropriate.

(2) AMOUNT.—The total amount of adjustments made under paragraph (2) for a year may not exceed the amount certified to the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b) for such year. To the extent that such adjustments in

a year would otherwise exceed the amount certified to the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b) for such year, the Secretary shall reduce the payments to home health agencies in a pro rata manner so that the adjustments do not exceed such amount.

MEDICARE HOME HEALTH EQUITY ACT—SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

CURRENT LAW

The cost-based payment method that has historically been used for Medicare home health services has inherent incentives for home care agencies to provide a higher volume of services. Therefore, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA) called for the implementation of a prospective payment system (PPS) for home care by October 1, 1999. In the interim (FYs 1998 and 1999), home health agencies will be paid according to an Interim Payment System (IPS) established by the BBA.

The IPS reimburses home health agencies using the lowest of three cost limits: 1) an agency's actual costs; 2) a per visit cost limit applied to each skilled nursing, physical therapy, or other type of home health visit provided; or 3) an agency-specific aggregate per patient cost limit that is based 75 percent on an agency's average cost per patient in 1994 and 25 percent on a regional average cost per patient in 1994.

The Interim Payment System penalizes cost-efficient home health agencies by basing 75 percent of the agencies' per patient payment limits on their FY 1994 average cost per patient. Giving such a heavy weight to the agency-specific costs per beneficiary effectively rewards agencies that provided the most visits and spent the most Medicare dollars in 1994, while it penalizes low-cost, more efficient providers. As a result, high-cost and inefficient agencies will continue to receive a disproportionate share of Medicare home health dollars.

THE MEDICARE HOME HEALTH EQUITY ACT

Formula change for setting per beneficiary cost limits

The Medicare Home Health Equity Act will level the playing field and make certain that those home health agencies that have been prudent in their use of Medicare resources are not unfairly penalized. Moreover, it will ensure that home health agencies in the same region are reimbursed similarly for treating similar patients. Instead of allowing the experience of high cost agencies to serve as the basis for the cost limits, the bill sets a new per beneficiary cost limit based on a blend of national and regional average costs per patient. This new formula would be based 75 percent on the national average cost per patient in calendar year 1994 ($3,987) and 25 percent on the regional average cost per patient in calendar year 1995.

Restoration of the per-visit cost limit to 112 percent of the national mean

The per visit cost limits essentially place a cap on the amount of costs that can be reimbursed by Medicare for each home health care visit provided. The BBA reduced these cost limits from 112 percent of the mean to 105 percent of the median. This was done to provide additional savings. However, most of the BBA savings (at least 80 percent) came from the per-beneficiary cost limits. According to Price-Waterhouse, changing the formula from an agency-specific to a national/regional average cost per patient blend achieves an additional $5.5 billion in savings. The Medicare Home Health Equity Act of 1998 uses these savings to restore the per-visit cost limit to 112 percent of the national mean.

Most analysts agree that the growth in Medicare home health expenditures is due to the high number of visits provided to patients, not by the cost per visit. In fact, the cost per visit has remained relatively stable in recent years, and CBO confirms that controlling use, not price, is the key to Medicare home health cost containment. It is appropriate to use the savings achieved by rewarding rather than penalizing cost-efficient agencies to re-establish the cost limits that enabled many of those agencies to provide more efficient care over the entire episode of care. The average cost per visit tends to be higher for lower-overall cost, non-profit HHAs which tend to provide care in fewer visits. By keeping visits to the number that are medically necessary, costs per visit may increase slightly, but overall costs per patient decrease.

Modifies Application of Proration of Per Beneficiary Limits Provision

The BBA contained a provision which requires proration of the per beneficiary annual limit where the patient is served by more than one home health agency. The Medicare Home Health Equity Act modifies this provision to clarify that proration only applies where it can be demonstrated that a home health agency is attempting to circumvent the limits by shifting care between agencies.

Establishes an Outlier Provision

The bill instructs the Secretary of HHS to prescribe rules under which adjustments can be made in payments to home health agencies that are ''outliers'' where events beyond their control or extraordinary circumstances, including their case mix, create ''reasonable costs'' that exceed what otherwise would be their payment limits. This is included so that there is some provision for higher payments for home health agencies that treat the sickest Medicare home care patients and does so in a way that is budget neutral.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

REGION'S HOME-CARE FIRMS FACE BEING PUNISHED FOR THEIR EFFICIENCY

(By Carol Gentry)

If New England had been just a little greedier, its home-health industry would be a lot better off now.

In a rush to cut Medicare spending, Congress has set up a home-health payment system that punishes low-cost agencies and states, while it rewards big spenders and regions where audits have found widespread fraud and abuse. Ironically, New England is getting clobbered by the system because of its tradition of non-profit community service and efficiency.

And patients are feeling the effects. In the past two weeks, about 30 complaints have come into the Boston office of the federal agency that must implement the change, the Health Care Financing Administration. The agency says the complaints are coming from patients who need frequent, long-term nursing visits, but say they are being turned away or cut off.

''I fear we're now looking at home health agencies dumping (expensive) patients,'' says Margaret Leoni-Lugo, chief of the HCFA quality-improvement branch for New England. Such discrimination violates state and federal regulations.

Ms. Leoni-Lugo says she sympathizes with the difficult situation confronting New England agencies, but cannot condone patient dumping. Today she is expected to hold a telephone conference with health-department officials in the six New England states, warning them to watch for evidence that agencies are cutting care too much.

''We want to keep the beneficiaries safe,'' says Ms. Leoni-Lugo.

THE NEW FORMULA

The new system rolls back payments to 1993–94 levels minus 2%, regardless of whether an agency's budget was low or grossly inflated during those years. Under the system, home-health agencies' Medicare payments will be affected not only by their own budget history, but also by their location. If a company is in a penny-pinching region, its payments will be lower than if it comes from an area of big spenders. The agencies that come out best under this formula are those that spent money willy-nilly five years ago and were surrounded by companies that did the same thing. The biggest winners will be states in the South.

Meanwhile, frugal agencies in regions with moderate costs—especially New England, the Midwest and the Mountain states—are reeling. Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine will be among the hardest-hit states in the nation. Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island fare only marginally better.

Advocates for the elderly and the region's home-health agencies say such a system gives a competitive advantage to the worst players in the industry. ''This is not in the best interest of taxpayers,'' says Susan Young, executive director of the Home Care Association of New Hampshire.

Adds Margaret Gilmour, president and chief executive officer of Home Health & Hospice Care, a home-care agency in Nashua, N.H.: ''This is going to be a tidal wave of disaster for elder care.''

Layoffs are already under way in New Hampshire, Ms. Young says, where the industry is among the leanest in the nation.

The congressional delegation from Massachusetts hopes to derail the new system before it can do massive damage. ''This defies common sense.'' says Rep. James P. McGovern, a Democrat from Worcester. ''This is a big, fat mistake.''

TAKING CARE OF THE HOMEBOUND

In late November, Rep. McGovern and 11 other members of the state's congressional delegation sent a letter of concern to HCFA. The group hopes to meet with top agency officials in Washington soon.

Home-health agencies send nurses, aides, and physical and speech therapists to the homes of patients who are so physically or mentally disabled that they cannot easily go or be taken to a medical clinic.

While most private insurers and health-maintenance organizations cover home health care, the main money pipeline is Medicare. All homebound elderly and disabled beneficiaries of the program are eligible for free unlimited visits, as long as the visits are part of a treatment plan that is authorized by a physician and is updated every two months.

There are several types of home-health agencies, including the community-based nonprofits, such as the Visiting Nurses Associations of America; the newer for-profit companies; and hospital-affiliated agencies. Medicare's costs have been higher for patients who go through one of the hospital or for-profit companies.

Hospital-affiliated agencies tend to have higher per-visit costs than independent ones because they can legally transfer some of the hospital's overhead to the home-health books and have Medicare pay for it. For-profit agencies tend to generate higher Medicare payments by billing for a greater number of visits per patient.

Patients recuperating from surgery or a short-term illness may need only a few visits, but home-health agencies are a lifeline for patients with long-term conditions—multiple sclerosis. Alzheimer's disease, heart failure, severe diabetes—who are trying to stay out of nursing homes.

The new system sets an annual limit on the amount that Medicare will spend on any given patient. While that cap is different for every agency, it averages out to 75 visits a year in Massachusetts. Patient advocates say this gives agencies an incentive to take only those clients who are going to get better or die in a short time.

To make matters worse, agencies must reduce expenses without knowing just how deep the cuts will be. The details of the payments formula won't be determined until April 1, but will be retroactive to Oct. 1.

SEEKING FORMULA CHANGE

In the letter to HCFA, the Massachusetts delegation asked administrators to alter the new formula to ''lessen the blow'' to low-cost, efficient home-health agencies. The letter says it is unfair to tag payments to a 1994 average per-patient cost of $4,328 in Massachusetts, when Tennessee was getting $6,508 and Louisiana $6,700.

Rep. McGovern says he hopes to repeal the payment-system provision when Congress convenes later this month, but he knows that may not be easy. Many of the leaders of Congress are from the South, where payment rates are projected to be double those in much of New England.

Massachusetts has a lot at stake. In 1995, the last year for which Medicare has complete data, the program spent more than $1 billion in New England to provide home health to 246,000 beneficiaries. Of that money, Massachusetts absorbed more than half for 119,000 homebound patients. More than 14% of the state's Medicare beneficiaries were served by home care, while the rate was about 10% nationwide.

Under the new payment system, members of the Massachusetts delegation say, their state stands to lose $95 million and at least 1.5 million patient visits in the first year.

Why will the system affect Massachusetts so much? The state's home-health agencies deliver care at a more moderate cost per visit than most other states, federal data show, but also perform more visits per patient, on average. Pat Kelleher. executive director of the Home Health Care Association of Massachusetts, says one reason is that the state has deliberately pushed home care to save state tax money. Federally paid Medicare home-health visits keep patients out of nursing homes, which draw most of their revenue from the state Medicaid program.

ROUGH TIME AHEAD FOR VERMONT

If the other New England states affected, Vermont, the only state that legally requires home-health companies to be non-profit, especially faces troubled times. After consistently providing home care at the lowest cost per patient in the nation. Vermont's 13 agencies stand to lose more than $2 million this year and estimate they will have to reduce service by 10%.

The Vermont Assembly of Home Health Agencies estimates the average per person payments in the state this year will be $2,600 a year, less than half what they payout is expected to be in, say, Alabama.

''The system was supposed to limit the high rollers'' says the association's director, Peter Cobb but instead ''Congress rewarded excess.''

The rule changes stem from the passage last August of the Balanced Budget Act, which cuts $115 billion from Medicare by 2002. The home-care portion of the act slices $16.2 billion from the budget.

Home care seemed a logical place to look for cuts, since it's the fastest-growing segment of the health industry. Between 1990 and 1995, while the number of Medicare beneficiaries rose 10%, the number of home-health visits grew 255% and spending went up 316%.

Some of that increase accompanied the rise of managed-care companies that try to keep patients out of the hospital to save money and, if they must go, keep the visits as brief as possible. However, much of the inflation in home care was a predictable response to a payment system that offered no incentive to be frugal.

PROBE FINDS WASTE, FRAUD

Massive fraud, waste and ineptitude in Medicare billings were reported last summer by the Office of the Inspector General of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services following a two-year investigation called Operation Restore Trust. The study covered five states that account for 40% of Medicare payments: California, New York, Florida, Texas and Illinois.

The report said one-fourth of home-health agencies in those states received nearly half the Medicare dollars spent on home-health care. According to the report, the ''problem'' agencies tended to be for-profit, closely held corporations with owners that were involved in a tangle of interlocking, self-referring businesses. Texas was cited as the biggest home-health spender of the states studied. (An HCFA audit conducted in Massachusetts and Connecticut last year found a few overpayments, but no cases of fraud.)

It just so happened that the revelations of Operation Restore Trust occurred at the same time that Congress was looking for ways to cut Medicare spending.

Congress wanted to change the home-health payment system so that it would reward efficiency, by switching to a flat rate by diagnosis. This ''prospective payment system'' would be similar to the one that Medicare uses to pay hospitals.

But HCFA said it needed more time to develop the complex formula to set prospective payment in motion. So Congress created an interim system that will run until Oct. 1, 1999. It freezes spending at the rates there were in place in 1993–94—before Operation Restore Trust began.

VARYING PAYMENTS

Now payments vary illogically. The average patient cap in Tennessee is expected to be $2,200 higher than that in Connecticut, and the cap for Mississippi $2,000 more than Maine, without any evidence that patients in the Southern states are sicker or that nurses cost more there.

But those who think the Southern states are pleased at getting a patient cap double that of New England are mistaken. Officials at the Texas Association for Home Care say they need bigger payment rates because they have a high rate of poor elderly who have never had proper health care, and the state Medicaid program hasn't taken care of them because it's stingy.

''Congress has cut into the bone,'' says Sara Speights, director of government and public relations for the Texas group.

Inequities exist even within the same region. Ms. Gilmour of the Nashua, N.H., home-care agency says a competitor in northern Massachusetts could end up with a payment cap twice as high as her own as a result of her staff's efforts to keep costs down. Because patients are free to choose either agency, she worries they will gravitate to the one that has a bigger budget.

Joan Hull, chief executive of the nearby competitor, the Home Health Visiting Nurses Association of Haverhill, Mass., says her agency is a product of a merger between agencies that had different payment rates, so she doesn't know whether the Medicare cap will be $3,400 or $4,600 per patient. Unfortunately for her agency, services it has delivered since the beginning of its fiscal year in October will be on the new payment rate, but the agency won't know what the rate is until April.

''It's crazy, isn't it?'' Ms. Hull says with a laugh.

YANKEE THRIFT

Home health agencies in the New England states have delivered care for less money than the national average, both in Medicare payments per visit and per patient. (Data shown here are from 1995.)

	No. of patients (in thousands)	Avg. payment per visit	Pct. above or below national avg.	Avg. payment per patient	Pct. above or below national avg.
Connecticut	57	$60	−30	$4,770	6.6
Massachusetts	119	50	−19.0	4,730	−5.7
Rhode Island	19	64	3.0	4,037	−9.7
Maine	22	53	−15.0	3,717	−16.9
New Hampshire	17	50	−19.0	3.057	−31.7
Vermont	12	45	−28.0	3,030	−32.3
New England	246	53	−15.0	4,400	−1.6
U.S.	3,430	62	.....	4,473	.....

Sources: Health Care Financing Administration and The Wall Street Journal

BIG SPENDERS

While Medicare costs for home health services have gone up nationwide, Sunbelt states led the spending spree. The new payment system rewards states where payments were far above average, as shown below (Data are for 1995.)

	No. of visits per patient	Avg. payment per patient	Pct. above national avg.
Louisiana	144	$7,867	75.9
Oklahoma	127	7,358	64.5
Texas	117	7,217	61.3
Tennessee	121	6,886	53.9
Utah	106	6,283	40.5
Mississippi	128	6,205	38.7
THE SOUTH	95	5,488	22.7
U.S.	72	4,473	.....

Sources: Health Care Financing Administration and The Wall Street Journal

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues, Senators COLLINS, CHAFEE, JEFFORDS, LEAHY, REID and others in introducing the Home Health Medical Equity Act of 1998. I especially want to compliment the Senator from Maine, who has taken the lead on this issue. It is a matter of enormous concern in her State and also in mine. I think it is worth taking a moment just to acknowledge how useful the Senate Aging Committee is, to be able to highlight an issue like this. I wonder whether this issue would have gotten the attention it deserves had it not been for that forum, where we were able to have an excellent hearing and hear from Senators all over the country whose States are very negatively affected by the rules that were put into place. I congratulate the Senator from Maine for taking the initiative out of that hearing to introduce legislation.

This legislation is a crucial step in ensuring that the Medicare Home Health Care program's Interim Payment System does not penalize regions of the country that have been providing home health services efficiently.

Mr. President, I have been working to promote the availability of home care and other long-term care options for my entire public life because I believe strongly in the importance of enabling people to stay in their own homes. For seniors who are homebound and have skilled nursing needs, having access to home health services through

the Medicare program is the difference between staying in their own home and being moved into a nursing facility. Home care offers feelings of security, dignity and hope. Where there is a choice, we should do our best to allow patients to choose home health care.

Mr. President, I recognize that there are situations when one's ability to conduct the activities of daily living are so limited, and the medical needs are so great, that the patient would be better served, in some cases, in a skilled nursing facility. I also want to recognize that my State of Wisconsin has a very, very good network of caring and high-quality nursing homes. Without a doubt, there is a need for these services. But, Mr. President, as I travel throughout Wisconsin's 72 counties every year, what seniors tell me again and again is that, to the extent possible, and as long as it is medically appropriate for them to do so, they would like to remain in their own homes. I think seniors need and deserve that choice.

Mr. President, seniors clearly prefer to remain in their own homes rather than be moved to a nursing home. Their medical needs can often be met through home health services. Despite these facts, the implementation of the Medicare Home Health Interim Payment System as passed in last year's budget could create serious access problems for seniors in States like Wisconsin and Maine when they seek the home health benefit. The cuts to the Medicare Home Health program imposed by the Interim Payment System are so severe that home health agencies will have no choice but to reduce dramatically the amount of services provided. Some home care agencies may get out of the home care business altogether. But, Mr. President, the real impact of the Interim Payment System will not be simply to reduce payments to home care providers and force some out of business, what it will really do and what really concerns me is it will drastically reduce the options that homebound seniors now have today with respect to whether they will remain in their home in the community or whether they will be forced into a nursing home situation that is not necessarily the best place for them.

As of right now, Mr. President, the Interim Payment System for Medicare home health care is a system that pays agencies the lowest of the following three measures: (1) actual costs; (2) a per visit limit of 105% of the national median; or (3) a per beneficiary annual limit, derived from a blend of 75% an agency's costs and 25% regional costs. Now, these measures are pretty technical and I will not go into any more of the specifics about them. But suffice it to say that the net effect of the Interim Payment System will be to penalize severely agencies who have been operating efficiently all these years. Since the Interim Payment System will pay the agency the lowest of the three measures that I mentioned, agencies in areas where costs have been kept lower will be disproportionately and unfairly affected.

Mr. President, according to the Health Care Financing Administration, just in Wisconsin alone, there are currently 181 home health care agencies that participate in Medicare. Of these, two-thirds of them are operated as nonprofit entities. These nonprofit home health care providers are often county health departments and visiting nurse organizations; these are not entities out to make a fast buck on the backs of homebound seniors. According to administrators of Valley Visiting Nurse Association in Neenah, WI, the average, per patient Medicare home care cost in Wisconsin is $2,586, compared to $5,000 in other parts of the country. Let me repeat that, the statistics, because it is really quite striking. The average, per patient Medicare home care cost in Wisconsin is only $2,586, compared to often over $5,000 or more in other places in the country. These nonprofit providers in Wisconsin are already as lean as they can be. I am fairly convinced they don't have any ''fat'' to cut from their programs. The Visiting Nurse Association Home Health of Wausau showed me some figures demonstrating that, over the past 5 years, their services have averaged 30 percent below limits imposed by the Health Care Financing Administration, with 36 percent fewer visits per beneficiary than the national average.

Mr. President, the effect of the deep reductions imposed by the Interim Payment System will be, quite simply, a devastating blow to these types of agencies, and, in turn, will seriously impact the availability of home health care services to many people in Wisconsin. This devastating blow is dealt not because Wisconsin has been providing too many services too expensively. It is just to the contrary. States like Wisconsin and others are being penalized more precisely because they have always operated efficiently. Moreover, on a national level, with a reduced per-patient limit, home health agencies have a disincentive to take more seriously ill patients onto their rolls.

Mr. President, the legislation my colleagues and I introduce today will change the Interim Payment System to bring about greater payment equity for Medicare home health providers in different parts of the country. The bill, as the Senator from Maine outlined, would create a new formula for the per-patient limit that reflects a higher percentage of national data rather than relying solely on regional and local data. The change in payment calculation would enable high-efficiency, low-cost home health agencies to continue providing services efficiently and cost-effectively. But, Mr. President, the most important impact of the Medicare Home Health Equity Act will be to make sure that seniors who are homebound and have skilled nursing needs will retain for as long as possible the right to decide to stay in their own homes.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his cosponsorship of this important legislation and for his leadership in this issue.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am pleased to sponsor the Medicare Home Health Equity Act of 1998 with my distinguished colleague from Maine. I want to applaud Senator COLLINS' efforts to correct a provision in the Balanced Budget Act (BBA) of 1997 which has had the effect of penalizing those home health agencies that have taken the lead in becoming more cost-efficient over the last several years.

The Medicare Home Health Equity Act of 1998 will help avert the potentially devastating effect of the Interim Payment System (IPS), established by the Balanced Budget Act, on many home health agencies in Rhode Island, and throughout the country.

The IPS for Medicare home health services that was established by the BBA bases its reimbursement in large part on agency-specific costs during fiscal year 1994. Consequently, home health agencies that had already been implementing cost-efficient practices at that time, like many agencies in Rhode Island were doing, are now finding their reimbursements greatly reduced.

Home health agencies in my home state have told me that this decreased reimbursement, in addition to being unfair, might lead to reductions in critical health services that currently enable elderly patients to maintain their dignity and quality of life. These agencies also have pointed out that this interim payment system may well result in a loss of jobs in the home health industry.

I am greatly troubled by the thought that the IPS now in effect may well put into financial jeopardy those Rhode Island home health agencies that have been working diligently to heed our appeal to deliver cost-efficient services. The impact of this payment system on one of Rhode Island's most vulnerable populations, the infirm elderly, is unpredictable and potentially devastating.

The Medicare Home Health Equity Act of 1998 bases Medicare reimbursement for home health services primarily on national costs during the baseline year rather than agency-specific costs. Consequently, the most efficient home health agencies will not be placed at financial disadvantage. This is a matter of economic necessity—we will never be able to maintain the financial security of the Medicare program unless we encourage everyone involved in the system to help make it work.

This bill is budget-neutral and will not increase overall Medicare expenditures. The legislation is a big step forward in our goal of a cost-efficient and reliable health care system for our older citizens.

