Lofgren	Moran (VA)	Strickland
Meehan	Myrick	Sweeney
Meek (FL)	Pallone	Young (AK)
Meeks (NY)	Sessions	

□ 1105

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 430, I was unavoidably detained in my District. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 429 and 430, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both measures.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 278) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 278

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Government Reform: Mr. Lynch of Massachusetts, to rank after Mr. Clay of Missouri; and

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Mr. Lynch of Massachusetts, to rank after Mr. Rodriguez of Texas; and Ms. Davis of California, to rank after Mr. Udall of New Mexico.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3167, GERALD B. H. SOLOMON FREEDOM CONSOLIDATION ACT OF 2001

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 277 ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3167) to endorse the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations; (2) a further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVIII, if offered by Representative Lantos of California or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted a modified closed rule for consideration of the Gerald Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

The rule provides that the amendment recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The rule provides for consideration of only the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial rule for a noncontroversial, but important, bill. The Gerald Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act endorses the work of President Bush and President Clinton to expand NATO into Eastern Europe. It also authorizes military assistance to seven potential NATO members.

Mr. Speaker, during its markup of this measure, the Committee on International Relations passed one amendment, an amendment to name H.R. 3167 after our former Committee on Rules chairman, Gerald Solomon. Chairman Solomon, who passed away the week before last, was a dear friend to all of us on the Committee on Rules, and he and Mr. Moakley, who, unfortunately, passed away earlier this year, were quite a pair together. They disagreed often, but they always did it as gentlemen and they always did it with a great deal of humor, and quite frankly, all of us miss them a lot.

While he was a Member, Chairman Solomon was also a strong advocate for NATO. Indeed, during his last year on the Hill, he even published a book about NATO expansion. It is fitting, therefore, that we honor Mr. Solomon with this bill today.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, as well as the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a modified closed rule. It will allow for the consideration of the Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001.

As my colleague from North Carolina has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. This rule will permit a Democratic substitute, if offered by the committee's ranking minority member. No other amendments may be offered from the House floor.

The bill expresses the support of Congress for expanding the number of members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It recognizes the importance of admitting seven specific nations in Central and Eastern Europe. This legislation is in keeping with the vision expressed by both President Clinton and President Bush.

I want to take this opportunity to express my sadness at the loss of former House Member and Committee on Rules chairman Jerry Solomon, who died last month of heart failure. Jerry and I often found ourselves on different sides of the issue, but we were fully united in our respect for the House of Representatives and our role in leading the Nation.

Jerry was a man of honor and integrity. He spoke his heart and he stood up for his beliefs without hesitation. It is fitting that this bill is named in his memory.

With that, I urge the adoption of the rule and of the underlying.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Charlotte for yielding me this time, and I want to congratulate her, as well as I see my friend the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) here, the ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is in the Chamber. I wanted to congratulate them.

I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for his statement. I see the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) is here. I tried to mention just about everybody in the Chamber. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is right behind him.

I do not want to see any other Members, so I can make my points here.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important piece of legislation. Both the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) made it clear it is a fitting tribute to my predecessor, Jerry Solomon. We continue to mourn his passing and extend our condolences to Freda and his wonderful family.

We know that Jerry Solomon was, as was stated so eloquently in the tributes that were given at his funeral last week, a real fighter, and I considered him to be a fighter with a heart, because he was one who stood firmly for principle, but had a great warmth and kindness to him as well.

□ 1115

He fought as hard as anyone to expand the cause of freedom throughout the world. I should say parenthetically that I had the privilege of joining my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), for a delegation that observed one of the freest and fairest elections that I have had the opportunity to observe in the many years that I have been able to serve here in the Congress and visit elections around the world; and this election took place in Nicaragua just this past weekend. We saw the people of Nicaragua overwhelmingly state their preference, and I should say that I am very gratified that they came out on the side of freedom and self-determination, and it is something that would have made Jerry Solomon very proud. That was in this hemisphere.

The legislation that we are talking about today, Mr. Speaker, is focused on the very important North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance which, as we all know, has been critically important to many of the national security and foreign policy successes that we have had around the world.

Mr. Solomon wrote a very thoughtful volume on the importance of NATO expansion, and I believe that that is one of the major reasons that his name is very appropriately tied to this legislation. As the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) said, the prospect of the expansion of these seven countries into the NATO alliance is something that I believe is on the horizon, and I believe that we need to encourage it. I should say that President Bush is a strong proponent of NATO expansion and has made that clear in more than a few addresses and in his policy proposals.

