

During the Cold War, it served to stand guard and to deter attack and that attack was deterred; and it saved lives and it helped us come to the end of the Cold War. But the Cold War is over. The price we paid for NATO in the tens of billions of dollars was worth it back then. It is not worth it now.

In fact, what NATO today is is nothing more than a subsidy for the defense of Western Europe and in Europe as a whole. They can afford, our European friends can afford to pay for their own defense now. When NATO was first created, they were coming out of World War II, their economies were in a shambles; and yes, we stepped forward to protect the world against communism, just as we stepped forward to protect the world against Japanese militarism and Nazism. We can be proud of that, and we can be proud of the role NATO played. But today, the purpose NATO was created for has passed away, and the Europeans can afford to pay for their own defense. By staying in NATO, we are going to continually be involved in missions like those in Kosovo and Bosnia, right in our European friends' backyard, and we end up paying a major portion of that battle in Kosovo and Bosnia. That makes no sense.

Our European friends are richer than we are. The European governments have many, many more services for their people than we have for our own people, because we are spending that money trying to police the world. By keeping NATO going, it just reinforces that policy that the United States is going to be the policeman of the world.

Furthermore, by expanding NATO the way this bill is proposing, we are slapping Russia in the face. Come on. Come on, now. NATO was established to counter the Soviet Union, and now the Russians have done what we always wanted them to do: cast off this dictatorship. And what do we do? We try to expand this military alliance right into their front yard. That is wrong.

Russia has disbanded the Warsaw Pact; it is trying to be democratic. President Putin is making efforts. In fact, he was the first one to call President Bush to offer his help when America was attacked on September 11. We should not be putting that type of pressure on a democratic Russia. We should, instead, be reinforcing that we are their friends and no longer consider Russia a threat. If Russia ever goes back to its old ways, we can reconfigure that. I would just say NATO is not helping us as much as they should in this current crisis, so why should we continue subsidizing our European friends.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, we have here a satellite photograph of a section of the Euro mountains in Russia called Yamantau

Mountain. Here is Yamantau Mountain. Just south of Yamantau Mountain are two cities, two closed cities, by the way; and they house about 60,000 people that do nothing but work on Yamantau Mountain.

Now, Yamantau Mountain is the largest, deepest, nuclear secure facility in the world. The Soviets and now the Russians have spent about \$6 billion on Yamantau Mountain. We have had two defectors from Yamantau Mountain; and with what they have told us, we know roughly what is down there. It is enormous, about the size of inside our Beltway with railroad tracks running in opposite directions and enormous rooms carved out of the rock.

Again, it is the most nuclear secure facility in the world. The Russians will not tell us why they are doing it. They have just ramped up activity there. They have built accoutrements there that they do not have in their other cities, tennis courts and so forth. They cannot pay their military. They cannot afford \$200 million for the service module of the space station, but this is important enough to them that they keep pouring millions and millions of dollars into it, \$6 billion currently. Its only use is either during or postnuclear war.

Now, I ask my colleagues, why would Russia do this? When they have all of these needs in their society, why would they pour all of this money into Yamantau Mountain? What I am told is, they are paranoid. They do not believe we are their friends. They are planning for a nuclear war. They apparently believe that it is inevitable and winnable, and they are going to win it with this kind of preparation. We have no idea what they are going to do there, but we know that they are building and spending a lot of money on it.

Now, my question is, why at this time in history would we want to feed Russia's paranoia? Why would we want to enlarge NATO right up to their borders? NATO they perceive as a threat to them. For the first time in its history, we used them as an aggressive power in Kosovo.

□ 1130

If we want a friendship society, a goodwill society, in Europe, please, Mr. Speaker, call it something else. Do not call it NATO. NATO is very threatening to the Russians. It was set up to counter the Warsaw Pact. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) said it did its job. It was very successful. The Warsaw Pact does not exist.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very unwise political move. I cannot understand how we could perceive that it is in our national security interest to enlarge NATO and feed the paranoia of the Russians when they continue to pour money into things like Yamantau Mountain.

This is not a good bill. I support the rule; I vigorously oppose the underlying bill.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. The rule is noncontroversial, but the bill itself, the bill to expand NATO and the foreign aid involved in it, is controversial from my viewpoint. It may not be controversial here in Washington, but if we go outside of Washington and talk to the people who pay the bills and the people who have to send the troops, they find this controversial. They think we are taken for saps as we go over and extend our sphere of influence throughout the world, and now extending into Eastern Europe.

I, too, was a friend of Jerry Solomon. We came into the Congress together in 1978. One thing for sure that Jerry understood very clearly was the care that we must give to expanding our influence as well as sacrificing our sovereignty, because he was strongly opposed to the United Nations.

As chairman of the Committee on Rules, he would permit my amendment to come up and at least debate the effectiveness of belonging to the United Nations, so I have fond memories of Jerry, especially in his support of my efforts to try to diminish the United Nations' influence and the taking away of our sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker, this is one reason why I do oppose NATO. I believe that it has a bad influence on what we do. We want to extend our control over Eastern Europe, and as has been pointed out, this can be seen as a threat to the Russians.

NATO does not have a good record since the fall of the Soviets. Take a look at what we were doing in Serbia. Serbia has been our friend. They are a Christian nation. We allied ourselves with the KLA, the Kosovo Muslims, who have been friends with Osama bin Laden. We went in there and illegally, NATO illegally, against their own rules of NATO, incessantly bombed Serbia. They had not attacked another country. They had a civil war going on, yet we supported that with our money and our bombs and our troops, and now we are nation-building over there. We may be over there for another 20 years because of the bad policy of NATO that we went along with.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should stop and think about this, and instead of expanding NATO, instead of getting ready to send another \$55 million that we are authorizing today to the Eastern European countries, we ought to ask: Has it really served the interests of the United States?