Mr. President, I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the

Medicare Home Health Equity Act of 1998.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, Vermont's home health agencies are a model of efficiency for the nation. For the past seven consecutive years, the average Medicare expenditure for home health care in Vermont has been the lowest in the nation. This efficiency was achieved by exclusive reliance on 13 nonprofit agencies which provide care without sacrificing quality, and which adhere strictly to Medicare requirements and guidelines. Today, I am cosponsoring The Medicare Home Health Equity Act of 1998, with my good friend Senator COLLINS, in order to preserve this high-quality, low-cost home health system from possible insolvency.

At this moment, Vermont is facing an unprecedented crisis in its home health care system. This is not a crisis of their own making, and the home health agencies had little, if any, advance warning that disaster was imminent. The crisis that befalls Vermont's home health care agencies, and many others throughout the country, arose from the decision made by Congress, as a part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA), to adopt a Medicare prospective payment system for home health care.

There is compelling rationale and general agreement for moving Medicare to a prospective payment system (PPS) in the home health care sector. Under a national, prospective payment system, low-cost agencies will fare well, as they have already learned how to manage their resources wisely. However, the interim system created by the BBA for the transition to a PPS is fundamentally flawed and rewards high-cost agencies. Under the Interim Payment System, reimbursement limits for home health care are heavily weighted toward an agency's historical costs. This means that until a prospective payment system can be designed and implemented, the lowest cost agencies will face the most significant caps on their Medicare payments.

Where a prospective payment system aims to level the playing field for agencies that care for similarly situated patients, the interim system preserves and reinforces significant disparities across agencies. Although high-cost agencies will face reductions in payments under the interim system, these will be the agencies in the best position to make those cuts. Low-cost agencies with budgets that are already lean have no place to turn. It would be a national tragedy if those low-cost agencies cannot survive the transition to a prospective system.

I commend the efforts of my good friend Senator COLLINS for bringing this bill forward. it was a difficult task to craft a remedy that allows committed and responsible home health agencies to survive and also maintain budget neutrality. The Medicare Home Health Equity Act of 1998 would alter the interim payment formula by basing payment caps on a blend of national and regional averages. In this way, we can move toward a more uniform level of reimbursement and allow home health care agencies in the same locale to operate under the same constraints. Furthermore, this legislation can be implemented quickly. This is important, because the regulations defining the interim payment system were not published until January of this year—nearly four months after the payment system was in force.

The situation is serious. We must provide relief to home health agencies and peace of mind to the clients who are under their care. Last August, I voted in support of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. I was proud of the changes we made to preserve Medicare benefits for the present and for future generations. Today, I urge my colleagues to enact The Medicare Home Health Equity Act of 1998 and correct the unintended consequences of the BBA's interim payment system reimbursement limits on low-cost home health agencies.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join today with my distinguished colleague, Senator SUSAN COLLINS, in the introduction of the ''Medicare Home Health Equity Act of 1998.'' This bill tries to fix what we believe to be an unintended injustice in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

As many of you know, home health agencies have historically been reimbursed on the basis of costs. The Health Care Financing Administration paid each agency to cover the cost of providing care. This arrangement has been widely criticized because of offers no incentive for agencies to control their costs.

In order to correct this, we in Congress agreed that Medicare should move to a prospective payment system to control costs and ensure quality and access to care. The Balanced Budget Act establishes this system for home health, effective as of October 1, 1999. In the mean time, an interim payment system has been put in place. These changes were needed in order to rein in the incredible growth—some due to inappropriate payments—in the industry in the last seven years. In 1990, Medicare spent $3.7 billion on home health care. In 1996, $16.7 billion was spent. In addition, the average number of visits per beneficiary soared from 26 in 1990 to 76 in 1996.

I believe the change to the prospective payment system had to be done. However, the interim payment system will reward high-cost, inefficient home health provides at the expense of those home health agencies that have historically kept their costs low. I don't believe this was the intent of Congress, and that is why I am cosponsoring Senator COLLINS' bill to correct this injustice.

As co-chair of the Senate Rural Health Caucus, I've been working for a long time to change the big city, urban bias in Medicare's reimbursement payments. It penalizes more conservative cost-effective approaches to health care, and that hurts rural areas like Iowa. We went a long way towards fixing that bias in Balanced Budget Act by equalizing Medicare's reimbursement payments for managed care services.

But unbeknownst to me and, I believe, most of my colleagues, while we provided rural equity in one area, we took it away in another. It is just common sense that we should reward those who provide quality care in a cost-effective, efficient manner. We did this when we changed the Medicare managed care rates. It doesn't seem right that in the same Act, we created an interim payment system for home health services that rewards the high cost, wasteful agencies and leaves those that have successfully kept their costs low struggling to survive.

The system's reliance on a provider's historical costs in determining their reimbursement amounts has produced an uneven playing field. Many of the newer agencies, who got started during a period of high growth, now have a competitive advantage. They will now be reimbursed at a higher rate than their lower cost competitors.

Senator COLLINS' bill does the right thing—it rewards those agencies who have done the most to save Medicare money. These include many visiting nurse associations, non-profit free standing agencies and most non-profit hospital based programs.

The Home Health Equity Act will revise the current system of reimbursement based on 75 percent of agency cost blended with 25 percent of national costs. The legislation would create a 75 percent national rate blended with 25 percent regional rate to level payments to providers in a given geographic area. In addition, this bill continues the cost savings that the interim payment system was intended to achieve. Price Waterhouse has analyzed the bill and found it to be budget neutral.

If we don't fix the interim payment system, I am afraid we risk a reduction in access to and quality of health care for Iowa seniors. Iowa home health care agencies have historically provided efficient, quality service and they ought to be rewarded, not punished for this. Most importantly, rural patients and their families deserve continued access to the best possible care.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today I join my colleagues in introducing the Medicare Home Health Equity Act of 1998.

The Balanced Budget Act (BBA) included numerous changes to Medicare that were necessary to extend the solvency of the trust fund and increase the program's integrity. It was extremely important legislation that I strongly supported, but there was no way to know the impact of every provision it included.

One provision of the BBA in particular, the interim payment system for

home health care, locks in place inequities between regions of the country, efficient and inefficient providers, and new and older agencies. I am concerned about the impact of that provision on my state of South Dakota.

In South Dakota, the interim payment system has raised significant concern. The interim payment system bases each agency's per patient cost limit largely on its per beneficiary cost in 1994. My concern is that South Dakota's cost per beneficiary and number of visits per patient were well below the national average in 1994. Many of the home health agencies in the state have expanded the geographic area they serve since 1994 and have added services that formerly were not available in the more rural parts of the state. Some of these agencies are the sole providers in our most rural counties.

I have heard from Hand County Home Health Agency which primarily serves women, age 85 and older, with little family nearby and with difficult health conditions. Since 1994, the Hand County Home Health Agency has kept its costs down, but has added new services such as physical therapy and has expanded the geographic area to serve areas that no other provider covers. The agency has told me that they have to consider discontinuing the new services they cover or decreasing the geographic area they serve. Neither of these options seems acceptable to me.

The interim payment system also creates problems between new and older agencies. In the same geographic area, where there is a new provider and an old agency, the new provider's limit will be based on the national median reimbursement. This results in significant discrepancies in reimbursement and ultimately the services that agencies can afford to deliver within the same area and market.

Ultimately the impact of this payment system falls on beneficiaries, and this must be foremost in our minds. Senator COLLINS' bill would go a long way to addressing the access, quality, and equity issues that have been raised by the interim payment system in South Dakota. I am pleased to join her in beginning the dialogue on this issue that I hope will lead to construction changes for home health care patients in South Dakota and across the nation.

By Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. SANTORUM):

S. 1994. A bill to assist States in providing individuals a credit against State income taxes or a comparable benefit for contributions to charitable organizations working to prevent or reduce poverty and to protect and encourage donations to charitable organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. COATS, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 1995. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the designation of renewal communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. COATS, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

S. 1996. A bill to provide flexibility to certain local educational agencies that develop voluntary public and private parental choice programs under title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

RENEWAL ALLIANCE LEGISLATION

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I am here today to announce, along with several Members—in fact, a coalition of 30 Republican Members from both the House and the Senate called the Renewal Alliance, which has been in business now for a considerable amount of time—more than a year—will be jointly introducing new initiatives to help restore hard-pressed urban neighborhoods of our country to reach out to families and communities and neighbors that are dealing with some of the most difficult and intractable social problems that affect our society.

This package, called REAL Life—renewal, empowerment, achievement, and learning for life—contains what we believe are essential elements to help bring improvements and restore hope to impoverished communities and to bring self-sufficiency to low-income individuals and families. REAL Life seeks to address the critical deficits facing neighborhoods and communities, families, those communities and neighborhoods who lie behind the gleaming skyscrapers, the neighborhoods where some of the most difficult problems in our society—homelessness, drug abuse, teen pregnancy, poverty, and violence—are found in some of the most complex and intractable forms in the neighborhoods, however, where groups of individuals and private community organizations and leaders are already at work defeating the poverty and dysfunction that have defied our well-intentioned and lavishly funded Federal efforts.

Before I begin to make specific comments about the legislation that we will be introducing, let me take a moment to read from a letter given to me by Light of Life Ministries, a rescue mission operating in Pittsburgh, PA. I think this letter communicates in a very compelling and clear way both the problems that we face today in our low-income areas and particularly in our cities—although these are no respecters of income or persons, but it seems that the problems are particularly acute in some of our urban areas—but also addresses some of the solutions that even today are within our grasp.

This letter is from a fellow named Benjamin Primis, a young man who, after a promising start in life, fell on hard times. He was a graphic artist working in the television industry, and he began using drugs and became addicted to crack cocaine. Soon he was homeless and desperate.

Benjamin writes:

> I found myself homeless in Pittsburgh. It seemed as though the world had turned its back on me. . . . When there was nowhere else to run, the Light of Life Ministry in Pittsburgh opened their doors of unconditional love. . . . Instantly I was comforted with three hot meals a day, clean linens, drug and alcohol therapy. . . . They fed me when I was hungry. They clothed me when I had nothing else to wear. [Most importantly,] they cared for me when I didn't care for myself.

Benjamin Primis's story is one of thousands, maybe tens of thousands, of stories of hope and restoration and healing that bring us together here on this floor, the Senate floor, this morning. Ben Primis was failed by both the dogmas and initiatives of Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals. A booming economy did not prevent his fall into poverty. And the Government safety net proved to be an illusion. Instead, Ben was rescued by one of the thousands of neighborhood-based, privately run, often faith-based religious charities that operate in poor neighborhoods across our country.

Let me give another example, Mr. President. For years, officials in the District of Columbia and Members of Congress have wrestled with the problem of violence in this city that has plagued this city. A lot of programs have been tried, and the police department has been strengthened and reorganized and redeployed on several occasions to almost no effect. It seemed that none of the often very expensive initiatives had any fruition.

Last year, a group of African American men called the Alliance of Concerned Men began brokering peace treaties among the gangs that inhabit, and frequently dominate, some of the city's public housing complexes. Benning Terrace in southeast Washington, known to the D.C. police department as perhaps the most dangerous area of the city, has not had a single murder since the Alliance's peace treaty went into effect early last year. This movement is now spreading across the city.

These are community healers who are saving lives where all other Government efforts have failed. I have met with these individuals. I have listened to their stories and some of the most remarkable stories of transformation of individual lives and reconciliation that anyone could ever encounter.

The Light of Life Mission in Pittsburgh, the Alliance of Concerned Men in Washington, DC, Gospel Rescue Mission of Washington, these are the kinds of organizations that the Renewal Alliance REAL Life initiative wants to place at the center of our Nation's welfare and social policies.

REAL Life is not a handout, it is an opportunity agenda for America's poor,

and it is concentrated on those who live on America's meanest streets. It does acknowledge a role for Government programs, but it makes that role one of a junior partner—not a CEO, not a director, but a junior partner, a junior partner with those organizations that, without Government help, without Government rules and regulations, are reaching out and actually bringing hope and bringing restoration to some of the most desperate situations that our country encounters. This whole array of community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, social institutions, help restore individual lives and rebuilds neighborhoods.

Finally, REAL Life is a vision that starts with a belief that real and lasting social reform begins among the families, the churches, the schools, the businesses, that are the heart and the soul of local communities.

We have three central components in REAL Life. We have a community renewal component, which I will talk a little bit more in a moment, which incorporates a State-based voluntary charity tax credit, charity donations protection, liability reform. We have an economic empowerment component, which incorporates a number of empowerment initiatives that have been discussed and talked about over the years. These will be discussed by other members of the Renewal Alliance. We have educational opportunity for low-income families. This real-life initiative by the Renewal Alliance has narrowed its scope to three essential components as a means of demonstrating the effectiveness of these initiatives.

Before I yield to other members of the Renewal Alliance—and I note that Senator ABRAHAM, a key member of our Alliance, is here and ready to speak—let me briefly discuss the community renewal portion of the package we are introducing today.

The REAL Life Community Renewal Act begins with the belief that social capital, the invisible elements of trust, cooperation, and mutual support that undergird communities life, have been severely damaged by 30 years of misguided Government programs. The traditional networks of community action and caring anchored in churches, schools, and volunteer programs have been displaced by Government programs. Too much money and too little wisdom have combined to wreak havoc in urban neighborhoods. We seek to repair that damage done by the Great Society by shifting authority and resources out of Government and into the private, religious, and voluntary groups that know the deepest needs of local neighborhoods. We achieve this through State-based charity tax credit.

We tap a wide range of existing Federal welfare block grants as a funding source for these charity tax credits. The credit is entirely voluntary. It builds up on efforts in the States to find innovative approaches for the delivery of welfare services. Already, Arizona and Pennsylvania and Indiana have either incorporated or are in the process of incorporating charity tax credits as a way to provide incentives for contributions to these organizations.

As I said, we also contain provisions which will strengthen charities through enhanced liability protections and also to prevent IRS actions against these organizations to allow them to better do their mission. Others here this morning will speak in greater detail about the economic empowerment and educational opportunities sessions of our proposal.

The bottom line is this: After 30 years of experiments with top-down Federal poverty strategies and an enormous expenditure of money, the returns are in. The Great Society approach, the Government-knows-all approach, the Government-can solve-all-your-problems approach, has failed. It has been a failure that has been widespread across this country. Many of the initiatives were well motivated, but the results are in. It is time now for us to look at a new approach, a new approach that makes local leadership, community-based institutions, and neighborhood center reform efforts the heart of our welfare strategy.

I trust that my colleagues will join us in this effort to bring real life to those in greatest need in our society. I could spend the day discussing and talking about initiatives that have taken place in communities across this country where individuals, inspired by nothing more than a dream or a vision, often severely and desperately underfunded, have opened their arms and opened their hearts and opened their doors to provide real support and real help for real people in need. They have done so in a remarkable way.

The Center for the Homeless in South Bend, IN, has combined the efforts of 300 churches spanning the spectrum of denominations and religions. They have utilized the services of the University of Notre Dame, the hospital community of St. Joseph County, and help from volunteers from all walks of life, and put together a model homeless shelter which has a six-part, 2-year strategy of taking homeless individuals and turning them into homeowners, restoring their lives, and, in the process, restoring neighborhoods and restoring communities. It is one of the most remarkably efficient and effective efforts that I have witnessed.

But the story is repeated all across the State of Indiana in initiative after initiative. The Matthew 25 clinic in Fort Wayne, IN, a combination of doctors, dentists, and nurses, on a volunteer basis, is reaching out and established a clinic, providing medical care and help to low-income individuals who are not insured and don't have opportunities for medical treatment in the normal course of things. They have made a remarkable difference in our community. It is not a Federal program; it has nothing to do with a Federal program; there are no Federal funds. It is voluntary efforts by the community of medical personnel in our city. Whether it is a maternity home, a home for girls, a spouse abuse shelter, any of a number of programs, they are duplicated and replicated in virtually every city in America. Yet, they are struggling, struggling because, as I said, after 30 years of Federal initiatives, their efforts have been almost overwhelmed by the well-intended, well-meaning, extraordinarily expensive, and incredibly low-result efforts of the Federal Government. It is this problem that we are trying to address.

This doesn't have to be a partisan issue. This is something Republicans and Democrats can come together on. I believe liberals, who have been well-motivated and well-intended, have seen the dismal results of their efforts and are looking for an alternative. And those conservatives who say, ''Let this sort itself out; after all, it is an issue of personal responsibility and there is nothing Government should be involved in,'' I think are ignoring the fact that some of these institutions that are so essential to helping in this process need support and need to be rebuilt.

This is not a new, massive Federal program, this is simply some startup initiatives to point the way and, hopefully, to encourage the support and development of these non-Government institutions.

My colleague from Michigan is on the floor, Senator ABRAHAM, who has been instrumental in helping to develop the REAL Life initiative. I am pleased to yield time to him to explain another component of this particular package.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to begin by thanking Senator COATS for the leadership he has provided. Even before there was such a thing as the Renewal Alliance, Senator COATS was, in a variety of contexts, bringing forth the arguments in the case that he has begun to present here today. I think the existence of his efforts and the various projects he has worked on was really the basis upon which a lot of us thought it made sense to begin working on a joint venture, the Renewal Alliance agenda that we are presenting today.

I would like to discuss a piece of legislation that has to do with an important part of the Renewal Alliance agenda. This is a bill which provides economic empowerment in economically distressed areas. It is part of an effort by a number of us who wish to bring about the revitalization of economically and socially distressed areas in our country, especially in our cities.

Traditional responses to persistent poverty have not been particularly effective. Frankly, even in the best of economic times, we find that certain parts of our communities still don't see significant change and feel that they are left behind—and indeed they are,

economically. On the other hand, at the other end of the spectrum there has been the Government solution approach that we have seen over the last several decades, more than $5 trillion in Government programs. Yet, we have seen very little change in the level of poverty in the country. The fact is that the debate that has occurred over the past 30 years between, on the one hand, the argument that all we need is a strong economy and, on the other hand, all we need are more Government programs, leaves us still short of the mark.

So what the Renewal Alliance has attempted to do is look beyond those traditional responses, believing that across America people have an abundance of desire to help the less fortunate to rebuild our cities and stop moral decay; also believing that too often the Federal Government impedes or fails to promote the community renewal that we need.

We must encourage families, churches, small businesses, and community organizations to take on the hard work of social renewal. How? By reducing Government barriers that are making it difficult for economically distressed areas to improve the quality and conditions of life there and, at the same time, providing incentives so that the culture and the private sector can assist the Government in achieving this objective. Yes, we do need a social safety net for the truly deserving, but that will never give people the opportunity to get out the economically distressed conditions they find themselves in. We must go further.

So what I would like to talk about specifically now is the economic empowerment component of the Renewal Alliance agenda. What we need are new approaches to our urban problems and problems of any community in the country that suffers from economic disadvantage because, as I say, despite the War on Poverty, our cities still face an array of problems.

Illegitimacy in our inner cities is at a record high level, in some areas exceeding 80 percent.

Harvard's Lee Rainwater estimates that by 2000, 40 percent of all American births will occur out of wedlock. And our cities are losing population, as well.

Since the mid-1960s, our largest 25 cities have lost approximately 4 million residents. Too often, the people left behind are the poor.

Half the people in our distressed inner cities lived below the poverty line in 1993.

To address this tragic situation, we propose the ''REAL Life Economic Empowerment Act.'' This legislation would target America's 100 poorest communities and offer pro-growth incentives to create jobs and spur entrepreneurship where it is needed most.

In order to become a renewal community, a community must meet several criteria. First, it must need the assistance. That means people in the area must be experiencing abnormally high rates of poverty and unemployment.

Second, State and local governments must enter into a written contract with neighborhood organizations to reduce taxes and fees, increase the efficiency of local services, formulate and implement crime reduction strategies, and make it easier for charities to operate.

Third, the community must agree not to enforce a number of restrictions on entry into business or occupations, including unnecessary licensing and zoning requirements.

In exchange, the community would receive a number of benefits from the Federal level. Our legislation would zero out capital gains taxes within these empowerment areas, it would increase business expensing, it would give a 20 percent wage credit to businesses hiring qualified workers who were still employed after 6 months, and it would provide tax incentives for entrepreneurs who clean up environmentally contaminated ''brownfield'' sites.

Unlike the administration's current ''empowerment zones,'' our incentives recognize that it is the private sector, not the Federal Government, that must be part of any effort to revitalize our communities.

Mr. President, there will be no boards established to dole out Government patronage, and our legislation will not include the onerous conditions and bureaucratic requirements of current programs. What is more, States and localities will be joining the Federal Government in reducing the burden of Government so that local small businesses can start and grow in distressed areas.

We know that it is these small businesses, from barber shops to local grocery stores, that often serve as the glue holding communities together. Not only do these small businesses provide jobs, they also provide places where people can meet one another to exchange news and keep in touch with local events and other job opportunities. It is crucial that we seed our distressed areas with businesses like these so that residents can pull their communities together and work toward a better life.

Mr. President, in short, what we hope to do with our legislation is to provide the incentives so that small entrepreneurial enterprises can develop in areas where there is currently significant economic distress. Therefore, the jobs being created will be created where the people are who don't have jobs. Right now, the biggest impediment to creating jobs is to create conditions in which entrepreneurship can exist. That means cleaning up contaminated brownfield sites, it means providing access to capital so small businesses can begin and flourish, it means making sure that Government regulations and rules aren't so burdensome and onerous that even the best-intentioned small business person can't even open their enterprise. The only way that is going to happen is if we have State, local, and Federal teams working together in the fashion that our legislation suggests.

The suggestion that this can work is, I think, abundantly clear if one looks to just existing examples of this going on in the country today. In our State of Michigan, under Governor John Engler, we have launched several extraordinarily interesting initiatives along these lines—one called the Renaissance Zone Concept, which essentially does the same thing we are proposing in this legislation; it just doesn't have the Federal component. Obviously, the State could not include us in the mix. But what the State has done is to say that, within a certain number of zones in the State, in economically distressed areas—and they range from inner-cities to rural areas, Mr. President—we will dramatically reduce the burdens of taxes and regulations in order to try to stimulate economic development. And we are doing that with tremendous results.