So I think that we have done the right thing here in paying tribute to our dear friend, Jerry Solomon. I will continue to miss him every day. I am happy to say that there is a spectacular portrait of Mr. Solomon that is in the Committee on Rules and, I would invite any of our colleagues who would like to come by and take a look at that portrait if you have not testified before the Committee on Rules lately to come and visit us there and to know that when we overwhelmingly pass this rule and the legislation itself, it will be a great tribute that we can provide to this wonderful man.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time at this time. I could have some requests, so I would ask the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) to go ahead with her speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me this time and for her service, of course, on the Committee on Rules as well.

Mr. Speaker, as we continue to defend democracy and freedom, which is what this Nation is about today, and the battle in the war against terrorism within our own borders, it is important to remember that we are not alone. We are not the only country that upholds the ideals that we are fighting for. Our friends and allies in the NATO alliance have helped us to defend democracy across the Atlantic and beyond in so many ways and for so many years during the Cold War. We now have the opportunity to expand our NATO alliance and allow new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe and other areas to join in the defense of freedom, something we all care greatly about.

This legislation outlines and reaffirms congressional support for further enlargement of NATO as expressed in statements by President Bush and former President Clinton. It does not call for the admission of any specific country to NATO, but is supported by the candidates of all contenders which meet the criteria outlined by the current NATO members. Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Baltics, Slovenia, Slovakia, Bulgaria and Romania are keenly interested, I know from personal experience, and there are others.

In addition, the Solomon Act authorizes funding for military assistance for each candidate in accordance with administration requests for 2002. In other words, we are together on this here on the Hill and downtown. The modest cost of this assistance is a very small price to pay for the potential of gaining long-term allies in a formalized way in this critical region of the world. As a member of the House of Representatives delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I have been privileged to see firsthand how the expansion of NATO is a lot more than about just the falling of the last remnants of ice from the old Cold War. The fact is, just a dozen or so years ago, many of these nations we are talking about were part of a Warsaw Pact that was pledged to destroy NATO. Think about that. Now, these nations are vying for a relationship of mutual protection with the West.

As we move through these uncertain times, it is of great importance, of course, that we cultivate the strongest ties possible with all of the nations of Europe. NATO expansion, under membership guidelines and procedures already agreed upon, will help the United States achieve this very, very important goal.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot possibly count the number of hours, meetings, trips, speeches, reports, or personnel we have talked to and invested in the question of NATO expansion. In all of this, Jerry Solomon, his vision, his leadership, showed the way; and he made the case very forcefully. He even made the case in Moscow that someday Russia will join NATO, and I have no doubt to believe that.

This legislation will send a strong and welcome signal. People do pay attention to what this Congress does, and now is the time to gear up for the expansion in NATO that will be discussed one year from now in Prague. I urge support for this legislation. It really does matter.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS). As chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and vice chairman of the Committee on Rules, we rely on him a lot for his expertise in this area, and it is quite evident that he has been involved in this for many, many years. So I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule, but in opposition to the underlying legislation. Let me take a moment to salute Jerry Solomon, who was a dear friend. We will miss Jerry Solomon. It is a pain in our hearts that we will have as someone who meant so much to us and he is no longer with us. I worked so many hours on so many issues over the years with Jerry that I think that no doubt, on both sides of the aisle, he will be dearly missed.

Now let us talk about NATO. NATO will not be missed. NATO has done its job. NATO deserves to pass on, because NATO accomplished its mission and now it deserves to dissolve.

We called on this organization, we created this organization back when there was a major Soviet threat to invade Western Europe. Thus we created NATO in order to deter war, not to waste money, because that money was necessary at the time. But instead, to deter a Soviet invasion of Western Europe. It did its job, and it did its job well.

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 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. ROHRABACHER) 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.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2620, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mrs. MYRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–273) on the resolution (H. Res. 279) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2620) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GERALD B. H. SOLOMON FREEDOM CONSOLIDATION ACT OF 2001

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 277, I call up the bill (H.R. 3167) to endorse the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Pursuant to House Resolution 277, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 3167 is as follows:

H.R. 3167

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 ''Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103–447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress declared that ''full and active participants in the Partnership for Peace in a position to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area should be invited to become full NATO members in accordance with Article 10 of such Treaty at an early date . . .''.

(2) In the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (title VI of section 101(c) of title I of division A of Public Law 104–208; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress called for the prompt admission of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia to NATO, and declared that ''in order to promote economic stability and security in Slovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Moldova, and Ukraine . . . the process of enlarging NATO to include emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe should not be limited to consideration of admitting Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia as full members of the NATO Alliance''.