Now that is old-fashioned, to talk about the interests of the United States. We are supposed to only talk about the interests of internationalism, globalism, one-world government. To talk about the interests of

the United States in this city is seen as being very negative, but I would say if we talk about U.S. security, security of the United States of America and our defense around the country, it is very popular.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Seventh District of Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), our deputy whip.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and of the bill, and I particularly appreciate the fact that this bill has been designated to honor our good friend, Jerry Solomon, who represented us so well in the association of NATO parliamentarians and who had made so many friends for America around the world, and particularly with our NATO allies.

There is no question that NATO has been the most successful alliance in history. I would not want to revisit all of the issues of our policies in Eastern Europe today, but I think if we look back at who was following whose lead in what we did the last couple of years, it might not have been us following NATO as much as NATO following us on policies that were vigorously debated here on this floor.

That is not what this bill is about. This bill is about whether we continue to open the doors of NATO to nations that meet the standards that NATO set, nations that add to the common defense of NATO, nations that so much want to be on this side of the curtain of freedom, if the curtain of freedom ever comes down again.

Recently, at the NATO parliament meeting in Lithuania, those of us who represented the House of Representatives there saw people come out who remembered clearly not only what it had been like to live under the Soviet Union, but remembered what it had been like to be dominated by the Nazis; people who did not want to have that ever happen again; people who were desperate, because if they had not been in a concentration camp or sent out of the country, they knew somebody in their family that had.

Person after person, group after group, came chanting NATO, NATO, NATO, with a sense of desperation; that if the line of freedom is ever drawn again, they know which side of that line of freedom they want to be on.

This does not mean that the line of freedom has to end at the Russian border. In fact, meeting the right circumstance, the line of freedom can extend, but it does mean that those countries that are striving to meet the standards that NATO set, those countries that are striving to meet the standards that NATO set for membership that can add to the common defense, that are democracies today and want to ensure that democracy can best ensure that democracy by joining this family of nations and being part of

NATO, by being part of the NATO parliament, by being part of the NATO defense structure.

This is hugely important to the countries mentioned. All of them are not included in NATO as a result of anything we do, but we are just making the point again that that door is open to peace-loving people, freedom-loving people, people who honor democracy, and these countries are among those.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman for his historical perspective on what has happened with NATO over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the author of this legislation.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to follow the articulate statement offered by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT). He spelled out, I think in some detail, why NATO continues to be very important to the democracies of Western Europe and to the United States and Canada, as well.

Indeed, in Lithuania, we saw graphic examples and heard from people on the streets, at high levels of government and the people in the booths selling things to us why NATO was so important, why they do not want to come under totalitarianism again.

In fact, I think there is strong bipartisan support for the continuation of NATO. The dissident voices we heard here today are certainly appropriate in a democracy, but I think they do not reflect the bipartisan recognition that NATO has been important, it is important today, and it will be important in the future.

There are probably two critical institutions in Europe today which help ensure that this security umbrella will be over the nations of the former Warsaw Pact in Central and Eastern Europe and that they will be able to continue their movement towards democracy and a full array of human rights. They are, first and foremost, NATO; and secondly, the European Union.

As the countries, seven of which are identified for authorization, or reauthorization, in this legislation move towards, or hope to successfully gain, membership in NATO, they are making a number of changes. They are embracing a full array of the features of democracy to meet the criteria for NATO membership, they are providing for transparency in their military budgets, they are providing for civilian control of their military, and they are providing for the kind of interoperability of their defense systems with those of the 19 countries of NATO.

It is on the basis of NATO that we were able to form a coalition that performed so well in the Persian Gulf,

that was brought to bear after we had some failures from the United Nations in certain parts of the Balkans, and which today underlie the coalition which President Bush and the United States have built in our war against terrorism.

It is not by accident that it was the other countries of NATO which provided the first meaningful response to a coalition against terrorism when they invoked Article 5, that meant that when there is an attack on one of its members, in this case from a foreign source on the United States, they said by invoking Article 5, that it is an attack on all of us. So this defensive alliance, 52 years of age, has taken on some new responsibilities for Western democracies and for the United States, in this case in the war against terrorism. It is a critical institution.

As we see the other countries of Eastern and Central Europe attempt to secure EU membership and NATO membership, we should also note that NATO has created the Partnership for Peace program to permit not just these seven countries, but a wider array of countries, even into the former Soviet Union, with an opportunity to eventually move towards full integration with Western institutions and Western democracy through NATO membership.

Indeed, the door is not shut to Russia. In fact, we have provided, through the North Atlantic Council, a special opportunity for Russia to have input into the deliberations of NATO; not anything approaching a veto, for certainly something we would not want to give them.

Mr. Speaker, If we did not have NATO today we would have to create something like it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I not only urge support of the rule, but since time is limited on the debate on the bill itself, I thought it was appropriate to make these remarks here today with respect to the importance of NATO today and into the future.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill appears to be in very good shape. The rule is certainly acceptable to us.

I think it is fitting that we call this bill the Gerald Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act. Mr. Solomon was chairman of the Committee on Rules for the few years in which I served under him. As a Democrat, and he was a Republican, he was tough, he was difficult, but he was a fair man. He never lied. He was a man of integrity. He was a good Representative.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for his kind comments about Chairman Solomon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.