Another approach that is somewhat similar is being done in an effort to get people off of the welfare rolls and onto the job rolls. In fact, we have a country in Michigan which, because of this kind of State and local cooperative effort, the county of over 200,000 people has virtually nobody left on the welfare rolls because of the innovative approach that is being taken.

It is time to learn from these ''laboratories,'' these experiences at the State level. We believe this legislation moves us in that direction. So as we proceed forward with this Renewal Alliance agenda, I intend to work very hard on that component of it to find us economic empowerment. We want to give the Members of the Senate a chance to decide whether or not the business-as-usual approach is the way we want to enter the 21st century, or whether we want to augment what we do in Federal programs, as well as private sector initiatives, by providing, through the legislation we will offer, an opportunity to reduce the impediments to starting new business opportunities in our economically distressed areas, as well as providing incentives to create more of those businesses that obviously provide more people with a chance to get on the first rung of the economic ladder.

Mr. President, let me conclude, because other members of the Alliance are here. I thank Senator COATS for his leadership on this. I look forward to working with all of our colleagues as we try to move this agenda forward this year.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for his invaluable contributions to this effort. I now turn to another key member of our Renewal Alliance, someone who has offered additional invaluable contributions, for further explanation of the package we are introducing, Senator SANTORUM of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer for his recognition.

Mr. President, let me thank Senator COATS for his tremendous leadership on what is, really, a new paradigm. Those listening to the debate on the Senate floor and the discussion of the Renewal Alliance agenda—renewal, empowerment, achievement learning for life—may be hearing some things for the first time, as to a different approach.

One of the things that I know Senator COATS talked about and, in a sense, schooled many of us in here on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle, I might add, is the importance of understanding the problems of this country, the real intractable problems, the ones that we sort of don't believe that there are any quick fixes to and are not going to be fixed in Washington. In fact, many of us would argue that many were exacerbated by attempts by Washington to fix those problems.

As a result of Senator COATS' urgings, the more I have gotten out into the neighborhoods in the last few years—poor neighborhoods, in particular, in Pennsylvania—to see what works and what doesn't: What are people doing at the local level that is making a difference in people's lives, that is taking absolute hopelessness and despair and turning it into productivity and optimism?

What I see is that, almost without exception, they are not Government programs and, almost without exception, they don't take Government dollars because, in so doing, it would corrupt what works for them because the Government would have some way of dictating to them how this program must work or what hoops they must jump through. And they have designed a program that meets the needs of the people in that community, designed by people in that community who have, in many, if not most, cases experienced the same kind of hopelessness and despair before they arrived where they are today—in a state of now helping those come out of the problems they have.

So what I have learned from my discussions with those very people is that we need to look here in Washington as to how we can help them, help them do the mission—and it is a mission, it is not a job. I don't know of anybody I have met in these communities who is making any money, who is getting a good night's sleep at night, who is profiting in any real financial way from, or any tangible way from, their work, but profiting enormously in the intangibles that are, frankly, the most satisfying.

It is a true labor of love for people in these communities, whether they are in the economic development area, or in the community development area, or in dealing with homelessness, or abused women, or doing a charter school, or running a small parochial school. Whatever the case may be, these are people who are convicted, who care deeply—not about education, not about homelessness, not about drug abuse; they care about that person sitting across the table from them. It is not a macroissue. It is a one-to-one, person-to-person challenge to save someone's life. They do it because they care. They do it because they love that person. That is the magic that no Government program can provide.

What DAN COATS, SPENCER ABRAHAM, and SAM BROWNBACK—those of us who are members of the alliance having looked into the eyes of those who care, not those who appropriate money here in Washington who say we care, but those who are there across the table shedding the tears, holding the hands, embracing those in real pain, those people who care—how can we help them? How can we help the world ministries, the real healing agents of our society to solve those intractable problems that, believe it or not, they solve, and do so so well? How did we help them do it better? How can we help them turn more lives around and replicate the great accomplishments they have made to so many neighborhoods? There isn't a neighborhood in America where there is not at least one person or one organization—whether it is a school or whether it is a rehab center or whether it is a homeless shelter or a soup kitchen—that isn't touching and changing people.

We have come forward with this agenda that is not, as the speaker said before, a Washington-based solution to the problem. But it is, in fact, a way that Washington can, one, get out of the way; two, maybe help with some of the things in a legal sense to get out of the way; three, give financial resources to those organizations that need those resources to either help the community or help the economy; and, next, give resources to the hands of parents and children so they can have the opportunity to hope through an education that gives them the tools to be able to be successful in our society.

But I am going to focus my couple of minutes more to talk in the area of education. I cannot tell you the number of employers I talked to just within the southeastern Pennsylvania area the other day, Philadelphia. Employer after employer, factory or industry, they told me how they desperately need skilled people. They desperately need people who are even semiskilled who can be trained. There are such shortages in the workplace today. Then I asked—the unemployment rate in the city of Philadelphia, the center city, or in Chester, or in Levittown, or places like that is very high, and there is available work? They say, ''Yes, there is. We have job fares. We ask people to apply, and they don't.'' I said, ''Why don't they?'' They said, ''Well, by and large, they don't have the education. They can't, in many cases, fill out applications, or they just simply don't have the education necessary to even meet what is a minimal skilled job.''

The jobs are there. But we just do not have people who are educated enough to take advantage of those opportunities. That is, in fact, a shame, and, as a result of a variety of factors, a breakdown in the family, the breakdown in the community, and, yes, the breakdown of the educational structure.

There are lots of things we can do to solve the first two problems that have been talked about. I am going to talk about the third, which is the breakdown of the education structure. I am not going to profess to you I have the answer—the silver bullet to make public education work in America's poor neighborhoods. I do not have a silver bullet. I can sit up here and suggest a variety of things that may or may not work to solve that intractable problem in educating poor students in poor schools. I do not have that answer off the top of my head. What I do have is a solution that will give children and families the opportunity to send their child to school where they can get a good education tomorrow. We have to step back and say, ''Well, is that good enough?'' Some may say, ''Senator, you are not solving the big problem tomorrow in public education in the poor neighborhoods of our country.'' I will answer, You are right. I am not. I am not going to solve that problem tomorrow. But what I am going to start to do today is to give that young person who may have a dream, or that mother or father who sees the spark in that young child's eye and believes that spark can lead them to somewhere in life if given the educational tools. I am going to give them the chance to get that child a chance. That is all we can do right now—to give them a scholarship, to send them to a school where they will have the opportunity to see that spark catch fire, to feed them what they need to take on the world.

Our program, called Educational Opportunities for Low-Income Families, is to provide scholarships through existing block grants that go to the States right now. We would allow that block grant to be used for scholarships to go to low-income children and 185 percent of poverty and below in the poorest neighborhoods in our country so that it will give low-income kids in poor neighborhoods the opportunity to have a scholarship that pays up to 60 percent of the cost of their tuition and would give them the opportunity to go to school and learn. I think it is a great opportunity for us to help one child at a time. I believe that in the long run helping one child at a time and giving that choice will, in fact, cause dramatic reforms in the whole educational system in those communities.

I have been given the high sign here. I will follow my chairman's lead. Again, I thank Senator COATS for his tremendous leadership on this.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, it is very difficult to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to wrap up his remarks because he, obviously, has such a deep-felt and heartfelt passion for these issues. I appreciate his work with us. We are under some time constraint.

I now turn the floor over to the Senator from Kansas, Senator BROWNBACK, who has also been a very key instrumental member of the development of this package.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Thank you very much. Mr. President, I am delighted to be able to work with the distinguished Senator from Kansas, who is presiding today, and also the distinguished Senator from Indiana, who has put forth this new alliance. It is a cadre of members who are putting forth these points that we think have not been sufficiently debated nor brought forward in the overall debate in America about what we should do about the crying issues of poverty that has so hit and harmed our Nation in so many places, both urban and rural.

More than 30 years after the United States first declared the War on Poverty, most signs point to failure. The United States has spent hundreds of billions of dollars—by some accounts we have spent nearly $4 trillion—to fight poverty only to find poverty in America has grown more widespread, more entrenched, and more pathological. The solution is not to expand more Government but rather to go a different way, and to say, ''Look, we have tried that route. We have spent nearly $4 trillion trying that route. We have tried every program you possibly can with that route. Maybe there is another way that we should be going.''

This is what the Renewal Alliance, this program, is about—about rewarding self-help and not Government help. It is about encouraging charity rather than encouraging Government. It is about encouraging volunteerism rather than putting more people on the taxpayer rolls to solve problems that we have failed to be able to solve. Family breakdown, crime, poor education performance, and a lack of opportunity in the inner cities, and many other areas, including many rural areas, are now national problems. But many of the solutions are to be found on a local level and not in Washington, through personal contacts that people can make between individuals and the dedicated involvement of families, churches, schools, and neighborhood associations. These small groups, not big Government, but rather small groups, often referred to as the ''little platoons'' in a civil society, can often accomplish what no Government program could dream of or ever been able to do. They have the soft hearts and the willing hands to be able to reach out and touch people directly in a community where they are in there with the families working with them.

Last December, I had the chance to visit several of these small, private charities in my home State of Kansas. To me, they are living proof of the amazing effectiveness of small, local charities that lead with heart, that lead with love.

Mr. President, in this very body, in this very room, as you enter into the main doorway coming in here, there is a sign above the door mantle which reads ''In God We Trust.'' As I visited these small charities in Kansas, I was reminded at that time and was thinking about how many people say that versus how many people do that. These are charities, which ''In God We Trust'' they live every day.

I visited Good Samaritan Clinic in Wichita, which serves around 300 patients a month from Wichita's poorest neighborhood. This tiny clinic operates on less than a shoestring budget. With the exception of a fax machine and one piece of furniture, everything in the clinic is donated. The clinic's staff, a dedicated and accomplished group of doctors, are mostly volunteers. They are reaching out and touching people, and helping and healing people with their skills and with their hearts.

I visited the Topeka Rescue Mission and the Union Rescue Mission of Wichita, both of which serve thousands of people each year.

These missions are not merely assigning people to bunks, but they challenge them personally and spiritually, and they are challenged to change their hearts and their souls along with helping them out in their lives.

I visited the Crisis Pregnancy Outreach Program in Topeka and a maternity home in Wichita and saw firsthand the love and personal attention devoted to each woman who passes through those doors.

Contrast that with the large Government solution that we have tried for the past 30 years that gets millions of people flowing through the door but constantly keeps them flowing back out the door and never really changes things in a person's life, continues to hand them something but doesn't put arms around them and hug them, doesn't put arms around them and give them heart and soul and say, ''Here is my phone number; call anytime.''

It is not that we don't have a lot of good and dedicated servants; we do, but they are limited in what they can do. This is a mission for them. They must not see the number of people who are walking through; they must see a soul at a time. They must see another and another, to reach out and touch and help them. We need to encourage these groups and not discourage them.

As the past 35 years of our history has shown, the Federal Government is limited in its capacity to solve the problems of poverty and pathology, But it can eliminate perverse incentives that reward irresponsibility and fuel the flight of capital from the inner cities, and it can encourage entrepreneurialism, charitable giving and investment in the inner cities and its inhabitants, investment in the inhabitants of those areas and rural areas as well. It can do these things and it should. And through the renewal alliance REAL Life legislation, it will.

That is why I am delighted to be associated with the Senator from Indiana in this package that we have put forward. It is a different way. It is a way that people every day are proving can and is working, and we need to encourage it and lift it up and move it forward. I am delighted to be a part of this legislation.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas for his invaluable support and effort in helping craft this legislation.

Mr. President, I know the time allocated to us is just about up.

I send to the desk three pieces of legislation, one that I am introducing, another that Senator ABRAHAM is introducing, and a third that Senator SANTORUM is introducing, all of which encompass the three major components of the renewal alliance package. I would ask for its immediate referral.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent if it is possible—a qualified unanimous consent request—to have these numbered sequentially since these three pieces of legislation are part of a package. If it is possible, we would like to have them numbered consecutively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection? The Chair hears none, and the bills will be so numbered. They will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I believe that wraps up our time. I think the Senator from Iowa is in the Chamber prepared to speak within a moment or two. Let me ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes to wrap up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 additional remaining on his time.

Mr. COATS. That is propitious then. The Senator will take all 2 of those minutes. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, in summary, let me state that what we are attempting to accomplish here is a third alternative. We believe that the well-intentioned, well-motivated programs of the past, at great cost to the taxpayers, have failed to successfully address some of the most difficult social problems facing our Nation, and particularly problems facing low-income urban communities where in many situations nothing but crime and drugs are the prevalent activities of those organizations. By the same token, the argument that no Federal policy is the best policy to address these problems is something that we as a group cannot accept.

We think this third alternative, providing REAL Life meaningful solutions to the areas of community renewal, economic empowerment and educational opportunities for low-income families offers real hope. It does so not through Government organizations,

Government structures or even significant Government funding. It does so by encouraging those community volunteer, nonprofit, often faith-based organizations that already exist and should exist in greater numbers to take a much greater role in addressing these problems. We want to make the Federal Government not the dominant partner but a junior partner, an entity that can assist through the provision of Tax Code changes, primarily tax credits and other incentives, to encourage individuals and other organizations to contribute to these nonprofit groups to allow them to do a better job. They have demonstrated success at an efficiency rate and at a cost-effectiveness that far exceeds those current programs in place.

Are we calling for a dismantling of the safety net? No, we are not. We are calling for a better use of dollars, a better commitment, stronger commitment to organizations which have demonstrated real success in providing hope to individuals, transformation and renewal of communities.

Mr. President, I believe the time is probably expired, and with that I yield the floor and encourage my colleagues to take a look at the REAL Life Renewal Alliance initiative which we are happy to provide and discuss with our colleagues.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. FAIRCLOTH):

S. 1997. A bill to protect the right of a member of a health maintenance organization to receive continuing care at a facility selected by that member; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE ''SENIORS' ACCESS TO CONTINUING CARE ACT OF 1998''

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the ''Seniors' Access to Continuing Care Act of 1998'', a bill to protect seniors' access to treatment in the setting of their choice and to ensure that seniors who reside in continuing care communities, and nursing and other facilities have the right to return to that facility after a hospitalization.

As our population ages, more and more elderly will become residents of various long term care facilities. These include independent living, assisted living and nursing facilities, as well as continuing care retirement communities, which provide the entire continuum of care. In Maryland alone, there are over 12,000 residents in 32 continuing care retirement communities and 24,000 residents in over 200 licenced nursing facilities.

I have visited many of these facilities and have heard from both residents and operators. They have told me about a serious and unexpected problem encountered with returning to their facility after a hospitalization. Many individuals have little choice when entering a nursing facility. They do so because it is medically necessary, because they need a high level of care that they can no longer receive in their homes or in a more independent setting, such as assisted living. But residents are still able to form relationships with other residents and staff and consider the facility their ''home''.

More and more individuals and couples are choosing to enter continuing care communities because of the community environment they provide. CCRC's provide independent living, assisted living and nursing care, usually on the same campus—the Continuum of Care. Residents find safety, security and peace of mind. They often prepay for the continuum of care. Couples can stay together, and if one spouse needs additional care, it can be provided right there, where the other spouse can remain close by.

But hospitalization presents other challenges. Hospitalization is traumatic for anyone, but particularly for our vulnerable seniors. We know that having comfortable surroundings and familiar faces can aid dramatically in the recovery process. So, we should do everything we can to make sure that recovery process is not hindered.

Today, more and more seniors are joining managed care plans. This trend is likely to accelerate given the expansion of managed care choices under the 1997 Balanced Budget Act. As more and more decisions are made based on financial considerations, choice often gets lost. Currently, a resident of a continuing care retirement community or a nursing facility who goes to the hospital has no guarantee that he or she will be allowed by the MCO to return to the CCRC or nursing facility for post acute follow up care.

The MCO can dictate that the resident go to a different facility that is in the MCO network for that follow up care, even if the home facility is qualified and able to provide the needed care.

Let me give you a few examples:

In the fall of 1996, a resident of Applewood Estates in Freehold, New Jersey was admitted to the hospital. Upon discharge, her HMO would not permit her to return to Applewood and sent her to another facility in Jackson. The following year, the same thing happened, but after strong protest, the HMO finally relented and permitted her to return to Applewood. She should not have had to protest, and many seniors are unable to assert themselves.

A Florida couple in their mid-80's were separated by a distance of 20 miles after the wife was discharged from a hospital to an HMO-participating nursing home located on the opposite side of the county. This was a hardship for the husband who had difficulty driving and for the wife who longed to return to her home, a CCRC. The CCRC had room in its skilled nursing facility on campus. Despite pleas from all those involved, the HMO would not allow the wife to recuperate in a familiar setting, close to her husband and friends. She later died at the HMO nursing facility, without the benefit of frequent visits by her husband and friends.

An elderly couple in Riverside, California encountered the same problem when the husband was discharged from the hospital and retained against her will at the HMO skilled nursing facility instead of the couple's community. At 25 miles apart, it was impossible for his wife and friends to visit at a time when he needed the tenderness and compassion of loved ones.

Another Florida woman, a resident of a CCRC fractured her hip. Her HMO wanted her to move into a nursing home for treatment. She refused to abandon her home and received the treatment at the CCRC. Her HMO refused to pay for the treatment, so she had to pay out of her pocket.

Collington Episcopal Life Care Community, in my home state of Maryland, reports ongoing problems with its frail elderly having to obtain psychiatric services, including medication monitoring, off campus, even though the services are available at Collington—how disruptive to good patient care!

On a brighter note, an Ohio woman's husband was in a nursing facility. When she was hospitalized, and then discharged, she was able to be admitted to the same nursing facility because of the Ohio law that protected that right.

Seniors coming out of the hospital should not be passed around like a baton. Their care should be decided based on what is clinically appropriate, not what is financially mandated. Why is that important? What are the consequences?

Residents consider their retirement community or long term care facility as their home. And being away from home for any reason can be very difficult. The trauma of being in unfamiliar surroundings can increase recovery time. The staff of the resident's ''home'' facility often knows best about the person's chronic care and service needs. Being away from ''home'' separates the resident from his or her emotional support system.

Refusal to allow a resident to return to his or her home takes away the person's choice. All of this leads to greater recovery time and unnecessary trauma for the patient.

And should a woman's husband have to hitch a ride or catch a cab in order to see his recovering spouse if the facility where they live can provide the care? No. Retirement communities and other long term care facilities are not just health care facilities. They provide an entire living environment for their residents, in other words, a home. We need to protect the choice of our seniors to return to their ''home'' after a hospitalization. And that is what my bill does.

It protects residents of CCRC's and nursing facilities by: enabling them to return to their facility after a hospitalization; and requiring the resident's insurer or managed care organization (MCO) to cover the cost of the care, even if the insurer does not have a contract with the resident's facility.

In order for the resident to return to the facility and have the services covered by the insurer or MCO: 1. The service to be provided must be a service that the insurer covers; 2. The resident must have resided at the facility before hospitalization, have a right to return, and choose to return; 3. The facility must have the capacity to provide the necessary service and meet applicable licensing and certification requirements of the state; 4. The facility must be willing to accept substantially similar payment as a facility under contract with the insurer or MCO.

My bill also requires an insurer or MCO to pay for a service to one of its beneficiaries, without a prior hospital stay, if the service is necessary to prevent a hospitalization of the beneficiary and the service is provided as an additional benefit. Lastly, the bill requires an insurer or MCO to provide coverage to a beneficiary for services provided at a facility in which the beneficiary's spouse already resides, even if the facility is not under contract with the MCO, provided the other requirements are met.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I am committed to providing a safety net for our seniors—this bill is part of that safety net. Seniors deserve quality, affordable health care and they deserve choice. This bill offers those residing in retirement communities and long term care facilities assurance to have their choices respected, to have where they reside recognized as their ''home'', and to be permitted to return to that ''home'' after a hospitalization. It ensures that spouses can be together as long as possible. And it ensures access to care in order to prevent a hospitalization. I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this important measure to protect the rights of seniors and their access to continuing care.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 1998. A bill to authorize an interpretive center and related visitor facilities within the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

THE FOUR CORNERS INTERPRETIVE CENTER ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that would authorize an interpretive center and visitor facilities at the Four Corners National Monument. As my colleagues know, Four Corners is the only place in our country where four state boundaries meet. Over a quarter of a million people visit this monument every year.

The Four Corners area is also unique for reasons other than the political boundaries of four states. Once inhabited by the earliest Americans, the Anaxazi, this area is rich in historical, archaeological,and cultural significance as well as natural beauty.

Currently, however, there is nothing at Four Corners that would help visitors to fully appreciate and learn about the area. And, at a national monument that has 250,000 visitors a year, one would expect certain basic facilities to exist—restrooms, for example. But, there is no electricity, running water, telephone, or permanent structure at Four Corners.

The bill I am introducing today is simple: We propose a Federal matching grant to build an interpretive center and visitor facilities within the boundaries of Four Corners Monument Tribal Park.

We are not suggesting a museum the size of the Guggenheim. But, exhibits on the history, geography, culture, and ecology of the region would significantly enhance the area and Americans' appreciation of this unique part of their country and their heritage. And, I daresay that some very basic guest amenities would enhance their enjoyment of it.

There is, as you can imagine, a great deal of excitement and enthusiasm for this project from many fronts. Currently, the Monument is operated as one of the units of the Navajo Nation Parks and Recreation Department. And, since there has been so much debate about ''monuments'' recently, I should clarify that the Four Corners ''Monument'' is merely a slightly elevated concrete slab at the juncture of our four states.

The Navajo Nation owns the land in the Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah quarters and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe owns the quarter in Colorado. Although the Navajo Nation and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe are fully supportive of the project and have entered into an agreement with one another in order to facilitate planning and development at the Four Corners Monument, neither Tribe has the necessary resources to improve the facilities and create an interpretive center at the Monument.

The bill, however, does not contemplate federal government giveaway. The bill requires matching funds from nonfederal sources and for the two tribes to work collaboratively toward the development of a financial management plan. It is intended that the Interpretive Center become fully self-sufficient within five years.

