

gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] said, and refer to the assertions of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] with reference to oil and Desert Storm and carry him back to my remarks regarding Angola, which we just visited under the aegis of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa.

I would say to my colleague from Texas [Mr. PAUL] that we get 7 percent of our oil in the United States from Angola. The U.N. peacekeeping mission there does not have one American soldier involved at all, and that helps us to maintain that level of civility.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me conclude, and again, there are consensus-breakers, and I think the diplomats and the leaders of the U.N. need to be on notice that, if they continue the social engineering, one, they will not get their arrearages; and, secondly, the efforts that the gentleman from Texas is undertaking will gain support among the American people, and I think at some point there will be an effort to take us out of it and to severely restrict our funding to it. But right now I think we ought to try to reform it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I certainly will support some of these reforms, especially in curtailing some of these funds going to abortion. Certainly that would be repugnant to me. But still, I go back to the issue of the cost. Yes, we want to do good, but can we do this by harming poor people in this country, because when we tax and take money from this country, we really do contribute to problems in this country, unemployment, inflation, deficits; and this is all part of the picture.

So can we morally justify injuring our people here at home with the pretense that we are doing good overseas?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, if I could reclaim my time, the bottom line is, it is a very modest commitment. When we juxtapose foreign aid to the rest of the budget, it is about 1 percent, it is not very much. We are talking about, and I believe we ought to be our brother's and sister's keeper. There are times when we need to become involved. And when there is a humanitarian crisis, it behooves us to be out there first and foremost with all of the possible medicines, foods and the like.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I certainly agree that we should have concern. If we left more money in the hands and pockets of the American people, they would be charitable, and I do believe we would help them. I believe when we take money from poor people, put it in the hands of government and give it to another government, that is when we get into trouble. If we left more money in the hands of

the American people and allowed them to be charitable, I believe the outcome would be much better.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in opposition to the gentleman's proposal. He certainly has made a lot of strong arguments that we recognize. However, I just want to remind the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] that there is a test force at work to try to put severe conditions into reforming the United Nations, to make it more effective, to make it more cost-effective as well.

We will have a separate bill on the U.N. arrearages coming up very shortly, and we will have an opportunity to debate that at that time. But in that bill I hope the gentleman will watch closely for the conditions that we are trying to impose on the United Nations to do some of the things the gentleman is concerned about, to make certain there is not going to be waste and that there is going to be a more effective administration.

I think this amendment could harm our vital interests. If we can keep people talking to each other and keep them apprised of some of the problems around the world, we are going to save them from going into hostile action, that would cost us even more than the U.N. problems are costing us today. I hope that the distinguished gentleman will bear that in mind as he looks forward to what we can do about reforming the United Nations.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I do not serve on the Committee on International Relations, and I have deferred in the past to debates on these issues. However, sincere as I believe my colleague from Texas is, I think he is absolutely dead wrong. I would just say that I believe in the sincerity of the amendment; I just think it is dead wrong.

As a former Peace Corps volunteer, I do not want to live in these United States the way I lived and saw the absolute abject poverty that exists around the world. There is no poverty close to the kind of poverty we see in Africa and other areas of the world. We need the United Nations. We need not be the world's policeman, we need not be the world's peacemaker; we need to join with others in sharing that responsibility.

I was here during the awful tragedy in Somalia, and that was not the fault of the United Nations; that was the fault of our own policy and how we carried it out. I agree with those who say the United Nations needs to be more efficient, the United Nations needs to be more effective. We need to be active partners in the United Nations. Frankly, we need to pay our debts to the

United Nations and be the world leaders that we should be and set the example we should. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York controls the time.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I have no false illusions about the amendment, but I think it is very important to talk about these issues, because I do believe that I am on the right track when it comes to what is authorized in the Constitution and, also, what is very popular with a lot of Americans. I think that is important. People have a hard time when they see money going to programs like this, they have a great deal of trouble accepting it.

The end of this will come, not because I say so or not because my amendment will pass, but all great nations finally fall when they get too stretched out financially and in their foreign policy and in their military, and we are vulnerable to that. We have great deficits, bigger than are admitted, and we are on a course. We have not really attacked the budget, we are not cutting back.

It was suggested earlier that this was just a small amount. Well, every bill is just a small amount when we look at a \$1.7 trillion budget; so it is a small amount, but it continues to add up. Eventually great nations fall when they overextend. I fear for that, I fear for America, because I believe we are on the wrong track.

I do not believe we should be the policeman of the world. I do not believe the programs have been all that successful, and we should do our very best to debate this. If nothing else, maybe some of the reforms will do some good if we do not have my way now. But someday we will, because we are going to run out of money.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a situation where with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, some people in this country, some Members of Congress, feel as if we can crawl back into a continental shell and ignore the rest of the globe. The reality is, unlike at any time in history before today, this economy and the survival of America as a leader of the world is dependent on our international involvement. When we look at the jobs that are produced as a result of trade globally, it is because of America's foreign policy leadership that we have markets in the world unmatched by any other country.

The U.N. is an instrument of America's interest. We have a control in that body unlike most international organizations that give us veto power. The question is whether or not this country is better off dealing with the crises and