I would like to clarify this. I would like to urge all my people in my district, people in California, to contact Mr. Clinton not to veto this important bill.

Let me tell you what this really truly says. In the last year, 1995, fiscal year, our administration came to Congress to ask for $533 million for the U.N. peacekeeping mission, just peacekeeping. That is our assessment. At 6 months later, they come back asking an additional $672 million. Adding it together, our assessment was actually $1.2 billion last year alone, cash assessment to the United Nations.

This year our administration asked again for only $445 million.

Now, who is trying to fool who this time? This is a very unrealistic request to try to trick the system by grossly underestimating our peacekeeping assessment numbers so that the overall budget looks smaller. I can bet you that they are going to come back halfway through this year asking another $1/2 billion.

Anyway, in addition to $1.2 billion we paid to the United Nations, we also paid an additional $75 million last year as a gift, as a gift, voluntary gift. This year they are asking an additional $100 million as a voluntary gift.

It is beyond my comprehension why we are paying gifts in addition to $1.2 billion.

The U.S. Government gets no credit for these voluntary contributions.

Let us talk about other countries. How much do they pay? Ninety countries How much do they pay? Ninety countries pay less than one-hundredth of 1 percent, 0.01 percent, nothing; 90 countries pay less than that. Only 10 countries pay more than a lousy 1 percent. Let me repeat only 10 countries in the world pay more than 1 percent on this U.N. peacekeeping mission.

How much do we pay? Thirty-two percent.

□ 1500

We used to pay only 25 percent. What happened? Because Russia dissolved and were unable to pay, we have to pick up the tab. Is that not ridiculous?

We are paying 32 percent while only 10 countries pay more than 1 percent. Now, that means we are paying more than 3½ times more than the second largest contributing nation, which is Japan. Japan pays 12.5 percent. Not to mention the gifts and not to mention the in-kind contributions.

Let me tell you what it is. We spent $1.7 billion in-kind contributions to support of this U.N. peacekeeping mission. What are they? Let me give an example: Sending military forces to Somalia, millions and millions of dollars is what it cost us. Also the airlift of supplies to Bosnia.

We are now involved in 13 different places on peacekeeping and humanitarian support in this world.

Altogether we spent $1.7 billion in addition to the $1.2 billion cash assessment, in addition to the gifts.

Now, this $1.7 billion we spent as in-kind contributions was not credited to us. Added altogether we are about $30 billion a year that we are donating to the United Nations under the name of peacekeeping mission.

Now, what this bill will do, let me explain: Under section 509 it says the United States shall not pay more than 25 percent. Is that not fair?

Second, section 506 says that all the in-kind donations shall be credited, credited to the United States. That is exactly what it says.

Section 507, no more voluntary gifts unless it is some kind of emergency or national security interest.

Finally, section 511 says U.N. management must be reformed. You cannot just go around and asking us for money like we were a bottomless pit. They have to reform, they have to shape up. That is what this bill does, asking the U.N. to shape up. We are asking them to hire an inspector general so they can audit the books and find out exactly who pays what and how much.

We are not against peacekeeping. I understand we all believe in human rights, but, by golly, it has to be fair. This bill provides for a more equivalent sharing of the real cost of such activities, something that all the American people deserve. That is what it is all about. We are not talking against peacekeeping. It is about time for us to get a fair share and a better accountability.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

FOREIGN COMMAND OF U.S. TROOPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, one of my staff was in a grocery store, local grocery store, just a few days ago and happened to be in the toy section of the store and lo and behold here is what he found and picked up. These are little toy soldiers, just like we used to play with when we were little boys and girls. It says ''U.N. troops.''

Mr. Speaker, how far have we gone? How far has this madness gone? It used to be, when I was a little boy, I would play with my G.I. Joe. They were American soldiers we used to play with. They were not United Nations troops.

I think maybe the reason these kinds of toys are being marketed now is because maybe it is becoming acceptable that we no longer have our sovereignty any more, we no longer have control. We have given control of U.S. troops, our young men and young women, put them in harm's way, put them under the direct jurisdiction of the United Nations.

In fact, in 1988, there were only 5 peacekeeping operations being operated by the United Nations across the world. Today the United Nations supports 17 peacekeeping operations. More and more, these missions involved internal unrest, including ethnic clashes as opposed to conflicts between nations.

Mr. Speaker, today is a landmark day. We passed a wonderful piece of legislation that redirects our attention, that refocuses our priority on America, on America's vital interests, what is beneficial to this country and not the world at large.

This is a wonderful day, and I think it was one of the most impactful bills, but unfortunately the media out there has decided to neglect any discussion of this bill. I will not comment as to why. But I will comment that these toy soldiers, they are meaningless, you can throw them away, they can end up in the wastebasket, it does not matter. But young men and young women, their lives do matter. When they are fighting on foreign soil, we have an obligation in this body to be sure they are standing up for our interests, our vital national security interests, and not for some utopian concepts of peacekeeping in areas that we really cannot keep the peace.

This bill, H.R. 7 that we just passed, is very impactful in that it restricts the deployment of U.S. troops to missions that are in our interest. It demands that U.S. troops be commanded by U.S. commanders, not by U.N. bureaucrats.

It reduces the cost to the United States for U.N. peacekeeping missions and demands that the United States Representatives to the United Nations press for reforms in the management practices of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I have also got to mention that I believe we have got to keep our eye on that one big ball that is out there, that $5 trillion Federal debt that we have. Not only do we not have human lives to waste abroad for needless causes, but we do not have the capital as well. We have a debt to pay off. As Mr. KIM pointed out adequately, we have paid a disproportionate share of the cost of peacekeeping. We pay 33 percent. The next highest country, Japan, pays in the neighborhood of 13 percent. That is unreasonable.

We pay 25 percent of the costs for upkeep and maintenance of the United Nations. If we were getting what we paid for, it might be a different story. But I do not think we are.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate this body for doing some wonderful work today, and, hopefully, the measure will pass the other body and President Clinton will get significant support from the people out there, the voters, calls from the real people out there, the voters, calls from the real