The bill requires that proposals meeting the stated criteria be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior. These criteria include, among other things, compliance with the existing agreements between the Navajo and Ute Mountain Ute Tribes, a sound financing plan, and the commitment of nonfederal matching funds. The federal contribution would not exceed $2.25 million over a 5 year period.

Over the past several years, the Navajo Nation has met with many of the local residents of the area and has found overwhelming support to improve the quality of the services provided at the Four Corners Monument. The local area suffers an unemployment rate of over 50 percent and any development which would create employment opportunities and would encourage visitors to stay longer in the area would be welcomed.

Another important participant in the development of this proposal is the Four Corners Heritage Council. This Council, which was established in 1992 by the governors of the four states, is a coalition of private, tribal, federal, state, and local government interests committed to finding ways to make the economy of the Four Corners region sustainable into the future. The mission of the Heritage Council is to guide the region toward a balance of the sometimes competing interests of economic development, resource preservation, and maintenance of traditional life ways.

Back in 1949, nearly 50 years ago, the governors of the states of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah assembled at the Four Corners in a historic meeting. Each governor sat in their respective state and had what is probably the most unusual picnic lunch in history. They pledged to meet often at the Four Corners Monument to reaffirm their commitment to working together. Clearly, the governors understood that they shared stewardship of a unique piece of western real estate.

Mr. President, the heritage of this area belongs to all Americans. The small investment requested in this legislation will help bring it to life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1998

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 ''Four Corners Interpretive Center Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Four Corners Monument is nationally significant as the only geographic location in the United States where 4 State boundaries meet;

(2) the States with boundaries that meet at the Four Corners area are Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah;

(3) between 1868 and 1875 the boundary lines that created the Four Corners were drawn, and in 1899 a monument was erected at the site;

(4) a United States postal stamp will be issued in 1999 to commemorate the centennial of the original boundary marker;

(5) the Four Corners area is distinct in character and possesses important historical, cultural, and prehistoric values and resources within the surrounding cultural landscape;

(6) although there are no permanent facilities or utilities at the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park, each year the park attracts approximately 250,000 visitors;

(7) the area of the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park falls entirely within the Navajo Nation or Ute Mountain Ute Tribe reservations;

(8) the Navajo Nation and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding governing the planning and future development of the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park;

(9) in 1992 through agreements executed by the governors of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah, the Four Corners Heritage Council was established as a coalition of State, Federal, tribal, and private interests;

(10) the State of Arizona has obligated $45,000 for planning efforts and $250,000 for construction of an interpretive center at the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park;

(11) numerous studies and extensive consultation with American Indians have demonstrated that development at the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park would greatly benefit the people of the Navajo Nation and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe;

(12) the Arizona Department of Transportation has completed preliminary cost estimates that are based on field experience with rest-area development for the construction of a Four Corners Monument Interpretive Center and surrounding infrastructure, including restrooms, roadways, parking, water, electrical, telephone, and sewage facilities;

(13) an interpretive center would provide important education and enrichment opportunities for all Americans.

(14) Federal financial assistance and technical expertise are needed for the construction of an interpretive center.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to recognize the importance of the Four Corners Monument and surrounding landscape as a distinct area in the heritage of the United States that is worthy of interpretation and preservation;

(2) To assist the Navajo Nation and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe in establishing the Four Corners Interpretive Center and related facilities to meet the needs of the general public;

(3) To highlight and showcase the collaborative resource stewardship of private individuals, Indian tribes, universities, Federal agencies, and the governments of States and political subdivisions thereof (including counties);

(4) to promote knowledge of the life, art, culture, politics, and history of the culturally diverse groups of the Four Corners region.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) CENTER.—The term ''Center'' means the Four Corners Interpretive Center established under section 4, including restrooms, parking areas, vendor facilities, sidewalks, utilities, exhibits, and other visitor facilities.

(2) FOUR CORNERS HERITAGE COUNCIL.—The term ''Four Corners Heritage Council'' means the nonprofit coalition of Federal, State, and tribal entities established in 1992 by agreements of the Governors of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) RECIPIENT.—The term ''Recipient'' means the State of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, or Utah, or any consortium of two or more of these states.

(5) FOUR CORNERS MONUMENT.—The term ''Four Corners Monument'' means the physical monument where the boundaries of the states of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah meet.

(6) FOUR CORNERS MONUMENT TRIBAL PARK.—The term ''Four Corners Monument Tribal Park'' means lands within the legally defined boundary of the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park.

SEC. 4. FOUR CORNERS MONUMENT INTERPRETIVE CENTER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary is authorized to establish within the boundaries of the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park a center for the interpretation and commemoration of the Four Corners Monument, to be known as the ''Four Corners Interpretive Center.''

(b) Land for the Center shall be designated and made available by the Navajo Nation or the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe within the boundary of the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park in consultation with the Four Corners Heritage Council and in accordance with—

(1) the memorandum of understanding between the Navajo Nation and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe that was entered into on October 22, 1996; and

(2) applicable supplemental agreements with the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the United States Forest Service.

(c) CONCURRENCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no such center shall be established without the consent of the Navajo Nation and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe.

(d) COMPONENTS OF CENTER.—The Center shall include—

(1) a location for permanent and temporary exhibits depicting the archaeological, cultural, and natural heritage of the Four Corners region;

(2) a venue for public education programs;

(3) a location to highlight the importance of efforts to preserve southwestern archaeological sites and museum collections;

(4) a location to provide information to the general public about cultural and natural resources, parks, museums, and travel in the Four Corners region; and

(5) visitor amenities including restrooms, public telephones, and other basic facilities.

SEC. 5. CONSTRUCTION GRANT.

(a) GRANT.—The Secretary is authorized to award a Federal grant to the Recipient described in section 3(4) for up to 50 percent of the cost to construct the Center. To be eligible for the grant, the Recipient shall provide assurances that—

(1) The non-Federal share of the costs of construction is paid from non-Federal sources. The non-Federal sources may include contributions made by States, private sources, the Navajo Nation and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe for planning, design, construction, furnishing, startup, and operational expenses.

(2) The aggregate amount of non-Federal funds contributed by the States used to carry out the activities specified in subparagraph (A) will not be less than $2,000,000, of which each of the states that is party to the grant will contribute equally in cash or in kind.

(3) States may use private funds to meet the requirements of paragraph (2).

(4) The State of Arizona may apply $45,000 authorized by the State of Arizona during fiscal year 1998 for planning and $250,000 that is held in reserve by that State for construction towards the Arizona share.

(b) GRANT REQUIREMENTS.—In order to receive a grant under this Act, the Recipient shall—

(1) submit to the Secretary a proposal that meets all applicable—

(A) laws, including building codes and regulations;

(B) requirements under the Memorandum of Understanding described in paragraph (2) of this subsection; and

(C) provides such information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

(2) The Recipient shall enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Secretary providing—

(A) a timetable for completion of construction and opening of the Center;

(B) assurances that design, architectural and construction contracts will be competitively awarded;

(C) specifications meeting all applicable Federal, State, and local building codes and laws;

(D) arrangements for operations and maintenance upon completion of construction;

(E) a description of center collections and educational programming;

(F) a plan for design of exhibits including, but not limited to, collections to be exhibited, security, preservation, protection, environmental controls, and presentations in accordance with professional museum standards;

(G) an agreement with the Navajo Nation and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe relative to site selection and public access to the facilities;

(H) a financing plan developed jointly by the Navajo Nation and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe outlining the long-term management of the Center, including but not limited to—

(i) the acceptance and use of funds derived from public and private sources to minimize the use of appropriated or borrowed funds;

(ii) the payment of the operating costs of the Center through the assessment of fees or other income generated by the Center;

(iii) a strategy for achieving financial self-sufficiency with respect to the Center by not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(iv) defining appropriate vendor standards and business activities at the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park.

SEC. 6. SELECTION OF GRANT RECIPIENT.

The Secretary is authorized to award a grant in accordance with the provisions of this Act. The Four Corners Heritage Council may make recommendations to the Secretary on grant proposals regarding the design of facilities at the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

IN GENERAL.—(a) AUTHORIZATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act—

(1) $2,000,000 for fiscal year 1999;

(2) $50,000 for each of fiscal years 2000–2004 for maintenance and operation of the Center, program development, or staffing in a manner consistent with the requirements of section 5(b).

(b) CARRYOVER.—Any funds made available under this section that are unexpended at the end of the fiscal year for which those funds are appropriated may be used by the Secretary through fiscal year 2001 for the purposes for which those funds were made available.

(c) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary may reserve funds appropriated pursuant to this Act until a proposal meeting the requirements of this Act is submitted, but no later than September 30, 2000.

SEC. 8. DONATIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of the planning, construction, and operation of the Center, the Secretary may accept, retain, and expend donations of funds, and use property or services donated from private persons and entities or from public entities.

SEC. 9. STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act is intended to abrogate, modify, or impair any right or claim of the Navajo Nation or the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, that is based on any law (including any treaty, Executive order, agreement, or Act of Congress).

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise today to co-sponsor this important legislation introduced by my friend from Utah, Senator HATCH. The bill authorizes the construction of an interpretive visitor center at the Four Corners Monument. As I am sure

all senators know, the Four Corners is the only place in America where the boundaries of four states meet in one spot. The monument is located on the Navajo and Ute Mountain Ute Reservations and operated as a Tribal Park. Nearly a quarter of a million people visit this unique site every year. However, currently there are no facilities for tourists at the park and nothing that explains the very special features of the Four Corners region. The bill authorizes the Department of the Interior to contribute $2 million toward the construction of a much needed interpretive center for visitors.

Mr. President, the Four Corners Monument is more than a geographic curiosity. It also serves as a focal point for some of the most beautiful landscape and significant cultural attractions in our country. An interpretive center will help visitors appreciate the many special features of the region. For example, within a short distance of the monument are the cliff dwellings of Mesa Verde, Colorado; the Red Rock and Natural Bridges areas of Utah; and in Arizona, Monument Valley and Canyon de Chelly. The beautiful San Juan River, one of the top trout streams in the Southwest, flows through Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah.

In my state of New Mexico, both the legendary mountain known as Shiprock and the Chaco Canyon Culture National Historical Park are a short distance from the Four Corners.

Mr. President, Shiprock is one of the best known and most beautiful landmarks in New Mexico. The giant volcanic monolith rises nearly 2,000 feet straight up from the surrounding plain. Ancient legend tells us the mountain was created when a giant bird settled to earth and turned to stone. In the Navajo language, the mountain is named Tse' bi t'ai or the Winged Rock. Early Anglo settlers saw the mountain's soaring spires and thought they resembled the sails of a huge ship, so they named it Shiprock.

The Four Corners is also the site of Chaco Canyon. Chaco was an important Anasazi cultural center from about 900 through 1130 A.D. Pre-Columbian civilization in the Southwest reached its greatest development there. The massive stone ruins, containing hundreds of rooms, attest to Chaco's cultural importance. As many as 7,000 people may have lived at Chaco at one time. Some of the structures are thought to house ancient astronomical observatories to mark the passage of the seasons. The discovery of jewelry from Mexico and California and a vast network of roads is evidence of the advanced trading carried on at Chaco. Perhaps, the most spectacular accomplishment at Chaco was in architecture. Pueblo Bonito, the largest structure, contains more than 800 rooms and 32 kivas. Some parts are more than five stories high. The masonry work is truly exquisite. Stones were so finely worked and fitted together that no mortar was needed. Remarkably all this was accomplished without metal tools or the wheel.

Mr. President, 1999 marks the centennial year of the first monument at the Four Corners. An interpretive center is urgently needed today to showcase the history, culture, and scenery of this very special place. New facilities at the monument will attract visitors and help stimulate economic development throughout the region. I am pleased to co-sponsor this bill with Senator HATCH, and I thank him for his efforts.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1021

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1021, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that consideration may not be denied to preference eligibles applying for certain positions in the competitive service, and for other purposes.

S. 1180

At the request of Mr. KEMPTHORNE, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1180, a bill to reauthorize the Endangered Species Act.

S. 1334

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] 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. 1413

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1413, a bill to provide a framework for consideration by the legislative and executive branches of unilateral economic sanctions.

S. 1427

At the request of Mr. FORD, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1427, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to preserve lowpower television stations that provide community broadcasting, and for other purposes.

S. 1578

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1578, a bill to make available on the Internet, for purposes of access and retrieval by the public, certain information available through the Congressional Research Service web site.

S. 1645

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1645, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines to avoid laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 1677

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] were added as cosponsors of S. 1677, a bill to reauthorize the North American Wetlands Conservation Act and the Partnerships for Wildlife Act.

S. 1862

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1862, a bill to provide assistance for poison prevention and to stabilize the funding of regional poison control centers.

S. 1917

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1917, a bill to prevent children from injuring themselves and others with firearms.

S. 1963

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1963, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain beneficiaries of the military health care system to enroll in Federal employees health benefits plans.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 30, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Republic of China should be admitted to multilateral economic institutions, including the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 80

At the request of Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 80, a concurrent resolution urging that the railroad industry, including rail labor, management and retiree organization, open discussions for adequately funding an amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to modify the guaranteed minimum benefit for widows and widowers whose annuities are converted from a spouse to a widow or widower annuity.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 83

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN], the

Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HAGEL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLELAND], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 83, a concurrent resolution remembering the life of George Washington and his contributions to the Nation.

SENATE RESOLUTION 193

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 193, a resolution designating December 13, 1998, as ''National Children's Memorial Day.''

SENATE RESOLUTION 197

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] was added as a cosponsor 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1678

At the request of Mr. WARNER the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1678 intended to be proposed to Treaty 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1755

At the request of Mr. REED the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1755 intended to be proposed to S. 1173, a bill to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transit programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2310

At the request of Mr. KYL the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2310 intended to be proposed to Treaty 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.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

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

HARKIN EXECUTIVE AMENDMENT NO. 2312

Mr. HARKIN 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 section 3(2)(A), strike ''and'' at the end of clause (ii).

In section 3(2)(A), strike ''(iii)'' and insert ''(iv)''.

In section 3(2)(A), insert after clause (ii) the following:

(iii) any future United States subsidy of the national expenses of Poland, Hungary, or the Czech Republic to meet its NATO commitments, including the assistance described in subparagraph (C), may not exceed 25 percent of all assistance provided to that country by all NATO members.

At the end of section 3(2), insert the following new subparagraph:

(C) ADDITIONAL UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE DESCRIBED.—The assistance referred to in subparagraph (A)(iii) includes—

(i) Foreign Military Financing under the Arms Export Control Act;

(ii) transfers of excess defense articles under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(iii) Emergency Drawdowns;

(iv) no-cost leases of United States equipment;

(v) the subsidy cost of loan guarantees and other contingent liabilities under subchapter VI of chapter 148 of title 10, United States Code; and

(vi) international military education and training under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

CONRAD (AND BINGAMAN) EXECUTIVE AMENDMENT NO. 2313

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them 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:

At the appropriate place in section 3 of the resolution, insert the following:

( ) NON-STRATEGIC NUCLEAR WEAPONS.—

(A) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that

(i) the United States Strategic Command has estimated that the Russian Federation has between 7,000 and 12,000 non-strategic nuclear warheads, weapons that—unlike strategic systems—are not covered by any arms control accord;

(ii) the thousands of tactical nuclear warheads inside Russia present the greatest threat of sale or theft of a nuclear weapon in the world today;

(iii) with the number of deployed strategic warheads in the Russian and United States arsenals likely to be reduced to around 2,250 warheads under a START III accord, Russia's vast superiority in tactical nuclear warheads becomes a strategic concern;

(iv) the Commander in Chief of the United States Strategic Command has stated that future nuclear arms control agreements should include tactical nuclear weapons;

(v) statements from Russian officials that NATO enlargement would force Russia to rely more heavily on its nuclear arsenal have caused concern to be expressed that NATO expansion could be an impediment to progress on tactical nuclear arms control; and

(vi) the danger of theft or sale of a tactical nuclear warhead, and the destabilizing strategic implications of Russia's enormous lead in tactical nuclear weapons creates an urgent need for progress on increasing the security of Russia's tactical nuclear arsenal and working toward conclusion of a US-Russian agreement on tactical nuclear arms in Europe.

(B) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the Sense of the Senate that

(i) it would be advisable for future nuclear arms control agreements with the Russian Federation to address non-strategic nuclear weapons in Europe; and

(ii) the Administration should work with the Russian Federation to increase transparency, exchange data, increase warhead security, and facilitate weapon dismantlement.

(C) CERTIFICATION.—Prior to the deposit of the instruments of ratification, the Administration shall certify to the Senate that with regard to non-strategic nuclear weapons

(i) it is the policy of the United States to work with the Russian Federation to increase transparency, exchange data, increase warhead security, and facilitate weapon dismantlement; and,

(ii) that discussions toward these ends have been initiated with the Russian Federation.

(D) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the deposit of the instruments of ratification, the President shall submit a report to the Senate on the Russian Federation's non-strategic nuclear arsenal. This report shall include

(i) current data and estimates regarding the current numbers, types, yields, and locations of Russia's non-strategic nuclear weapons;

(ii) an assessment of the extent of the current threat of theft, sale, or unauthorized use of such warheads;

(iii) a plan to work with the Russian Federation to increase transparency, exchange data, increase warhead security, and facilitate weapon dismantlement; and,

(iv) an assessment of the strategic implications of the Russian Federation's non-strategic arsenal.

SMITH (AND) HUTCHISON EXECUTIVE AMENDMENT NO. 2314

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire (for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON) 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: At the appropriate place in section 3 of the resolution, insert the following:

( ) REQUIREMENT OF FULL COOPERATION WITH UNITED STATES EFFORTS TO OBTAIN THE FULLEST POSSIBLE ACCOUNTING OF CAPTURED AND MISSING UNITED STATES PERSONNEL FROM PAST MILITARY CONFLICTS OR COLD WAR INCIDENTS.—Prior to the deposit of the United States instrument of ratification, the President shall certify to Congress that each of the governments of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic are fully cooperating with United States efforts to obtain the fullest possible accounting of captured and missing United States personnel from past military conflicts or Cold War incidents, to include the following:

(A) facilitating full access to relevant archival material; and

(B) identifying individuals who may possess knowledge relative to captured and missing United States personnel, and encouraging such individuals to speak with United States Government officials.

SPECTER (AND TORRICELLI) EXECUTIVE AMENDMENT NO. 2315

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. SPECTER (for himself and Mr. TORRICELLI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them 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:

At the appropriate place in section 2 of the resolution, insert the following:

( ) UNDERSTANDING OF THE SENATE REGARDING PAYMENTS OWED BY POLAND, HUNGARY, AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC TO VICTIMS OF THE NAZIS.—

(A) UNDERSTANDING OF THE SENATE.—It is the understanding of the Senate that in future meetings and correspondence with the governments of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, the Secretary of State should—

(i) raise the issue of insurance benefits owed to victims of the Nazis (and their beneficiaries and heirs) by these countries as a result of the actions taken by their communist predecessor regimes in nationalizing foreign insurance companies and confiscating their assets in the aftermath of World War II;

(ii) seek to secure a commitment from the governments of these countries to provide a full accounting of the total value of insurance company assets that were seized by their communist predecessors and to share all documents relevant to unpaid insurance claims that are in their possession; and

(iii) seek to secure a commitment from the governments of these countries to contribute to the payment of these unpaid insurance claims in an amount that reflects the present value of the assets seized by the communist governments (and for which no compensation had previously been paid).

(B) DEFINITION.—As used in this paragraph, the term ''victims of the Nazis'' means persons persecuted during the period beginning on March 23, 1933 and ending on May 8, 1945, by, under the direction of, on behalf of, or under authority granted by the Nazi government of Germany or any nation allied with that government.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Tuesday, April 28, 1998, at 9:30 a.m. on year 2000 problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, the Finance Committee requests unanimous consent to conduct a hearing on Tuesday, April 28, 1998 beginning at 9:00 a.m. in room 215 Dirksen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 28, 1998 at 2:00 p.m. in room 226 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building to hold a hearing on ''S.J. Res. 44, a proposed constitutional amendment to protect crime victims.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for a hearing on Reading and Literacy Initiatives during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 28, 1998, at 10:00 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate for a hearing entitled ''Environmental Compliance Tools for Small Business.'' The hearing will begin at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, April 28, 1998, in room 428A Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS AND PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 28, for purposes of conducting a subcommittee hearing which is scheduled to begin at 2:30 p.m. The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 326, the Abandoned Hardrock Mines Reclamation Act of 1997; S. 327, the Hardrock Mining Royalty Act of 1997; and S. 1102, the Mining Law Reform Act of 1997.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND SPACE

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Tuesday, April 28, 1998, at 2:30 p.m. on Federal research and development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE CHALLENGE OF PUBLIC SERVICE

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, over the past year, some remarkable developments have taken place at the University of South Dakota (USD) involving the advancement of public service. The South Dakota Board of Regents has designated the University as a public service center of excellence,'' the Farber Fund which is committed to assisting students with experiences helpful to a future in public service has continued to grow, and the University's political science program has prospered.

There are a great many people responsible for these positive developments, but undoubtedly the person who has contributed the most, both in terms of effort and vision, has been Dr. W.O. Farber. I have a special fondness for Bill Farber because he was chairman of the USD political science department (then referred to as the government department'') when I was completing my undergraduate work there, and later Dr. Farber was instrumental in assisting me with my graduate studies. But beyond personal friendship, Dr. Farber has become an unequaled institution in our state—a voice for reason, progress and integrity respected by all.

Dr. Farber presented an important lecture this past year at the dedication of Farber Hall in the beautifully restored Old Main on the USD campus. I believe that all Americans would benefit from Dr. Farber's wisdom shared with us at that time and also by the Farber Testament'' which dates to our nation's bicentennial in 1976.

Mr. President, I ask that excerpts of Dr. Farber's speech, ''The Challenge of Public Service'' and the Farber Testament be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to recognize the contributions Dr. Farber has made to the advancement of public service and I encourage all of my colleagues to take the time to read these important observations.