(3) In the European Security Act of 1998 (title XXVII of division G of Public Law 105–277; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress declared that ''Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic should not be the last emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe invited to join NATO'' and that ''Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria . . . would make an outstanding contribution to furthering the goals of NATO and enhancing stability, freedom, and peace in Europe should they become NATO members [and] upon complete satisfaction of all relevant criteria should be invited to become full NATO members at the earliest possible date''.

(4) At the Madrid Summit of the NATO Alliance in July 1997, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic were invited to join the Alliance in the first round of NATO enlargement, and the NATO heads of state and government issued a declaration stating ''[t]he Alliance expects to extend further invitations in coming years to nations willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership . . . [n]o European democratic country whose admission would fulfill the objectives of the [North Atlantic] Treaty will be excluded from consideration''.

(5) At the Washington Summit of the NATO Alliance in April 1999, the NATO heads of state and government issued a communique declaring ''[w]e pledge that NATO will continue to welcome new members in a position to further the principles of the [North Atlantic] Treaty and contribute to peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic area . . . [t]he three new members will not be the last . . . [n]o European democratic country whose admission would fulfill the objectives of the Treaty will be excluded from consideration, regardless of its geographic location . . .''.

(6) In late 2002, NATO will hold a summit in Prague, the Czech Republic, at which it will decide which additional emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe to invite to join the Alliance in the next round of NATO enlargement.

(7) In May 2000 in Vilnius, Lithuania, the foreign ministers of Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia issued a statement (later joined by Croatia) declaring that their countries will cooperate in jointly seeking NATO membership in the next round of NATO enlargement, that the realization of NATO membership by one or more of these countries would be a success for all, and that eventual NATO membership for all of these countries would be a success for Europe and NATO.

(8) On June 15, 2001, in a speech in Warsaw, Poland, President George W. Bush stated ''[a]ll of Europe's new democracies, from the Baltic to the Black Sea and all that lie between, should have the same chance for security and freedom—and the same chance to join the institutions of Europe—as Europe's old democracies have . . . I believe in NATO membership for all of Europe's democracies that seek it and are ready to share the responsibilities that NATO brings . . . [a]s we plan to enlarge NATO, no nation should be used as a pawn in the agenda of others . . . [w]e will not trade away the fate of free European peoples . . . [n]o more Munichs . . . [n]o more Yaltas . . . [a]s we plan the Prague Summit, we should not calculate how little we can get away with, but how much we can do to advance the cause of freedom''.

(9) On October 22, 1996, in a speech in Detroit, Michigan, former President William J. Clinton stated ''NATO's doors will not close behind its first new members . . . NATO should remain open to all of Europe's emerging democracies who are ready to shoulder the responsibilities of membership . . . [n]o nation will be automatically excluded . . . [n]o country outside NATO will have a veto . . . [a] gray zone of insecurity must not reemerge in Europe''.

SEC. 3. DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.

Congress—

(1) reaffirms its previous expressions of support for continued enlargement of the NATO Alliance contained in the NATO Participation Act of 1994, the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996, and the European Security Act of 1998;

(2) supports the commitment to further enlargement of the NATO Alliance expressed by the Alliance in its Madrid Declaration of 1997 and its Washington Summit Communique of 1999; and

(3) endorses the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and urges our NATO allies to work with the United States to realize this vision at the Prague Summit in 2002.

SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF SLOVAKIA TO RECEIVE ASSISTANCE UNDER THE NATO PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1994.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Slovakia is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103–447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The designation of Slovakia pursuant to subsection (a) as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994—

(1) is in addition to the designation of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia pursuant to section 606 of the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (title VI of section 101(c) of title I of division A of Public Law 104–208; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) and the designation of Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria pursuant to section 2703(b) of the European Security Act of 1998 (title XXVII of division G of Public Law 105–277; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994; and

(2) shall not preclude the designation by the President of other emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe pursuant to section 203(d)(2) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of such Act.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES DESIGNATED UNDER THE NATO PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1994.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING.—Of the amounts made available for fiscal year 2002 under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763)—

(1) $6,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Estonia;

(2) $7,000,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Latvia;

(3) $7,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Lithuania;

(4) $8,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Slovakia;

(5) $4,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Slovenia;

(6) $10,000,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Bulgaria; and

(7) $11,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Romania.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 515 of the Security Assistance