

At the end of section 3(2)(A) of the resolution, insert the following:

(iv) as used in this subparagraph, the term "NATO common-funded budget" shall be deemed to include—

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

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

(C) Emergency Drawdowns;

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

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

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

Mr. HARKIN. Basically, we see this figure banded about that it is going to cost \$1.5 billion. That is common costs. There are other national costs to which we have committed to subsidize. Already, just in the past 2 years, the figures that we have been able to unearth and dig into show that the United States has already spent about \$1 billion in subsidies to these countries for their NATO expansion purposes. That is not calculated in the \$1.5 billion. It should be, because it is still a cost to the U.S. taxpayers.

This amendment, plus some others that I will have, will try to fashion this resolution so that we will have a really good handle as we go year by year as to just what the costs are to the U.S. taxpayers. We know already that \$1.5 billion is not the total cost to U.S. taxpayers. It is more than that. How much more? We don't know. That is why I was one who wanted to postpone the debate and vote on NATO expansion after June. I thought we could take it up in July, have a serious debate, pass it in midsummer, or not pass it, as the will of the body would be. At least at that time we would have a study being

done by NATO at the present time that is due in June. We don't have that study right now. This study is basically on the requirements for upgrading the militaries of these three countries. That way we would have a better idea of the shortfalls in these countries, in their militaries, and the costs to the United States—not just the common costs, but the other kinds of costs that we will be enlisted to come up with in terms of the national costs which we will be subsidizing for these three countries.

I am hopeful as this debate ensues that I will be able to engage with members of the Foreign Relations Committee to explain thoroughly for the record exactly what these national costs are, what our commitments are, what the subsidies are, and if we have any data at all, to give us a better idea of what these subsidies and the national costs will be. If we just projected ahead based upon what we found in the last couple of years, in the next 10 years we would be looking at somewhere in the neighborhood of at least an additional \$10 billion for our taxpayers, at a minimum, and that is before any of the upgrades have taken place in any of these countries. So that is just based upon what we spent in the last couple of years.

Mr. President, again I hope we have a good debate on this. I am hopeful we can get some better cost figures. As I said, I will offer this amendment at the appropriate time. I printed it in the RECORD today, to get a better handle on the costs. I also will be placing in the RECORD letters from former Senators, questions raised by academics around the country as to just what the purposes of NATO expansion are, what the goals will be, how will this affect our relations with Russia, how will it affect our relations with other coun-

tries that are not members of NATO now but perhaps want to be in the near future.

I understand there will be an amendment offered that will close the door for certain other countries to join NATO for some specified amount of time. What will this do to our relations with these countries and the relations of those countries with those nations that will be joining NATO if this resolution passes? I think these are all very serious questions. I hope the debate will flesh these out and that we can have some solid answers, especially as to the costs.

Perhaps as to relations between nations in the future, this may be more in the realm of speculation. But I believe that at least these ought to be talked about and debated, and they ought to be debated in light of what the costs to our taxpayers would be.

I am more interested in that than any of the other aspects of the bill that is now before us.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in adjournment until 9 a.m. tomorrow morning, March 18.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:44 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 18, 1998, at 9 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 17, 1998:

THE JUDICIARY

Susan Graber, of Oregon, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.