The material follows:

EXCERPTS OF THE CHALLENGE OF PUBLIC SERVICE

(By Dr. William O. Farber, Professor Emeritus (Political Science), University of South Dakota)

Note.—This lecture, presented August 1, 1997, was the first to be given in the newly dedicated Farber Hall in Old Main. Dr. Farber was introduced by President James Abbott.

USD Alumni and Friends: As you may well imagine, this moment has been on my mind for a long time. H.G. Wells, the fabled historian of my generation, once described the

eternal tragedy of a teacher to be that a teacher is a sower of ''unseen harvests.''

Today, I have the greatest of good fortune. For I am able to witness a ''seen harvest.'' In my wildest fantasy I never thought that some day, on a single spot, I would witness such an assembly of those who, during a sixty-year period, would have brought me such inspiration, challenge, and satisfaction. It is a great day, in this building, in this hall, for us to celebrate.

This is certainly a special event for me for more than one reason. There had been a rumor that there had never been a Farber family, that I had appeared out of nowhere. Here this afternoon are seven Farbers, including two brothers, my special critics. I am especially happy they are here.

The presence of all of you makes me realize the extraordinary nature of USD. The credentials of a university are its alumni and, as I survey this audience, I appreciate that the University of South Dakota has much of which to be proud.

There are those who think that ''politics'' is a dirty word and ''government'' is synonymous with incompetence. But you know and I know better, that ''politics'' is determining the problems facing the world and deciding what can be done to improve humankind's lot, and ''government'' is the agency through which, when individual efforts fail, we collectively make our nation and world a better place in which to live. And that is what democracy and public service are all about.

While you were a student and, even now, I think of us as partners in a goal to improve government and the world. We know that if government is bad, all other human endeavors will fail. We subscribe to the Athenian oath that we will seek to transmit our community to the next generation greater, better, and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us.

We are here today then as partners in an especially important enterprise, as contributors, indispensable contributors, who have made this renovation of Old Main and this event possible. Many of you, like myself, have great memories of this building. I believe a superior restoration job has been done. I am especially proud of the Governors' Balcony. The idea came to me in June 1996, when, on the retirement of Bob Dole from the Senate, the decision was made to designate a Senate Balcony as the Dole Balcony. USD has had ten of its alumni serve as Governor of South Dakota—Norbeck, Gunderson, Jensen, Sharpe, the two Mickelsons, Anderson, Foss, Farrar, and Janklow. I have been fortunate in knowing six of them. They serve as models of what can be done. Students of the future can receive their inspiration in this room as well as this building. We owe much to many.

Fortunately, USD now is at the threshold of what can be a great future. It reminds me of Shakespeare's ''tide in the affairs of men, which taken at the flood leads on to fortune.'' We are now lucky to have a USD graduate as president. I was tempted to say a ''coyote'' for president but somehow that didn't seem quite right. Jim Abbott was a political science major and is a member of the Farber Fund Executive Board. One wonders why we didn't place more emphasis on selecting one of our own sooner. Jim knows the territory.

There are three other developments which bode well for USD in achieving its goals. The Farber Fund is now approaching $1 million in assets and it takes only my death to put it there. (This is not a suggestion.)

The Fund has done much to stimulate ambition among our students and cause them to heighten their goals. The second development, thanks to Ray Aldrich, is the Chiesman Fund for Civic Education, which has over $400,000 to promote civic education through research and public forums. The third is the selection, by the Board of Regents of the Political Science Department's proposal, for a Leadership Training program as a Center of Excellence providing some $340,000 annually, including the recruitment of new staff.

Thus the Political Science Department and the University as a whole have some unusual opportunities in the near future. Already planned for next year is a lecture program, which involves some of you. The initial response from alumni has been excellent. Old Main is to be the center of student activity, an emphasis much to my liking.

* * * * *

THE BACKGROUND TO KNOW

What is this business about? It's about preparing ourselves and others. There is an awful lot of garbage out there being passed around as information, on the tube, on the web, on the newsstand, and, indeed, in the classroom. We need to ask the right questions. We need to determine priorities. We need to help others to take little for granted.

I had a jolting experience with respect to the background to know. I took a minor in education at Northwestern where I received my BA and MA. To complete the minor, I took ''practice teaching'' and had the luck to do my ''practicing'' at New Trier High School in Winnetka, Illinois. I was an understudy to Laura Ullrich. Although she was a high school teacher, she had a Ph.D. In my evaluation session with her, she was very laudatory, said I had good command of the class, etc. But then she said, ''You have one fault. You don't know your subject.'' That stinging rebuke I have never forgotten. You do need to know your subject. The need for the background to know is imperative. As part of the background to know, you must learn and love to read and write.

* * * * *

My favorite quote is from Elizabeth Barrett Browning: ''Every common bush is afire with God, but only he who knows, takes off his shoes. The rest sit round it and eat blackberries.'' The point is that it is possible to see in every situation intriguing and challenging forces. But you need to see. And that is what education is all about.

In addition to giving a stimulating lecture for all to hear collectively, the teacher must provide individual recognition. If a student calls for an appointment, I do my best to say, ''Can you come over now.'' The student calls when the problem is disturbing him. I like to go to class early, walking down the aisle in large classes, to invite access.

I came from a family with a strong work ethic. My dad, for some 50 years, owned and worked in a grocery store. . . . I worked in the store on Saturdays and summer during high school and during summers through seven years of college.

The experiences in the grocery store taught me many things. the first is the constant need to be a salesman, including of yourself. When Mrs. Peterson came in the store with her list of needs, I always thought, what does she really need that is not on her list, and I made the applicable suggestion. Now, when a student comes into my purview, I think what is a potential career he or she has not thought about, which might be even better than present goals?

In attaining goals it is important to give encouragement. Some time ago, I was going to Pierre by plane from Sioux Falls. A good looking fellow sat down beside me and said, ''Do you remember me?'' I fumbled and said ''Your face is familiar, but I do not recall your name.'' He identified himself and then said, ''I want to tell you what you did for me. Inside the cover of a bluebook, a test I had taken, you wrote 'It begins to look as though you are getting the hang of it.' You have no idea how encouraged I felt at a time I felt discouraged. I have gone on, graduated, and have a successful business in Sioux Falls and Denver.'' I was happy with the compliment, but then I thought of all the other bluebooks that had deserved a similar statement. The position of a teacher is a delicate one.

One of the things I have done at graduation time has been to encourage students by rewarding them with a token gift. Originally, it was a marble owl from Italy, later an onyx turtle from Mexico, and more recently a Dedo gargoyle from Notre Dame. This past year a former student called me from Boston. ''Doc,'' he said, ''when you gave me a turtle, you said, like the turtle you will only make progress when you stick out your neck. Doc, I've made it, and I want you to know I have kept that turtle in sight for twenty years.''

The background to know, fortunately is now easier to acquire, but at the same time there is much more to know. Thanks to technology we have greatly expanded our ability to know. We have access to global knowledge almost instantly. The shortcuts in acquiring knowledge are many and in this fast world the shortcuts are necessary. If you wanted to, you could get up from your seat, walk out on me here and read parts of my speech later on the Farber Fund web page. In the background to know, you must learn and love to read and write and cherish the value of both. As educators and public servants, we must not only acquire and dispense information, but also develop in ourselves and in others the inner hunger and imagination to use information meaningfully. Thus research in all areas including political science is a must and thankfully the USD Governmental Research Bureau, established in 1939, still exists and continues to provide needed studies in government. The Chiesman grant will make it possible to expand our research activities. It is a wonderful opportunity also for USD to promote civic education through public forums not only in Vermillion but throughout the state.

THE VISION TO SEE

The second important point is for one to have the vision to see. The background to know provides the pieces of the puzzle; as with a jigsaw puzzle, the vision to see puts the pieces in their rightful places.

Vision often comes easily. There are obvious reforms that should be made. In the early thirties Jane Addams, the founder of Hull House in Chicago, pointed out the ridiculousness of the American policy of killing little pigs to decrease supply when we had a nation of 12,000,000 unemployed and people starving. Justice Brandeis used to plead for ''education in the obvious.''

I have been enchanted with how the devil took Jesus to the top of a mountain to show him the kingdoms of the earth.

Thus from time to time we need to get to the mountaintops and examine our own problems. Look at South Dakota. The single most important political fact is our population size, only a bit over 700,000, less than the population of cities like Indianapolis, Phoenix, or San Antonio. Yet here we are to govern the 700,000 saddled with 66 counties, 300 municipalities, 900 township governments, and an increasing number of special districts. It is just plain nuts. Compared to Arizona with 16 counties, we should have 10 at most. Cities with populations of under 500 should be disincorporated. And townships have long since lost their reason for being.

E.A. Ross, a prominent University of Wisconsin sociologist, once said, ''Rural Wisconsin resembles a dried up fish pond with nothing but the bullheads and the suckers left behind.'' I wouldn't put rural South Dakota in

the same category as Wisconsin, but there is no doubt that the drain out of population with two-thirds of our counties losing population every census for the past thirty years has caused a loss of leaders.

* * * * *

It doesn't take too much vision to see that on the national level we should make certain that every child up to age 18 has adequate medical attention. And the tuition costs of college students are a national disgrace. Even our best and brightest are graduating with debts in many cases of more than $50,000. If China and Cuba can provide free educational and health costs, we, at least, could drastically reduce tuition costs.

In 1935, when I came to South Dakota, I was impressed by the vision of many of the local leaders. Governor Peter Norbeck was still alive and his record of accomplishment and his belief in what government could do was still remembered. In Vermillion, in the midst of a depression, the town could boast of a recently completed municipal swimming poll, a new Union Building, and a new hospital.

I had the good fortune to know Doane Robinson quite well. His vision of South Dakota included the building of the Missouri River dams, widespread irrigation including much of the land east of the Missouri and west of the Jim, extensive electrical power almost certain to attract a Henry Ford plant, and the use of the Missouri for transportation.

Many of these dreams have not been realized, but some have been. I am impressed with the great potential South Dakota has today. Look at Vermillion. The bridge to the south will open up new economic possibilities along the river itself. The example of Gateway stands out as an example for other industries to emulate. The caliber of our labor supply, the low crime rates, the quality of our labor supply, the low crime rates, the quality of living, the educational system, all make the state and its cities attractive places in which to live. Now is the opportune time to set up think tanks in South Dakota. Some of you have expressed a willingness to serve.

What we need for many of our problems is thus the vision to see. It is absurd to think that the governmental structure the founding fathers created in 1787 in Philadelphia, scared by a pending French revolution, is the best possible for the year 2000. And that much of state and local government should remain, two centuries later, relatively unchanged.

But there is another important ingredient to the vision to see. It is to secure human rights and equality of opportunity. One of the memorable events in my life was sitting beside Phil LaFollette at a graduate political science student session. We were considering at length First Amendment rights. He turned to me and said, ''We are discussing the wrong rights. More important than these are the right to feel secure, have a decent job with just compensation, the right to an education, a home and a family.''

Thus, I think we can conclude that while education is the basis of what we need to know and see, there is another important ingredient, to think of human values and the need to be caring. Life is not worth living if there is not a constant concern for others. I am reminded of one of Senator Karl Mundt's favorite quotes: ''The hermit of God who shuts himself in, shuts out more of God, than he shuts in.''

One of the best ways to provide a new dimension to one's vision to see is to be acquainted with a different culture. That is why the encouragement given to students to travel with funds from the Farber Fund has been so significant. One of my favorite quotes, an inscription on the old Pennsylvania Station in Washington, DC, is: ''He who would bring back the wealth of the Indies must first take the wealth of the Indies with him.'' The requirement of a report upon the student's return has helped to implement that advice.

THE WILL TO DO

This brings me to my third and final point, the will to do. Without action, without implementation, all else becomes pointless. But most of us, burdened by needs of everyday life, are reluctant to do more than will make our own life more comfortable. The lesson from Toynbee is the need to insure that our civilization, our government, reflects citizen involvement, so that future developments of the Hitler type can be and will be resisted. That demands participation of a high order, the lack of which even now threatens our government.

What I am pleading for is a will to do, not only for one's own self but as well for one's community, one's state, one's nation, and indeed, the world. None of us attains his fullest potential. We can be more than we are. We should sacrifice what we are for what we can become.

Winston Churchill said, ''we shall never surrender, never, never, never.'' And, ''There are no hopeless situations, only people hopeless about them.'' There is a need for all of us to continuously explore alternatives. There are many ways to skin the proverbial cat.

George Bernard Shaw's famous quotation provides an important clue: ''You see things as they are, and ask 'Why?' But I dream things that never were and ask 'Why not?' '' I am confident that most of you present here today are ''Why not'' leaders. Part of the will to do is to accomplish through others. I have always believed, as you know, that a college education is a partnership between teachers and students and the success of much of life depends on partnerships. And as Pat O'Brien has noted in his essay in *Dig Your Well Before You Are Thirsty*, Farber Fund contributors have been an amazingly successful network.

An essential ingredient of leadership is enthusiasm. A teacher not sold on the importance of the subject is doomed to be a poor stimulator of students. The key to Nelson Rockefeller's success as New York governor was described as his ''exuberance.'' I like Eisenhower's statement: ''It is not the size of the dog in a fight that counts, it is the size of the fight in the dog.''

The will to do involves leadership. I feel this afternoon that I am surrounded by leaders. The challenge today for professors and students has changed mightily since 1935. The complexity of modern problems demands a higher degree of expertise. Computers have opened up vast areas of information heretofore not available. In some ways, we are swamped. Leadership with guidance is increasingly important. In this world we need to speak out. In politics, if you don't blow your own horn, there is no music.

I have great confidence in South Dakota's potential. But I am equally convinced that without governmental changes of the sort outlined in the Vision to See, that potential will not be realized. I know that the conventional wisdom dictates that it is difficult to make changes in South Dakota. But we have, in my opinion, a population that can be sold. Remember, in 1936 the size of South Dakota legislature was reduced by public vote from 180 to 105 with the loss of 75 legislative seats—an astounding public victory.

I was a participant in the constitutional revision effort from 1969–1975. From a governmental point of view, the reorganizations of the executive and judicial branches of government were remarkable events that received popular approval. It is amazing what little things can help to bring about reform. Ted Muenster recalls that it was a letter from the State Snake Exterminator, who held office with no other employees, asking for a new pickup that made him realize the stupidity of a state administrative organization with over 100 reporting units. Action followed.

In 1982, I had the good fortune to head the successful drive, using the initiative, which changed the basis of our system, of electing legislators, abolishing the block system. It took time and effort but we did the job. What is needed is leadership. I am convinced that we have the ability to change our outmoded method of taxation. There are those in this room who could do it.

This emphasis on leadership is why, as we look to the future, the opportunities now open to USD and especially in political science are indeed attractive. Key to this program is the recruitment of a core group of superior students whose leadership has been demonstrated in high school. As you can readily appreciate this is why scholarship money is a critical need.

* * * * *

With rising tuition costs, few superior students can afford university training without scholarship aid. South Dakota can well afford the investment in such aid. At the present time this state, of its total revenue, devotes 6.5 percent to higher education, the lowest of any state in the region. North Dakota provides 10 percent, Iowa 8.4, Minnesota 6.8 and Nebraska 8.3. As a consequence, compared to surrounding states, our in-state tuition is the highest with the exception of Minnesota.

* * * * *

And thanks to many of you, the support of the Farber Internship and Travel Fund has made possible funding that has enabled more than 500 eager political science students to receive internships, attend state national conferences, and study overseas. It has raised their sights, stimulated their study, and attracted many to careers of public service.

THE FUTURE

It is my hope that here in Farber Hall past traditions will guide future activities to motivate students to become involved and reap the many rewards of public service.

In the evening, I often walk to the Shakespeare garden and then pause at the Quirk carillon. There I am encouraged as I read from Longfellow's Psalm of Life:

Let us then be up and doing,
With a heart for any fate,
Still achieving, still pursuing,
Learn to labor and to wait.

* * * * *

One final thought: It is my hope that in that wonderful and exciting twenty-first century in which you will have an important role, that sometime when the merry feast is on, you may reflect on what we did here on August 1, 1997, and celebrate by imbibing a strawberry daiquiri!

God bless you all and thanks much for attending.

THE FARBER TESTAMENT

To My Students: I believe that dedicated public service is the noblest of the professions. To enter it, whether as academic or as practitioner, is the greatest of good fortune. Thus, I have sought to encourage all in my purview to share the joys and rewards of this commitment.

You who came to me with some inner flame, it has been my mission to nurture, to

feed that flame, and at all costs never to kill it. With all the world's contemporary challenges, the chance to motivate, to stimulate, to kindle, remain the high calling, and ever to remind that in catastrophe there is opportunity, out of weakness can come strength. My hope has been that none of you has left my presence feeling the worse for the encounter.

The keys to a happy, acceptable, and productive life are participation, involvement and concern for others. I have hoped, by example, to inspire you to be change agents. Often your intellect, I know, has been superior to my own; only my experience has been greater and that I have tried to permit by association ''to rub off on you.''

To broaden one's horizons, travel, experimentation, and bold thinking must be the goals. I have sought to teach the importance of the background to know, the vision to see, the will to do. Like others before me I have often learned more from you than you from me. But always, for more than 40 years, has the joint educational venture been intensely human, exciting, and worthwhile. (May 8, 1976).●

NEW STUDY SHOWS HOW MINNESOTA'S CARGILL AND 3M COMPANIES BOOST THE U.S. STANDARD OF LIVING THROUGH THEIR GLOBAL ACTIVITIES

● Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, last week, a Washington-based trade association, the Emergency Committee for American Trade (ECAT), released an important new study on how American companies with global operations increase the U.S. standard of living and strengthen the domestic economy. The study is entitled ''Global Investments, American Returns'' and I highly recommend it to every Member of the Senate

I am proud that two of my state's most successful companies have contributed case studies to this compelling report. Cargill, Incorporated and 3M Company are examples of why America's economic future and an improved standard of living for all Americans depend upon our ability to operate, sell, invest and compete in the global marketplace.

Cargill, Incorporated operates in some 72 countries as a marketer, processor and distributor of agricultural goods and services. The company has been so successful in selling to foreign markets that some of Cargill's fertilizer facilities operate 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. This allows the plants to achieve lower unit operating costs and thereby allows Cargill to deliver a more competitively priced product. If these plants served only the U.S. market, they would sit idle most of the year because fertilizers are required only during very short periods of growing seasons. Cargill's global presence helps generate demand for its fertilizers all year round by serving different parts of the world during different growing seasons.

3M Company produces a large and continually evolving range of technologies and products. For example, the company currently offers more than 900 varieties of tapes alone. More than 53 percent of the company's total sales are from outside the United States. 3M Company's success in operating abroad has meant growth here at home. Efficient foreign distribution, sales, and technical support, and research and development generate increased U.S. production and research and development here at home. For example, 3M's $2.6 billion in Asian-Pacific sales contributes more than $182 million to the company's annual research and development budget of $1 billion—much of which is spent in Minnesota. In addition, finished and semi-finished goods that are manufactured in the United States and then exported help support overseas sales.

Cargill and 3M Company are just two of the American companies profiled in Global Investments, American Returns. The study uses data and business cases to illustrate the importance of operating globally. For example, the study shows that:

Global activities by American companies actually increase investments here at home rather than substitute for them.

The global presence of U.S. firms helps to increase export sales and create additional purchases from U.S. suppliers.

American companies with global operations account for most of the nation's research and development capital investments, and export sales.

American companies with global operations also rely heavily upon U.S. suppliers. These companies purchase more than 90 percent of their supplies—amounting to $2.4 trillion annually—from American companies.

American manufacturers with global operations pay higher wages than do purely domestically-focused firms. For production or blue-collar workers, the difference is 15 percent higher earnings.

I urge all of my colleagues to review carefully ''Global Investments, American Returns.'' It is an important study that should guide America's tax and trade policies. I am especially pleased to learn that ECAT—and companies like Cargill and 3M that contributed to the report—will launch a trade education campaign to help spread the facts and dispel the misconceptions about trade and investment. I am proud that these Minnesota companies are a part of this effort.

I ask that the Executive Summary of the study be printed in the RECORD.

The Executive Summary follows:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In public and private-sector debates over U.S. trade and investment policies, the role in the U.S. economy of Americans companies with global operations[1] has often been misunderstood. Although there is no doubt that the United States plays an important role in the world economy, most Americans are unaware of the critical contributions that trade and foreign direct investment (FDI) of American companies with global operations make to the U.S. economy.

To broaden public understanding of the positive role of these companies, this study expands upon the research in ECAT's previous Mainstay studies in two important ways. First, it focuses on the key issue of the U.S. standard of living. Second, it broadens the scope of the study to include all three major sectors of the economy: manufacturing, agriculture, and services.

There are two key points in Mainstay III. First, by raising U.S. worker productivity, American companies with global operations help raise the U.S. standard of living. Second, because the U.S. and foreign activities of these companies tend to complement each other, the ability of these companies to help raise the U.S. standard of living depends crucially on their ability to undertake foreign direct investment abroad.

Mainstay III is based upon analysis of the investments, research and development, exports, imports, and purchases from suppliers of American companies with global operations and many other data from 1977 through 1994. The primary data source is surveys of such companies conducted by the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) within the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The following sections summarize the major findings and conclusions of the study:

1. SETTING THE STAGE: THE WORLD ECONOMY IN WHICH AMERICAN COMPANIES WITH GLOBAL OPERATIONS COMPETE

American companies today operate in a world economy that is increasingly concentrated outside the United States and that is rapidly expanding its international linkages through FDI and international trade.

The U.S. share of the global economy is shrinking. For decades, the U.S. economy has been growing more slowly than the rest of the world, such that the U.S. share of total world output has been declining. This share was approximately 50 percent in 1945, but is down to only 20 percent today.

FDI and trade help U.S. integration into the global economy. American companies with global operations have helped integrate the United States more closely into the growing world economy. Average annual outflows of FDI from the United States quadrupled from the 1960s through the 1980s, and total trade as a share of U.S. output rose from 5.6 percent in 1945 to 24.7 percent in 1995.

By participating in the world economy, American companies with global operations maintain a significant presence in the United States.

Most employment is in the United States, not abroad. In 1977, U.S. parent companies accounted for 72.8 percent of total worldwide employment of American companies with global operations and by 1994, they accounted for 74.3 percent of the total.

Profits earned by foreign affiliates are mostly repatriated. In 1989 (the most recent year for which these data are available), U.S. parents repatriated 72.8 percent of their foreign affiliates' net income.

Most intermediate inputs are purchased from domestic suppliers, not foreign suppliers. From 1977 through 1994, more than 90 percent of all intermediate inputs purchased by U.S. parents came from American suppliers, not foreign suppliers.

Overseas, American companies with global operations are located primarily in developed countries, and the sales from these operations are overwhelmingly in local markets.

Most affiliate activity abroad is in developed—not developing—countries. In 1994, developed countries hosted nearly two-thirds of U.S. foreign affiliate employment and accounted for more than three-quarters of foreign affiliate assets and sales.

Foreign affiliate sales are mostly abroad, not back to the United States. In 1994, only 10 percent of total U.S. affiliate sales went to

the United States. The other 90 percent stayed abroad, and fully 67 percent of all sales were within the host countries of the foreign affiliates.

II. THE IMPORTANCE OF AMERICAN COMPANIES WITH GLOBAL OPERATIONS TO THE U.S. STANDARD OF LIVING: GENERATING HIGH PRODUCTIVITY

American companies with global operations contribute in several important ways to the U.S. standard of living, and this contribution is larger than that of purely domestic firms.

Investment in Physical Capital. American companies with global operations undertake the majority—57 percent in most years—of total U.S. investment in physical capital in the manufacturing sector.

Research and Development. American companies with global operations perform the majority—between 50 percent and 60 percent—of total U.S. research and development.

Exports. American companies with global operations ship the large majority—between 60 percent and 75 percent—of total U.S. exports. Their foreign affiliates are important recipients of these exports; their share has increased to over 40 percent today.

Imports. American companies with global operations also receive a sizable share of U.S. imports—roughly 30 percent. These imports benefit the U.S. economy in many ways, including giving U.S. companies access to foreign-produced capital goods and technologies.

All these activities help increase U.S. productivity and thereby enhance the U.S. standard of living.

III. THE IMPORTANCE OF AMERICAN COMPANIES WITH GLOBAL OPERATIONS TO THE U.S. STANDARD OF LIVING: PAYING HIGHER WAGES

American companies with global operations pay their workers higher wages than those paid by comparable American companies without global operations.

A study of 115,000 U.S. manufacturing plants indicated that U.S. parent plants pay comparable workers higher wages than purely domestic plants. Production workers receive an average of 6.9 percent less at comparable domestic plants employing more than 500 employees and 15.2 percent less at comparable domestic plants employing fewer than 500 employees.

Non-production workers receive an average of 5.0 percent less at comparable domestic plants employing more than 500 employees and 9.5 percent less at comparable domestic plants employing fewer than 500 employees. These results control for possible wage differences attributable to variations across plants in age, industry, location, and size. In light of all these controls, it seems likely that these wage differences are attributable to workers at U.S. parents being more productive than workers at comparable domestic plants.

IV. THE IMPORTANCE OF AMERICAN COMPANIES WITH GLOBAL OPERATIONS TO THE U.S. STANDARD OF LIVING: LINKAGES TO AMERICAN SUPPLIERS

In addition to directly raising the U.S. standard of living themselves, American companies with global operations may also raise the U.S. standard of living through their interactions with domestic U.S. suppliers.

Evidence exists that companies benefit from being exposed to other dynamic, successful firms. Exposure to ''worldwide best practices''—whether those best practices are in the same country or abroad—tends to foster innovation, cost control, and other improvements that boost firm productivity.

The very large amount of purchases of intermediate inputs from domestic suppliers by U.S. parents of American companies with global operations suggests the possibility that U.S. domestic suppliers have sufficient exposure to these high-productivity parents to realize some productivity gains. For the past 20 years, U.S. parents have purchased over 90 percent of their intermediate inputs—$2.4 trillion in 1994—from domestic, not foreign, suppliers.

V. HOW FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT ABROAD COMPLEMENTS U.S PARENT ACTIVITY AND CONTRIBUTES TO A HIGH STANDARD OF LIVING IN THE UNITED STATES

Because the U.S. and foreign activities of American companies with global operations tend to complement each other, the ability of these companies to raise the U.S. standard of living depends crucially upon their ability to undertake FDI abroad.

Analysis of BEA data, academic research, and case studies of 10 major American companies demonstrates that U.S. FDI generally complements rather than substitutes for U.S. parent activity. Within American companies with global operations, affiliate expansion generally triggers in U.S. parents additional investment, research and development, trade, and input purchases from domestic suppliers. As stated earlier, these activities are key determinants of the U.S. standard of living.

Restrictions on FDI that prevent U.S. companies from expanding abroad generally will reduce U.S. parent activity and thus, lower the U.S. standard of living.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The United States must continue to strengthen the open system of global trade and investment in order to maximize the contributions of American companies with global operations to an improved standard of living for all Americans. To that end, U.S. trade and investment policies should take into account the following recommendations based on the research and findings in this study:

The U.S. government should maintain its open trade and investment policies. Moreover, these policies should recognize the ways in which trade and foreign direct investment benefit the U.S. economy.

The U.S. government should continue to negotiate aggressively for more open foreign markets and should persuade foreign governments to end restrictions on trade and investment. Removing these restrictions will create a ''win-win'' situation that benefits both foreign countries and the United States.

The U.S. government should strive to continue to harmonize its international trade, investment, and tax policies. In the case of American companies with global operations, this harmonization should take into account the many ways that their foreign operations tend to complement their U.S. activities.

Given that most services are inherently nontradable, firms in these industries must invest abroad to serve global markets. Accordingly, efforts to liberalize trade and investment should focus special attention on the unique needs of U.S. services industries.●

HARRY M. CLOR PROFESSORSHIP

● Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate Professor Harry M. Clor of Kenyon College in Gambier, Ohio, on the establishment of the Harry M. Clor Professorship in Political Science. This coming weekend, Professor Clor's colleagues and students will gather in Gambier to honor him upon his retirement for his many years as an outstanding professor of political philosophy and constitutional law.

In addition to his many years as one of Ohio's exceptionally dedicated teachers, Professor Clor is also a distinguished scholar and author of books and numerous articles on constitutional law and public morality.

Ohio has always been fortunate to be the home for many outstanding colleges and universities. I am pleased to recognize Kenyon College and its Department of Political Science as they honor the distinguished service and teaching career of Professor Harry M. Clor. ●

TRIBUTE TO VFW POST #5245 ON THEIR FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the North Haverhill, New Hampshire, Post #5245 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) on the occasion of their fiftieth anniversary. As a veteran and member of the VFW myself, I honor these men for their selfless commitment to their country and to their community.

Since 1948, the original membership of 30 World War Two veterans has grown to 160 veterans of World Wars One and Two, the Korean War, the Vietnam War and the Gulf War. I would like to specially recognize the charter members that have been there from the beginning—William Fortier, Leo Fortier, Fred Robinson, Paul LaMott, Everett Jessman, Maurice Bigelow, Willis Applebee, Ernest Hartley, William Harris, Laurent Fournier, Clifford Sawyer and Leon Dargie. All have served our country valiantly, and now tirelessly serve the Upper Valley, devoting endless hours to their community.

The extent of the Post's involvement is endless, helping not only veterans, but anyone to whom they can lend a helping hand. They are especially involved with the youth of the Upper Valley. Their youth programs projects stretch from donating American flags to schools and teaching proper flag etiquette, to sponsoring essay contests and awarding college scholarships. They also sponsor Cub Scout and Girl Scout troops and instruct youth on bicycle safety. In addition, members host meals at a local soup kitchen, visit nursing homes and the VA Hospital and also visit shut-ins. They transport the elderly to appointments, donate wheelchairs and walkers and distribute food baskets on Thanksgiving.

For half of a century, these members have exemplified goodwill and concern for their neighbors, and their efforts will no doubt continue for the next fifty years. I congratulate Post #5245 for their steadfast service to the Upper Valley. New Hampshire and the United States are truly indebted to the North Haverhill Post #5245 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and I am proud to represent them in the U.S. Senate. ●

RETIREMENT OF RABBI JACK ROSOFF

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate an esteemed New Jerseyan, Rabbi Jack M. Rosoff, on the occasion of his retirement after 34 years of service at Congregations B'nai Israel in Rumson, New Jersey.

I really got to know Rabbi Rosoff when he organized a community-wide response to acts of vandalism committed against B'nai Israel and the neighboring Catholic church in Rumson. I spoke at the rally that Rabbi Rosoff put together condemning the desecration, and was very moved by his dedication to fighting bigotry.

Rabbi Rosoff's accomplishments during his tenure at B'nai Israel, for which he has just been elevated to Rabbi Emeritus status, are almost too numerous to mention. He has multiplied the membership of his congregation by hundreds and provided Sunday school opportunities for over 300 students. He developed the Israel Scholarship Program there, enabling all students in their junior year to spend six weeks in Israel.

Beyond those achievements, Jack has been a counselor and friend to the members of his synagogue. He has rejoiced with them in times of happiness and has been a comfort in times of grief.

Rabbi Rosoff has served on the boards of various organizations in Monmouth County, including Riverview Hospital, the Mental Health Association, the Day Care Center, the Clergy Advisory Council of the local Planned Parenthood, as well as being the founding member of the Greater Red Bank Interfaith Council.

Rabbi Rosoff should be honored by all of us not only for his 34 years of service to B'nai Israel, but for his community-wide leadership and civic involvement. I am pleased to congratulate him again on his retirement, and wish him well in this next chapter of his life. ●

ISRAEL'S 50TH BIRTHDAY

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 30, 1998, the St. Louis Jewish Community will be celebrating Israel's 50th Birthday. My home State of Missouri is especially excited for the event since President Harry S. Truman played a large role in the formation of the State of Israel.

The 50th anniversary is very significant because it marks the reestablishment of Jewish Sovereignty in the ancient Jewish homeland, the reasserting of Jewish peoplehood after the devastation of the Holocaust, the fulfillment of the Zionist vision, the blossoming of Jewish creativity and community. The Jewish Federation of St. Louis is the central planning and fundraising agency of the St. Louis Jewish Community. This outstanding organization has coordinated the St. Louis Israel 50th anniversary celebration congregation.

I congratulate the State of Israel and the Jewish community for 50 years of democracy. Additionally, I commend the Jewish Federation of St. Louis for its leadership during this exciting time. I wish them continued success in future years of Statehood.●

NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST 1998 TRANSCRIPT

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I had the privilege of chairing the 46th Annual National Prayer Breakfast held here in Washington, D.C., on February 5, 1998. This annual gathering in our Nation's Capital is hosted by Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives weekly prayer breakfast groups.

Once again, we were honored by the attendance and participation of the President and the First Lady, as well as the Vice President and Mrs. Gore. Our colleague, Senator CONNIE MACK, inspired and encouraged us with his remarks, and we were challenged by the prayer offered by Dr. Billy Graham.

This year we welcomed over 3,600 individuals from all walks of life, and from all 50 states and U.S. territories and many countries around the world. So that all may benefit from this special gathering, I request that the text of the program and a transcript of the 1998 proceedings be printed in the RECORD.

I understand that the Government Printing Office estimates that it will cost approximately $1,426 to print this transcript in the RECORD.

The material follows:

NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Chairman: The Honorable Daniel K. Akaka

Pre-Breakfast Prayer
Mr. Robert L. Parker, Businessman, Oklahoma

Opening Prayer
General Hugh Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

BREAKFAST

Welcome
The Honorable Daniel K. Akaka, U.S. Senate, Hawaii

Remarks—Senate and House Breakfast Groups
The Honorable Bobby Scott, U.S. House of Representatives, Virginia

Old Testament Reading
The Honorable Don Gevirtz, Former Ambassador to Fiji

Duet
Randy and Gae Hongo

New Testament Reading
Dr. Dorothy I. Height, National Council of Negro Women

Prayer for National Leaders
The Vice President of the United States

Message
The Honorable Connie Mack, U.S. Senate, Florida

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Closing Song
The Honorable Daniel K. Akaka, Randy and Gae Hongo (all join in)

Closing Prayer
Dr. Billy Graham

[Audience, please remain in place until the President, Mrs. Clinton and other Heads of State have departed]

ROBERT PARKER. May we ask you now to join us in prayer? Please join us in prayer, if you will.

Lord, as we gather together for the beginning of this new day, we pause now to listen to you. Thank you for being with us now, and thank you for being in this room. Your presence gives us hope and encouragement. Whenever we gather in your name, there is excitement. Help us capture that excitement today, to the betterment of the lives of us all.

We all need your help. We all need your guidance. Give us the wisdom to be more like you in all that we do. And we especially thank you for sharing your servant, Billy Graham, with us. He represents you well, helps all of us be better followers. Thank you for listening. Thank you for showing the way. And thank you for the many blessings you have bestowed upon us. In your name we pray, Amen.

ANNOUNCER. Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the First Lady of the United States, and Mrs. Gore. (Applause.)

Senator AKAKA. Will you all be seated, please. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Dan Akaka. I'm the convener of the United States Senate Breakfast Group and chairman of the National Prayer Breakfast. I want to say welcome to all of you here this morning.

On behalf of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, I welcome you to the 46th annual National Prayer Breakfast. We're happy to have you here on this special day. Robert Parker presented the pre-breakfast prayer this morning, and we are happy to have you here. At this time, General Hugh Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, will offer the opening prayer. General?

Gen. HUGH SHELTON. Let us pray.

O Lord, our strength and our redeemer, we come together today to pray for strength and guidance in a difficult and challenging world. Though we have come far, we have so far to go to realize your plan here on Earth. Lord, we ask your help and guidance for all those who have been chosen to lead our people all over the world. And grant that we may follow with humble and willing hearts to do the work that must be done to preserve the blessings of peace and to share the gifts that you have given us. May those chosen to lead, lead with wisdom and compassion, not in pursuit of wealth and power, but guided by your righteous word and walking in your upright ways.

Today we pray for your blessings on all our men and women in uniform, at home and abroad. Keep them safe as they keep the peace. And keep them strong to carry the burdens that must be borne in a troubled world. And Father, though we are of many faiths, we have but one prayer, and that is to share your peace with people everywhere. May you stretch your loving hands over friend and foe alike and bring us together in the spirit of truth so that in our time we may know your peace.

Now we pray that you would bless this food to the nourishment of our bodies and our help to thy service. These things we ask in your name. Amen.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, General Shelton. You honor us very much with your presence here at this prayer breakfast.

Please enjoy your breakfast. Our program will resume in a few minutes.

[Breakfast.]

Senator AKAKA. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It is a wonderful privilege for me to welcome all of you this morning to the National Prayer Breakfast. I particularly want to greet our international guests who represent over 160 nations. And everyone attending the prayer breakfast for the first time, I say again, welcome. (Applause.)

This morning we gather almost 4,000 strong from all 50 states, commonwealths and the U.S. territories and nations around the world to reaffirm our faith, seek spiritual support for our President and leaders in our country, and share fellowship and friendship with one another.

We are honored to have the President and First Lady and the Vice President and Mrs. Gore as our guests. In attendance we also have members of the Senate and the House, officials from the President's Cabinet and leaders of our armed forces, responsible student leaders and leaders from all facets of society throughout the United States.

We're also pleased to welcome the President of Albania, former heads of state, cabinet ministers, parliamentarians, members of the diplomatic corps, educators and business, labor and religious leaders from around the world.

Permit me to introduce the people sitting at the head table. And I'll do it quickly from my left to my right. Randy and Gae Hongo; General Hugh Shelton and Mrs. Carolyn Shelton; Dr. Dorothy Height; Mrs. Marilyn Gevirtz; Ambassador Don Gevirtz. (Laughter.) In a timely fashion to the Vice President and Mrs. Gore. (Laughter.) Congressman BOBBY SCOTT; the President and First Lady; my better half, Millie; Senator CONNIE MACK and Priscilla Mack; Dr. Billy Graham; Mrs. Catherine Parker and Mr. Robert Parker. (Applause.)

As chairman, I want to express my deepest appreciation to all participants this morning for sharing your faith with us. Looking upon this august and joyful assembly, I see the universality of the prayer breakfast, the coming together of people of different nations, faiths and cultures, and the power of love and consideration for one another.

I am reminded of the passage from Psalm 33, verse 12: ''Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord, the people he chose for his inheritance. From heaven, the Lord looks down and sees all mankind. From his dwelling place, he watches all who live on Earth. He forms the hearts of all and considers all their works.''

God's love for all of us is everlasting, for all men and women from all nations. This perfect love fills our hearths, prepares us for the challenges we face each day and opens our minds to God's wisdom. As we seek to love God and one another, let the spirit of this prayer breakfast enrich us, strengthen us and lead us on life's journey, where we are never alone.

It is my privilege at this time to introduce to you the honorable BOBBY SCOTT, Congressman from Virginia, who is leader of the House Prayer Breakfast Group. He will speak to us on behalf of the House and the Senate Prayer Groups. Bobby?

Representative BOBBY SCOTT. Thank you, Senator. Mr. President and Mrs. Clinton, Mr. Vice President and Mrs. Gore, other dais guests, ladies and gentlemen, I'm delighted to join my congressional colleagues from the House and the Senate Prayer Breakfast Groups in bringing you another welcome to the 1998 National Prayer Breakfast. This is our 46th year of coming together to commemorate the value of prayer in both our personal lives and our work on behalf of the people of this nation.

We are joined by national leaders of business, labor, government, religion and other walks of life throughout the United States and over 16 of countries around the world. Members from the U.S. Senate first met for prayer and divine guidance during World War II. The House organized a weekly prayer group shortly thereafter, And both groups have continued the practice of weekly prayer breakfasts, meeting for breakfast, prayer and fellowship.

Since those first meetings in the face of a great national crisis, the need for a prayer group and the benefit of fellowship and prayer have been recognized in Congress. From the beginning of the prayer breakfast groups in both chambers, members of all faiths have come together to hear testimonials of faith and challenge and to seek guidance and strength from each other.

What we discuss and exchange in those meetings stays in those meetings. So members are free to share with each other, and we do. The weekly prayer breakfast provides members with one hour during the week in which we can relax without the presence of the media and without regard to partisan political affiliation. And so I can assure you that it is one hour that many of us look forward to each week.

As an example of the typical weekly prayer breakfast in the House, we begin with Scripture and a prayer and a report on member's faith and challenges, such as illness, or illness or death within their family, so that we can offer our prayers and support to that member. We also sing a hymn or, as more accurately can be described, we make a joyful noise. (Laughter.) And at each breakfast, one member is invited to speak for 15 minutes to share a personal challenge, reflection or faith experience with the group.

The weekly Senate and House prayer breakfasts have met separately since their inception. However, in 1953 both groups decided to combine forces and hold the first National Prayer Breakfast. President Dwight D. Eisenhower attended that first National Prayer Breakfast, and every President since has attended each year's breakfast.

President Clinton and Vice President Gore—(applause)—President Clinton and Vice President Gore have continued that unblemished record through their presence here today, reflecting their recognition of the value of prayer in our professional and personal lives. So I know I speak for all of my colleagues in both chambers when I say that we are delighted to host this 46th National Prayer Breakfast. You strengthen us and uplift us with your presence.

So, again, welcome. And may God bless you, Thank you. (Applause.)

Senator AKAKA. We will now hear an Old Testament reading from the Honorable Don Gevitz, an outstanding businessmen from California and our former United States Ambassador to the Republic of Fiji, the Kingdom of Tonga, the Republic of Nauru and the Republic of Tuvalu.

Ambassador DON GEVIRTZ. Thank you, and good morning. Mr. President, my exboss, Mr. Vice President, distinguished guests. What is an ex-U.S. Ambassador born into the Jewish faith doing at an event like this? (Laughter.) Appreciating the power of interfaith brotherhood and fellowship inspired by the National Prayer Breakfast movement.

At the core of my philosophy are the two words I want on my tombstone. They are, ''He grew.'' Although my readings this morning are from the Old Testament. I would like to borrow for just a moment from the rich tradition of Luke, chapter 2, verse 52, in the New Testament, because of its clear statement about human potential. ''Jesus grew in wisdom and statute and in favor with God and man.''

I think that this is God's wish for all of his children. Proverbs in the Old Testament clearly identifies the characteristic a person must have to grow to realize his human potential. Proverbs, chapter 20, verse 5, points out that ''The purposes of a man's heart are deep waters, but a man of understanding draws them out.'' Additionally, verse 15 says, ''Gold there is, rubies in abundance, but lips that speak knowledge are a rare jewel.''

Proverbs, chapter 18, verse 15, suggests that ''The heart of the discerning gains in knowledge. The ear of the wise men searches for knowledge.'' And Proverbs, chapter 28, has important lessons of growth. Verse 14 says, ''Happy is the man who is never without fear. He who hardens his heart will fall into distress.'' And verse 22 says, ''He chases after wealth the man of greedy eye, not knowing that want is overtaking him.'' And finally, verse 1 says, ''The wicked man flees when no one is after him. The virtuous man is bold as a lion.''

The Bible has much wisdom for that person whose objective is growth. Samson had great credentials, but in Judges, chapter 16, verse 20, he learns that the Lord has left him. Consequently, he was remembered only for what he might have been. I want to be remembered for realizing my full potential, for earning those words on my tombstone, ''He grew.''

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Senator AKAKA. Renowned inspirational signers Randy and Gae Hongo have traveled all the way from Honolulu to be with us this morning. They are joined this morning by their son Andrew, who came here from Yale University to sing as a family. The Hongo family will offer us a musical reflection, of their own arrangement, the phrase, ''Ua mau ke 'ea 'o ka 'ania 'I ka pono,'' which translates from Hawaiian into ''The life of the land is perpetuated in righteousness.'' It was first uttered in thanksgiving by King Kamehameha III. It is now the motto of the state of Hawaii. Its insight holds true today. The Hongo family.

[Song.]

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much. Randy, Gae and Andrew. It is now my pleasure and great honor to introduce to you Dr. Dorothy Height, President of the National Council of Negro Women and a true national treasure, who will read from the New Testament.

DOROTHY HEIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, distinguished guests and friends. Our New Testament reading is from Matthew, the 25th chapter, the 34th to the 45th verse. It answers the question that all of us ask ourselves every day as we try to be truthful, to be faithful, to serve our God. It answers the question that we have with each other, whatever our differences: What is our obligation? What must be our commitment?

''Then the king will say to those on his right, 'Come, you who are blessed by my father. Take your inheritance, the kingdom prepared for you since the creation of the world. For I was hungry and you gave me something to eat. I was thirty, and you gave me something to drink. I was a stranger and you invited me in. I needed clothes and you clothed me. I was sick and you looked after me. I was in prison and you came to visit me.'

''Then the righteous will answer him, 'Lord, when did we see you hungry and feed you, or thirsty and give you something to drink? When did we see you a stranger and invite you in, or needing clothes and clothe you? When did we see you sick or in prison or go to visit you?' The king will reply, 'I tell you the truth, whatever you did for the least of these, my brothers of mine, you did for me.

''Then he will say to those on his left, 'Depart from me, you who are cursed, into the eternal fires prepared for the devil and his angels. For I was hungry and you gave me nothing to eat. I was thirsty and you gave me nothing to drink. I was a stranger and you did not invite me in. I needed clothes and you did not clothe me. I was sick and in prison, and you did not look after me.' They also will answer, 'Lord, when did we see you hungry or thirsty or a stranger or needing

clothes or sick or in prison, and we did not help you?' And he will reply, 'I tell you the truth, whatever you did not do for one of the least of these, you did not do for me.'''

[The reading of his word. (Applause.)]

Senator AKAKA. Thank you, Dr. Height. The Vice President and I entered Congress together as members of the class of 1976. As a Congressman and Senator, he faithfully participated in both the House and Senate breakfast groups. Today we are honored to have him offer the prayer for our national leaders. So it is with pleasure that I welcome the pride of class of '76—(laughter)—and an esteemed friend, the Vice President of the United States, Albert Gore, Jr. (Applause.)

VICE PRESIDENT GORE. Thank you very much. I'm glad to be introduced by the pride of the class of '76. Thank you very much, and to Mrs. Akaka, to the President and First Lady, to Congressman Scott and to Senator and Mrs. Mack, to Dr. Graham and all the members of the clergy who are present, members of the cabinet, Speaker Gingrich and members of the House and Senate who are present.

It is, of course, humbling to join with so many people of all faiths to rededicate ourselves to God's purposes and to reaffirm the ultimate purpose of our lives, to glorify the creator and to love the Lord our God with all our hearts, with all our souls and with all our minds, and to love our neighbors as ourselves.

I believe God has a plan for the United States of America and has since our founding. Our mission has always been to advance the cause of liberty and to prove that religious, political and economic freedom are the natural birthright of all men and women and that freedom unlocks a higher fraction of the human potential than any other way of organizing human society.

And I believe that God has given the people of our nation not only a chance, but a mission to prove to men and women in all nations that people of different racial and ethnic backgrounds, of all faiths and creeds, can not only work and live together but can enrich and ennoble both themselves and our common purpose and to prove, in the words of Jesus, ''that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee.''

Yet too often we lose sight of our common purpose and seek to make our public discourse one of meanness and not of meaning, one of bitterness and invective, not of faith and love. James Madison, one of our founders, wrote, ''A zeal for different opinions concerning religion, concerning government, an attachment to different leaders ambitiously contending for preeminence and power, have in turn divided mankind into parties, inflamed them with mutual animosity, and rendered them much more disposed to vex and oppress each other than to cooperate for their common good.''

We've seen those animosities unleashed by the whole continuum of human difference—differences of parties, opinion and faction, differences of nationality, religion, language and gender; and the most visible and therefore most persistent differences of all, those of race and ethnicity.

Overcoming those differences, fulfilling the mission that is ours in human history, must be achieved ''not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, sayeth the Lord of hosts.'' It requires a dedication to faith and trust in God.

And so, speaking for my own faith in Jesus Christ but acknowledging and respecting all of the faiths represented here, I offer this prayer for our nation and its leaders and ask you to join with me.

God, who through thy saints and prophets has spoken to us in days of old, speak to us again in this hour. Teach us to be peacemakers and agents of reconciliation. Show us how to live out your commitment to the poor and to the oppressed. Inspire us to overcome the fears that have long bound us to small visions and tiny dreams. Save us from the differences that can obscure our common purpose and serve as an excuse and trigger for the unleashing of the evil that lies coiled in the human soul.

Help us to overcome evil with good. Deliver us from the wanton selfishness that would make us rich in things but poor in spirit. Grant us wisdom and courage for the living of these days. We pray for all who are given the responsibility to lead our nation and the other nations of this world. Help all of these leaders to seek out your will and give to all of them the strength to live in your way in our world. In your name we pray, Amen. (Applause.)

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President. It gives me great pleasure to introduce our featured speaker this morning. Senator Connie Mack is a source of inspiration and strength in our Senate Prayer Breakfast Group. As our planning committee discussed whom to invite to address the breakfast, our focus turned inward. Connie has a wonderful message, and we are so grateful that he agreed to share it with us this morning. I give you my friend, the honorable Connie Mack. (Applause.)

Senator MACK. Mr. President, Mrs. Clinton, Mr. Vice President, Mrs. Gore, ladies and gentlemen of the head table and guests from throughout our land and from across the globe. This is a distinct honor for me and true privilege to have the opportunity to speak with you this morning.

There are several people that I would like to introduce before I begin my remarks, and in a sense it is an expression of the love and affection that I have for my family. I am one of eight children. Three of my brothers are here this morning: My brother Dennis, my brother Andy and my bother John. I am not quite sure where they're seated. (Applause.) All together.

I have an older sister who is a Catholic nun who could not be with us today. And John is a trained Baptist minister. (Laughter.) So I think you can get the feel that there have been some interesting discussions—(laughter)—about religion in our lives.

As I thought about what I would share with you this morning, I decided, rather than to give some speech on politics and government, that I would share with you my own personal quest for a deeper understanding of the teachings of Jesus Christ.

When I use the word ''share,'' this is something, frankly, that is pretty new to me. And when Danny called me and asked me if I would do it, frankly, there was no choice other than to say yes. But I must say to you, I felt a sense of terror go through my being. I'm an individual who has held my spiritual beliefs, my religious feelings and training, inside. I was not a person who shared those thoughts and ideas with anyone else, to the point that—and I see Don Nickles out there somewhere this morning—I can remember saying to Don before one of our policy committee lunches, when he asked me if I would give the blessing, I said, ''Don, I would rather not.''

And I don't know whether the men in the audience have had the experience of thinking about asking their wives to pray with them. We were having a discussion, a few of us in our Bible study and prayer breakfast, about prayer and about our prayer together, and I said to them, ''Isn't it strange? I find it difficult to say to my wife Priscilla—we've been married now 37 years—for some reason there was an incredible sense of vulnerability that kept me from turning to her and say, 'Would you be willing to pray with me?''' I am pleased to say that I did ask her, and we do pray together.

Again, I don't know whether you have shared the same feelings that I have had, but there have been many times in my life where I sensed that there was a void, that there was a part of me that I wasn't dealing with, that there was a part of me that I did not understand. But there is also a part of me that said I want to get in touch with that part of me.

And it is the prayer breakfasts and the Bible study group that helps me deal with that void, if you will. I was struggling really to have a deeper understanding of the word ''love.'' What does love really mean? Who is in control of my life? Like I suspect most of us in this room, and maybe especially at the head table, we have steadfastly tried to stay in control of our lives throughout our entire lives. What is the meaning of God's will? How do you know what God's will is?

I want to touch on those points as I go through my remarks. But I also want to recognize—I mentioned Don Nickles a moment ago, and another colleague of mine in the Senate, Dan Coats, who never lost faith in me. No matter how many times they would ask and I would refuse to join them in Bible study or the prayer breakfast, they never gave up. ''Connie,'' they said, ''you would love this. This is exactly what you need.'' And finally, one day I said yes.

And it's because of Dan and Don and Danny and others like them who kind of guided me along the path to a deeper understanding that I can honestly say to you today that on October the 26th, 1995, my life began anew. And I want to tell you about that, a very special meeting of Bible study. And again, a couple of our members, Dan Coats and I were engaged in a very focused discussion. Interestingly enough, today I cannot remember what the discussion was about. But I sure know it was focused. (Laughter.)

One of the thoughts that occurred to me as our meeting was starting was, as I looked around the room to see who was there, Danny Akaka had not come yet. And Danny Akaka is a person who I have gotten to know and to love and deeply appreciate as a result of our experiences today at both prayer breakfasts and Bible study. And Danny wasn't there, and I kept thinking, ''I hope he comes today. I hope he comes today.'' Again, mind you, now, this focused discussion that was taking place.

As it ended, seated right next to Dan Coats was Danny Akaka. And I was kind of stunned that you were there. I didn't know how you had gotten into the room. And I was expressing to him my sense of love and appreciation that he was with us.

Lloyd Ogilvie at that time, I think sensing something special, said to us, ''Is there anyone here this morning who would like to deepen his commitment to Jesus Christ?'' The immediate thought that went through my mind was, ''It ain't me, buster.'' (Laughter.) I mean, that's it. ''It ain't me, buster.'' Lloyd said I'm now going to be remembered as the guy that said, ''It ain't me, buster.'' (Laughter.)

But as soon as that thought went through my mind, no sooner had it gotten out of mind, I said, ''I want you to pray for me.'' And I had no idea what was going to happen after that. Lloyd asked me to move my chair to the center of the room, and all of my colleagues gathered around me, placed their hands on my shoulders and prayed for me.

It is difficult and, frankly, impossible to explain to you the emotion that I felt at that moment. But the one thing I do recall is, contrary to what you might think, there was a sense of something flowing out of me. And later, when I thought through what that experience was, I know what it was. It was that

desire of keeping control of my life, that I was the one that was in charge. I was willing to give up that control. And on that day, October the 26th, 1995, I know that that control went out of my life and I began the process, began the process, of turning my life over to God.

After that very moving experience, Priscilla and I had the opportunity to be in Vermont on vacation. And I had gone out to go skiing that morning. And I got to the foot of the mountain that was in Vermont. It was −10 degrees. The wind was blowing 15, 20 knots. And I say, ''I've got to be crazy out here skiing.'' I went back home. I picked up a book that Lloyd Ogilvie had written called ''The Greatest Counselor in the World,'' a book about the Holy Spirit.

And later that day there was a sense of restlessness in me, and I decided to go for a walk. And I put on some snow shoes. Now, being from Florida, I had not had that experience before. (Laughter.) And I walked out into the forest, along the sides of the mountain, by myself. As far as I could see, there was nothing but the beauty and cleanness of the white snow. The only sounds that I heard were the sounds of nature. The trees—I never heard this before, but the trees actually rubbing against each other as there was a breeze that made its way through the forest.

I made my way down into a ravine, and there was a small stream that was making its way; a few spots where the water could be seen around the ice, and the sounds of that stream bubbling up. And I stopped there, wanting to get on my knees and to pray. But I must say to you, I was terrified about getting on my knees with those snow shoes. And with the snow, I didn't think I could get back up. (Laughter.)

So I stood there, and I literally raised my hands to the heavens and prayed that the Holy Spirit would fill me. There was a rustling of the wind. I'm not trying to hold out any kind of mystery, but there was a rustling of the wind that gave me a sense that, in fact, I was being filled with the Holy Spirit. And as I look back on those days, I now recognize that the fruits of the Holy Spirit have become part of my day—love, peace, joy, patience, goodness, kindness, gentleness, faithfulness, self-control. They are part of my day because that's God's will.

I remember not long after that that Priscilla and I had the opportunity to be at the movies. And the movie was over and I turned to her and I said, ''I am filled with a sense of joy.'' What was rather startling about that was that later I said to Priscilla, ''Do you know that that's the first time in over 17 years that I have truly had a sense of joy?''

My brother Michael had died of cancer in 1979. And for all those years, I carried around in me the gloom of his death. But I recognized, at the moment that I turned to Pris and said, ''I feel a sense of joy,'' that the gloom had been lifted and God's love had replaced it.

I want to now share a couple of experiences with you to show you how my life has been changed as a result of this. Some of you in the Senate may remember a fellow by the name of Butch. He was a bus boy in the Senate dining room. I got to know Butch over the years as I would come in and have breakfast, and he would bring me a paper and we would chat for a few minutes.

One day I was having lunch with some of my colleagues in the Senate dining room, and one of the waitresses came up to me and handed me a note and said that Butch was seriously ill. Well, I put the note in my pocket. And as I left the Senate dining room, I stopped and talked with the waitress and she once again said that Butch was seriously ill. And I could sense she was saying—she had given me the note that said he was at, I believe, Southeast Greater Hospital here in Washington. I could tell she was really saying to me, ''Can't you go see Butch?'' And like I'm sure most of my colleagues, my initial reaction was one of ''Where am I going to find the time?''

Well, again, the note's in my pocket. I went home. The following morning I looked at my schedule. There was a gap in my schedule. And I thought, ''Well, maybe I ought to just go see Butch.'' So I went over to the hospital. I went up to Butch's room. A nurse was there giving him a shot. And I looked at Butch, his eyes wide open, almost transfixed on the television set. And within a few seconds, it became obvious to me that Butch was about to die.

It was just the two of us. I had asked the nurse how he was doing as I walked in, and she said, ''He was fine yesterday. His family came from Chicago. They had a great time together.'' But clearly things had changed. And again, it was just Butch and myself. And I thought, ''I cannot leave him here alone, to die alone.'' And I walked over to the side of the bed. I took Butch's hand, held it, rubbed his arms, and tried to comfort him in the sense of saying, ''It's all right. You're at peace now. You'll be joining your God and your creator.'' And Butch died just a few moments after that.

The nurse came back in the room. She called one of, I believe, his aunts. His aunt actually was already on her way. She walked in within a few minutes. I explained to her that Butch had just died. I hugged her, embraced her, and again told her that he died in peace and he died in the hands of his God and creator.

As you can imagine, as I made my way back to the Senate and back to the dining room so I could tell his colleagues on the staff of the dining room that Butch had died, as you can imagine, I was asking myself several questions. How did you get there that day? Why were you there at that moment? What was it that you were supposed to learn from that experience?

And what I learned from the experience is something that's all too obvious, but sometimes we have a tendency to forget, and that is that in God's eyes, as it should be in our eyes, that all of us are equal. It makes no difference whether you're a United States Senator or whether you're a buy boy in the United States Senate. (Applause.)

Another experience that happened to me was again an acquaintance of mine, and frankly, an acquaintance of many people in this room, Tom Korologos. Tom's wife Joy passed away as the result of melanoma, the same kind of cancer that killed my brother in 1979. I picked up the phone and I called Tom and gave my condolences and expressed my concern and my love for him.

I ended up going to Joy's funeral service. And again, I had maybe met Joy once. And as I was sitting in the church waiting for the service to begin, I was again asking myself—again, to the members of the House and Senate, and clearly the President and the Vice President, understand this incredible demand on us for our time. And it's almost a natural thing to kind of ask every place we go. ''Why are we here?''

And so as I'm, waiting for this service to begin, I'm asking those same kind of questions. Why am I here? Well, once the service began and the family began to express their deep convictions to their Lord and maker, it was pretty obvious to me why I was there. I wrote down some notes that morning during the service of some feelings that went through my mind, and I want to share from the notes that I made that morning. So they may not be grammatically collect, so bear with me. I'm going to read them exactly as I wrote them.

''Was there because I have replaced the love of self with the love for others. Being at the funeral service for Joy Korologos also allowed me to recognize that doing God's will is not the pursuit of the grand, but rather one day at a time, one moment at a time, pursuing God's will; that if I allow God to guide me one step at a time, I will eventually get to where he wants me to be in my life. And if I truly believe, if I truly believe this and follow that belief throughout each day, I will be free. I will be at peace; the ultimate freedom, to be free of worldly desires.''

I also learned that this moment was a life-changing moment. As I said above, pursue God's will one step at a time and not worry or even wonder where it may lead me. This is a radical departure for me from my previous life—management by objectives, goal-setting, state a goal, a target, an objective, and then pursue it. Now for me it is ''Help me, dear God, to do what is right, what is in your will at this moment, and then my life will take care of itself.''

To me, this was a great revelation. Two points that I would want to build on here for just a moment; that doing God's will is not the pursuit of the grand. I don't know about you, but as I have thought about trying to understand God's will, I always had this idea that there was some huge event in the future that I was called on to participate in, always trying to figure out what it was; never could do it.

And now I understand that if each day I will pursue God's will—and I think you're beginning to understand why I said a moment ago that when Danny called me and asked me if I would be willing to give this address this morning, I had no choice but to do it, because on that day my sense was it was God's will that I speak this morning. So, again, I try to live each day now attentive, attentive to the needs of others, attentive to the needs of my colleagues in the Senate, trying to make sure that I am not so busy that I don't hear their cries for help.

I'd like to close my thoughts here this morning with another personal experience. And I want to use 1 Corinthians, chapter 13, verse 13, which I suspect that many of you are familiar with. I have used 1 Corinthians 13 at both weddings and at funerals, because in essence it is all about life. ''And now abide faith, hope, love, these three. But the greatest of these is love.''

And I don't know about you, but I've always kind of wondered what makes love the greatest of those three. And I will try to explain in just a couple of minutes at least what my understanding of that Bible reading is.

Both my mother and father died during these past 20 months or so. In a conversation in Bible study, as I was expressing my concerns about having a deeper understanding of love and trying to understand my relationship with my God and maker, it was said to me that sometimes it's helpful to think about your loving relationship with your father here on Earth. It may give you some insight into your loving relationship with your God.

Well, as would, I think, be natural when you see your parents heading towards the last moments of their life, it's fairly easy to get into a discussion about what love is all about. And I found out one of the things that there's a big difference between the love between a mother and her son and a father and his son. My mother loved me unconditionally. It made no matter what I did. She was there to comfort me, to love me, to protect me.

But with my father, frankly, it was different. And I didn't understand what that relationship was. Was the relationship one

that was based on a need for reward? Was I looking for respect? What portion of it was fear? And as I watched my father over the last 20 years or so and recognized that he did over 17,000 hours of volunteer time at the local hospitals, and I heard people talk about seeing my father helping them being wheeled down to surgery or to the X-ray, I sensed that there was a strong sense of love that my father had expressed during those years.

And I finally understood the significance of the meaning of love and why love is so important, because frankly love is a collection of all the graces that God has given us in which we express in action, that we act in behalf of or on behalf of those less fortunate than us, those who at the moment need our assistance. And so for all those years I saw this outpouring of love from my mother and father and I understood then why I love my father and why I loved my Father in heaven, and it is very simple. It is because they so deeply loved me.

Thank you. Have a great day. (Applause.)

Senator AKAKA. Ladies and gentlemen, it is now my privilege and high honor to introduce the President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton. Welcome, Mr. President. (Applause.)

President CLINTON. Thank you very much. Thank you very much to my good friend and sometimes golfing partner, Senator Akaka, to all the members of Congress here, Reverend Graham, other head table guests and ladies and gentlemen.

For five years now, Hillary and I have looked forward to this day. For me it's a day in which I can be with other people of faith and pray and ask for your prayers, both as President and as just another child of God. I have done it for five years, and I do so again today.

At each of these breakfasts, from our shared experiences and our prayers, God's grace always seems to come, bringing strength and wisdom and peace. Today I come more than anything else to say thank you. First, thank you, Connie Mack, for your wonderful message and the power of your example. I also thank all of you here for many things in the last five years and ask your help in helping us to work together to make our nation better, and the work that God has sent me to do and you to do.

I thank you for helping me to strike blows for religious liberty—with the work so many of you in this room have done to help us to protect the rights of federal employees, to follow their faith at work, our students in school. In particular, I want to thank Reverend Don Argue, the former President of the National Association of Evangelicals and Rabbi Arthur Schneier and the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Newark, Theodore McCarrik, who next week will go to China to look into religious practices there and to begin a dialogue there in hopes that a part of our relationship with China will be about our concern for the kind of religious liberty we have practiced here this morning. (Applause.)

I thank so many of you in the community of faith who have worked with the government in partnership to help move poor families from welfare, from welfare to work, to honor the Scripture that our friend Dorothy Height read today. And I ask more of you to join in. I thank those of you who have been responsible for working with me—and I see Senator Grassley out there and Harris Wofford is here—to bring communities of faith into the circle of national service.

We now have 5,000 young Americans working with religious organizations earning the Americorps scholarship to go to college with after they serve with their community of faith wherever they live in America. And the Congress has provided for many more positions, and I ask you to help us to enlist more young Americans to give meaning to their lives, to live out their faith, and to help make our country a better place.

I thank you for the prayers, the letters, the scriptural instruction that I have gotten from so many of you and many others around this country in recent weeks and indeed in the last five years. And I ask that they continue.

Finally, I couldn't help thinking when Connie Mack was talking that what we all need very much is to take what we feel when we're here every year and keep it close with us when we leave here every year—day in and day out, week in and week out, in good times and bad. And I ask for your help in that.

We have a difficult decision we are facing now, as a country and our administration, because of the concern all Americans have that we not expose our children, if we can help it, to the dangers of chemical and biological warfare. And last night I came across a scripture verse that a friend of mine sent me in the last 72 hours that I had not had the chance to read—a prayer of King Solomon that I ask you to keep in mind as we face this decision. Solomon said in I Kings, ''I am only a little child, and I do not know how to carry out my duties. Your servant is here among people you have chosen—a great people—too numerous to count or number. So you give your servant a discerning heart to govern your people and to distinguish between right and wrong, for who is able to govern this great people of yours.''

I also ask for your prayers as we work together to continue to take our country to higher ground and to remember the admonition to Micah, which I try to repeat to myself on a very regular basis. I ask your prayers that I and we might act justly and love mercy and walk humbly with our God. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Sen. AKAKA. Thank you very much, Mr. President, for that wonderful message of gratitude and prayer. Thank you for sharing your wisdom and inspiration. And thank you for making the time to join us this morning. And I want you to know that we are praying for you.

To offer the benediction, I'm thrilled to welcome back to the National Prayer Breakfast a man whose presence inspires all of us to good and whose wisdom brings us comfort and hope, Dr. Billy Graham. We love you, Dr. Graham. (Applause.)

Dr. GRAHAM. Thank you very much. And as far as I'm concerned, I give all the glory and praise to God. (Applause.) It's been my privilege to be at many of these prayer breakfasts, I suppose more than any other person. (Laughter.) In fact, they told me that when I was interviewed by Senator Sam Nunn the other day about the history of the prayer breakfast, that they thought I was the oldest person that had attended the prayer breakfast for so long. And I suppose that's right. And they couldn't find any others that had been to so many, and so they asked me if I would be interviewed for the Archives—(laughter)—and the history of the prayer breakfast. (Laughter.)

But I don't know when I've been so moved at a prayer breakfast as this one. I feel the Holy Spirit is bringing us together and speaking to us. (Applause.) Not only different religious backgrounds, but different political backgrounds. And here I see members of all parties smiling, listening to the Word of God, listening to this magnificent word on the love of God an the love that he can put in our hearts.

And when the President spoke, I could not help but think of the various times that I've had the privilege of being with him alone to talk, read the Bible and pray. And I know that he's sincere in what he had to say. And to Vice President Gore and to all of you that are here, many of you, I look at you and I think back to times we've been together in years past, in your state, in your town. I'm an evangelist. I travel from place to place and preach the gospel. And it's the same gospel I started with. The human heart is the same. The gospel is the same. It never changes, that God loves you no matter who you are. (Applause.)

So I'm going to ask that we have this closing prayer together.

Our Father and our God, as we come to the close of another National Prayer Breakfast, we pause to give you thanks for the opportunity we have had to come apart from our daily tasks and turn our minds and our hearts to you. Give us a holy dissatisfaction with anything less than your perfect will that we heard expressed a few moments ago.

Help us to see ourselves as we truly are in your sight, as men and women who are subject to the temptations of pride and power and flesh and who need your forgiveness and your strength. Help us remember that you teach us that we're all sinners and everyone who is in this place needs repentance and forgiveness, including me.

May we all come to the cross. And by your grace, help us to turn to you for the forgiveness and mercy we need. We thank you for the promise of the Bible, that if we truly confess our sins that you're faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

As we leave this place, help us to find in you the strength we need to live as we should. Give us motives that are pure, lips that are honest, lives that are blameless, and hearts that are filled with compassion and love.

We pray for the millions of the hungry and poor in our world and for the thousands even in our own land and for all who are oppressed, that we will not be deaf to their cries. We pray today especially for President and Mrs. Clinton, for Vice President and Mrs. Gore, for the Cabinet, for members of the Supreme Court, for the Congress and all others to whom you have given responsibility in our land, and for their families who many times have to bear the burden of responsibility.

Give them strength and courage, integrity and wisdom, as they face the complex problems of our nation and our world. And, O Lord, we pray that we will be faithful in praying that if it be thy will that thou would bring peace to the Middle East. And we pray that if it be thy will, that we'll not have war, as President Yeltsin has warned us about.

Send the strong driving wind of the Holy Spirit across our land, to bring us a new breath of joy and freedom in serving you. May we see a national, an international revival. Renew our vision. Restore our faith. Rekindle our desire to love and serve you and serve each other. As we leave this place, may we commit ourselves afresh to him who alone is the way, the truth and the life.

And now, may the Lord bless you and keep you, the Lord make his face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you, the Lord lift up his countenance upon you and give you peace. In the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, Amen. (Applause.)

Senator AKAKA. Thank you. Thank you very much, Dr. Graham. This concludes the 46th National Prayer Breakfast. I ask all of you to please rise and remain standing until the President and Mrs. Clinton and Vice President and Mrs. Gore depart from the ballroom. (Applause.)

I thank all of you for your participation and your cooperation. Trust in God and carry his love with you and share it with others today and every day. Thank you very

much. This concludes the National Prayer Breakfast. (Applause.)●

CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

● Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I became an official cosponsor of S. 1645, the Child Custody Protection Act introduced by Senator ABRAHAM. This bill addresses a very critical problem impacting our nation's families and their children, abortion. Under this bill, adults who take children across state lines to receive an abortion without the knowledge of their parents would be committing a federal offense.

Currently, 22 states require parental notification if a minor is going to receive an abortion. Yet, each and every day adults help thousands of children travel across state lines to receive abortions in states which do not require the notification of a parent.

Being an ardent opponent of abortion, I am gravely concerned about the children who are being taken by adults, who are not their parents, into different states to receive abortions. This process is wrong and must be stopped. We cannot allow adults to circumvent state laws by transporting a minor across state lines for an abortion without parental consent and involvement.

The decision to have an abortion is a critical decision, one which I personally hope that women of all ages would elect not to have. However, despite an individual's personal opinion on abortion, the majority of Americans, myself included, believe it is imperative for minor children to involve their parents in this life altering decision. According to a 1996 Gallup poll, 74 percent of Americans supported requiring minors to get parental consent for an abortion. According to the Supreme Court, ''the medical, emotional, and psychological consequences of an abortion are serious and can be lasting; this is particularly so when the patient is immature.'' Clearly, our nation's children should not be kept from their parents when making an important life decision with such broad ramifications as an abortion.

This is why I am cosponsoring Senator ABRAHAM's bill, the ''Child Custody Protection Act.'' This bill would make it a federal offense to transport a minor across state lines with intent to avoid state laws requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion.

It is my firm belief that we must pass this law and stop people from bypassing the laws of our individual states. This legislation protects our children from making a life altering decision without the guidance of their most trusted advisors, their parents.●

TRIBUTE TO THE NATIONAL ORDER OF WOMEN LEGISLATORS

● Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate and commend the National Order of Women Legislators and the Georgia Chapter of the National Order of Women Legislators as they celebrate today 60 years of accomplishments since the organization was founded in 1938.

This year also marks the 150th Anniversary of the first Women's Rights Convention ever held to discuss the prohibitions then in force on women voting, holding public office, owning property, signing official documents, and receiving a formal education.

The women who have served in the National Order of Women Legislators and the Georgia Chapter of that organization have overcome gender barriers and are true champions of the women's rights movement. I applaud these women for fighting for and delivering to the women of this nation the right to vote, and a vital voice in local, state and national government.

The Declaration of Sentiments issued by the 1848 convention held in Seneca Falls, New York, launched a movement that unleashed and enhanced the myriad of talents and intellectual abilities already possessed by women throughout the United States. The resulting Women's Rights Movement has had a profound and undeniable impact on all aspects of American life, and has opened new and well deserved opportunities for women.

I would especially like to commend the spirit and hard work of Rebecca Latimer Felton, the first Georgia woman elected to the United States Senate in 1992, two years after women gained the right to vote; Florence Reville Gibbs, the first Georgia woman to serve in the United States House of Representatives (1940–1941); Viola Ross Napier, the first woman to serve in the Georgia House of Representatives (1923–1926); Susie Tilman Moore, the first woman to serve in the Georgia State Senate (1933–1934 and 1939–1940); and Grace Towns Hamilton, the first African American woman elected to the Georgia House of Representatives (1966–1984).

I am honored to serve in the United States Senate with nine remarkable female Senators—Sens. BARBARA BOXER (D–CA), SUSAN COLLINS (R–ME), DIANNE FEINSTEIN (D–CA), KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON (R–TX), MARY LANDRIEU (D–LA), BARBARA MIKULSKI (D–MD), CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN (D–IL), PATTY MURRAY (D–WA), and OLYMPIA SNOWE (R–ME). I also commend the 55 female members of the U.S. House of Representatives and female members in the Georgia State Legislature.

Members of National Order of Women Legislators serve as role models for women throughout this nation and the entire world. I ask my colleagues to join me today in saluting and congratulating the National Order of Women Legislators and the Georgia Chapter of the National Order of Women Legislators for setting a positive example to all Americans.●

TRIBUTE TO THE HOLLIS/BROOKLINE STUDENTS FOR THEIR PARTICIPATION IN ''WE THE PEOPLE . . .''

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to 27 students from Hollis/Brookline High School for winning the right to represent New Hampshire in the ''We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution'' national competition in Washington, D.C.

As the New Hampshire state champions, the Hollis/Brookline students will compete against more than 1200 students from across the United States in a three-day national competition May 2–4, 1998. Students will demonstrate their knowledge of the Constitution and its relevance to contemporary issues in front of simulated congressional committees composed of constitutional scholars, lawyers, journalists, and government leaders.

The distinguished members of the Hollis/Brookline team are: Meghan Amber, Wayne Beuner, Randy Brown, Jonathon Davies, Meredith Edmunds, Jaima Elliott, Emily Gagne, Sara Godshall, Laura Hacker, Alex Harris, Nicola Huns, Craig Kimball, Sarah Kirby, Anna Klein, Brannon Klein, Maya Levine, Sara Liebling, Kass Litwin, Heidi Packard, Amy Rattin, Jared Rosenberg, Nadine Schneider, Carrie Spaulding, Kent Springfield, Anja Helene Stronen-Lien, Amy Tozier and Amanda Vormelker. Their teachers, Helen Melanson and Joel Mitchell, deserve special recognition for their role in preparing these students for this intense constitutional testing. I applaud them for their commitment to enriching the lives of these students.

As a former high school civics teacher myself, I recognize the value of instilling an understanding of the Constitution in students. The ''We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution'' program provides an excellent opportunity for students to gain an informed perspective about the history and principles of our nation's constitutional government. I wish these young constitutional experts from Hollis/Brookline High School the best of luck in preparing for the national finals. It is an honor to have them represent New Hampshire, and I wish them luck as they prepare to be America's leaders in the twenty-first century. I am proud to represent them in the U.S. Senate.●

A LITERACY SUCCESS STORY

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Senator JEFFORDS and Senator REED, I would like to submit this statement given by Ms. Raynice Brumfield of Washington, D.C. for the RECORD. Ms. Brumfield testified at this morning's Labor and Human Resources Committee hearing on Reading and Literacy Initiatives. I commend her for the progress she has made as a participant of the D.C. Head Start Toyota

Family Literacy Program. Her testimony was very moving and she is a success story for others to emulate.

Mr. President, I ask that Ms. Brumfield's testimony be printed in the RECORD.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF RAYNICE BRUMFIELD, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS HEAD START ''TOYOTA FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAM''

Ms. BRUMFIELD. Thank you Senator Jeffords and members of the Senate Committee, for inviting me to share my story with you. By virtue of the fact that I can sit before you to take part in this occasion, proves that without a program like the Toyota Family Learning Tree, I would still be just stuck in the house, taking care of my two small children, faced with a future that didn't look bright.

I am Raynice Brumfield. I am a 25 year old single parent with four children; James 10, Delonte 8, Kiara 5, and Tyrone, age 4. I was born in Washington, D.C., and attended the public schools there. When I was 15 years old I became pregnant with my first child. Between the ages of 15 and 17, I worked at various jobs. I soon found that I could not make enough money to afford food, clothing, baby supplies and living expenses. At age 17, I became pregnant with my second child. By 19, I enrolled in one of the District of Columbia's public vocational schools. I dropped out of that school because the staff was not sensitive to the needs of young mothers, and I did not feel safe in that environment. I started to receive Public Assistance when I was 19, and soon became pregnant with Kiara, and the next year, Tyrone.

The opportunity to further my education, while being close to my children, seemed like a dream come true. On September 30th, 1996 my children and I started school. The adult education teacher (Mrs. Grace Blackwood), and the parenting instructor (Mrs. Irene Ball), greeted me warmly. I was quiet, scared, and very unsure of myself.

When I entered the program my reading and math levels were at a second grade level. My teachers, and the program's coordinator, Mrs. Peggy Minnis, made the other parents and me feel like we could accomplish anything. They made sure that we maintained a positive self esteem. We were encouraged to set goals, and they helped us work to meet each goal. The work was hard, but soon it became a daily routine, for my children and I to sit at the kitchen table, learning together. As my reading skills improved, I began to enjoy reading stories to my children at home, and going into their classroom to practice and share my new skills with any child who wanted to crawl up in my lap, to hear me read. The harder I worked, the easier it became to help my older children with their homework. I began taking part in the activities at their school. My children's home library grew from 2 or 3 books, to over 40. Reading stories or telling stories to my children has helped in their language development and provided me with practice in reading.

The parenting course helped me understand child development. Understanding the stages that my children were going through, helped me to be patient, understanding, and able to predict their behavior. I learned that there are whole new worlds that my family and I can explore for free. We visit these new worlds every weekend inside the public library. I tell my children that even though we don't have a lot of money, we can still visit far away places and people. Most importantly, we enjoy these adventures as a family. All of my children have their own library cards. I've become a responsible citizen who has a voter registration card and I vote.

As a result of being in the Toyota Family Literacy Program, new worlds have opened up for me and my family. Worlds that were once just part of my day dreams. . . . are now a reality. I am proud to tell you that I now read on a 10th grade level, and my math skills have increased to a 9th grade level. I received an award from my children's school, which honored me as being, ''Most Active Parent in Schoolwide Activities.'' I have volunteered more than 200 hours in my children's school. My children's report cards and teacher comments are no longer negative, but positive. I was invited to speak at last year's 27th Annual Congressional Black Caucus Legislative Conference in Washington, DC, by New Jersey's Representative Donald M. Payne. I shared how Toyota through the National Center for Family Literacy and the Head Start Program are helping to improve literacy in the African American community by focusing on young children and their parents. That speech was placed on the E-mail system of every congressman and representative in Congress. Now the most powerful people in the United States have heard about the wonderful work that all of you in this room have dedicated your lives to.

In January, the Head Start Program invited me to be a guest speaker at their staff development activities. Again, I told how family literacy programs make futures bright. I just took the GED examination on the 16th.

My adult education teacher encouraged me to apply for an intensive training program through the YWCA's Non-Traditional Jobs For Women Program last school year. I was accepted into the program, and have completed the training, which prepared me to be trained as a carpenter, plumber, mason, or electrical worker.

Upon notification of having passed the GED, I have been promised priority consideration for a non-traditional job at George Washington University (in the District of Columbia) through a partnership that has been set up between our program and the university. I will have the opportunity to work for no less than $12.00 per hour, have paid leave and benefits for my entire family.

I will gain experience, meet new people, and most importantly, the opportunity to continue my education free of charge. Upon advancement in my job, my children will be able to attend George Washington University and get their college education for free.

The partnership between Head Start, the National Center for Family Literacy and the Toyota Corporation have made my future look bright. By nurturing the promise of providing a quality education to my children and me, they have given me empowerment through Literacy.●

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—H.R. 2646

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of March 27, 1998, the Chair appoints the following Senators to serve as conferees to H.R. 2646, the Education Savings Act for Public and Private Schools.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. ALLARD) appointed Mr. ROTH, Mr. MACK, Mr. COATS, Mr. GORTON, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. BINGAMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Republican leader, pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 208 of the 105th Congress, appoints the following Senators to the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem: The Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 208 of the 105th Congress, appoints the following Senators as ex-officio members of the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem by virtue of their positions on the Committee on Appropriations: The Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS); and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), Ranking Minority Member.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination on the Executive Calendar: Calendar No. 578.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that any statements relating to the nomination appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination was considered and confirmed, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Togo Dennis West, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on February 24, 1998, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs held a hearing on the nomination of Acting Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs Togo D. West, Jr. be the permanent Secretary of that agency. The committee carefully evaluated the nominee and his statements before the committee. It reviewed Mr. West's submissions of his background and financial interests and the investigation completed on all Presidential nominations and conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As a result, the committee voted unanimously on April 21 to report favorably to the full Senate the nomination of Togo D. West, Jr. to be the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has been without a permanent Secretary since Jesse Brown resigned in July 1997. This is too long a period for any department of the Federal government to be without its senior leader and manager. It is especially true for the Department of Veterans Affairs which is in a period of major transition

of its health program from inpatient to outpatient care in a period of a declining real budget. In addition, the Department's administration of its benefits programs has been seriously challenged and is in need of major restructuring and effective leadership. Also, the Department, like other federal departments and agencies, faces a major hurdle in adjusting its computer-based information systems to the Year 2000.

It appears to me that Togo D. West, Jr. has the prerequisite qualifications to meet these challenges, to lead the Department, and to provide the health and benefits services which our veterans have come to expect and deserve.

Mr. West has been serving as Acting Secretary since January 2, 1998, pursuant to a December 2, 1997, Presidential directive under authority of the so-called ''Vacancies Act,'' 5 U.S.C. 3348. He concurrently has been serving as Secretary of the Army, a position he has held since November 1993. He relinquishes that position upon being sworn in as Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. West's background is extensive and impressive. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army Field Artillery Corps upon graduation from college and following law school, he was called to active duty in the Army's Judge Advocate General Corps. In 1975, he served in the Department of Justice as an Associate Deputy Attorney General and in 1977 he was named General Counsel for the Navy. In 1979, he served as the Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense and Deputy Secretary, and in January 1980 was appointed General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Mr. West is an articulate and dedicated public servant. I believe that he will serve well the Department and our country's veterans. Therefore, I thank my colleagues for their support of this nomination.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I'm delighted to join the Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Mr. SPECTER, in bringing before the Senate the nomination of Togo D. West, Jr., to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs and urging his confirmation.

Mr. President, Togo West has a long history of serving his country and America's service members. He began his career as an Army lawyer from 1969 to 1973, first as part of the Army Judge Advocate General's Corps and later with the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs. He left the Army in 1973, but never strayed far from public service. In 1975, he served in the Department of Justice as Associate Deputy Attorney General. In 1977, he was appointed to serve as the Department of the Navy's General Counsel. From there, he also served as the Special Assistant to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense, and in 1980 he was appointed General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Most recently, Togo West served our country as Secretary of the Army, a position he held beginning in 1993, until President Clinton appointed him Acting Secretary of Veterans Affairs on January 2, 1998. As Secretary of Veterans Affairs, West will be responsible for safeguarding and improving the VA's system of delivering health care and benefits to America's 26 million veterans. VA is the second largest federal agency, employing almost 235,000 people, many of them veterans themselves.

Togo West will be filling the vacancy left by Jesse Brown, the former Secretary of Veterans Affairs. Jesse Brown has always been a tireless veterans advocate, and his leadership and energy are missed by veterans and others who also fight on behalf of veterans.

Mr. President, Togo West has a wonderful opportunity to serve the veterans of our Nation in this new capacity. He has demonstrated himself to be a person of the highest integrity with extraordinary leadership skills. President Clinton has shown great confidence in him, his work, and his commitment to veterans by nominating him to serve in this important position. I concur with the President who has said that Togo West ''has always understood the special responsibility we owe to our men and women in uniform both during and after their years of service.'' His unique perspective and experience will serve him well in meeting the challenges that lie ahead.

Mr. President, I am proud of the confirmation of Togo West. I thank my colleagues for their unanimous support of this nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT 105–42

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following treaty transmitted to the Senate on April 28, 1998, by the President of the United States: Treaty with Brazil on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters (Treaty Document No. 105–42.)

I further ask unanimous consent that the treaty be considered as having been read for the first time; that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered:

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Federative Republic of Brazil on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Brasilia on October 14, 1997. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

The Treaty is one of a series of modern mutual legal assistance treaties that the United States is negotiating in order to counter criminal activities more effectively. The Treaty should be an effective tool to assist in the prosecution of a wide variety of modern criminals, including those involved in terrorism, other violent crimes, drug trafficking, money laundering, and other ''white-collar'' crime. The Treaty is self-executing, and will not require new legislation.

The Treaty provides for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance available under the Treaty includes:

(1) Locating or identifying persons or items; (2) serving documents; (3) taking testimony or statements of persons; (4) transferring persons in custody for testimony or other purposes; (5) providing documents, records, and items; (6) executing requests for searches and seizures; (7) assisting in proceedings related to immobilization and forfeiture of assets, restitution, and collection of fines; and (8) any other form of assistance not prohibited by the laws of the Requested State.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and give its advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 28, 1998.*

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 1998

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11:45 a.m. on Wednesday, April 29. I further ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted and the Senate then resume consideration of the Smith-Hutchison amendment No. 2314 to the NATO enlargement treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. SNOWE. I further ask unanimous consent that at 11:45 a.m., the Senate proceed to a rollcall vote on or in relation to the Smith-Hutchison amendment, with 2 minutes equally divided for debate prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will resume consideration of the NATO enlargement treaty at 11:45 a.m. tomorrow morning. At 11:45 a.m., the

Senate will immediately proceed to a rollcall vote on, or in relation to, the Smith-Hutchison amendment No. 2314 offered earlier today. The leader has indicated that he hopes that the Senate will complete action on the NATO expansion treaty by tomorrow evening or the close of business Thursday at the latest. Senators with amendments are encouraged to come to the floor to offer and debate those amendments so that good progress can be made during Wednesday's session. Therefore, Senators should expect rollcall votes throughout Wednesday's session on amendments to the NATO enlargement treaty or any other legislative or executive items cleared for action.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:45 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. SNOWE. 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 7:28 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, April 29, 1998, at 11:45 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 28, 1998:

STATE DEPARTMENT

MARI CARMEN APONTE, OF PUERTO RICO, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.

E. WILLIAM CROTTY, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BARBADOS, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY TO BARBADOS, THE COMMONWEALTH OF DOMINICA, THE STATE OF GRENADA, ST. KITTS AND NEVIS, SAINT LUCIA, SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES.

JEFFREY DAVIDOW, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO MEXICO.

JOHN O'LEARY, OF MAINE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHILE.

ARTHUR LOUIS SCHECHTER, OF TEXAS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE BAHAMAS.

CONFIRMATION

Executive Nomination Confirmed by the Senate April 28, 1998:

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

TOGO DENNIS WEST, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

THE ABOVE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEE'S COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.