

**AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF NATO, AND
FOR OTHER PURPOSES; RECOMMENDING THE
INTEGRATION OF LITHUANIA, LATVIA AND
ESTONIA INTO NATO; AND RECOMMENDING
THE INTEGRATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF
SLOVAKIA INTO NATO**

MARKUP

BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE
OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H. Res. 468, H. Con. Res. 116 and H. Res. 253

SEPTEMBER 25, 2002

Serial No. 107-113

Printed for the use of the Committee on International Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.house.gov/international_relations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

81-893PDF

WASHINGTON : 2002

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

HENRY J. HYDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York	TOM LANTOS, California
JAMES A. LEACH, Iowa	HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
DOUG BEREUTER, Nebraska	GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey	ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
DAN BURTON, Indiana	DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
ELTON GALLEGLY, California	ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida	SHERROD BROWN, Ohio
CASS BALENGER, North Carolina	CYNTHIA A. MCKINNEY, Georgia
DANA ROHRABACHER, California	EARL F. HILLIARD, Alabama
EDWARD R. ROYCE, California	BRAD SHERMAN, California
PETER T. KING, New York	ROBERT WEXLER, Florida
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio	JIM DAVIS, Florida
AMO HOUGHTON, New York	ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
JOHN M. McHUGH, New York	WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT, Massachusetts
JOHN COOKSEY, Louisiana	GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
THOMAS G. TANCREDO, Colorado	BARBARA LEE, California
RON PAUL, Texas	JOSEPH CROWLEY, New York
NICK SMITH, Michigan	JOSEPH M. HOFFFEL, Pennsylvania
JOSEPH R. PITTS, Pennsylvania	EARL BLUMENAUER, Oregon
DARRELL E. ISSA, California	SHELLEY BERKLEY, Nevada
ERIC CANTOR, Virginia	GRACE NAPOLITANO, California
JEFF FLAKE, Arizona	ADAM B. SCHIFF, California
BRIAN D. KERNS, Indiana	DIANE E. WATSON, California
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia	
MARK GREEN, Wisconsin	

THOMAS E. MOONEY, SR., *Staff Director/General Counsel*

ROBERT R. KING, *Democratic Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE

ELTON GALLEGLY, California, *Chairman*

DOUG BEREUTER, Nebraska	EARL F. HILLIARD, Alabama
PETER T. KING, New York	BRAD SHERMAN, California
JOHN COOKSEY, Louisiana	ROBERT WEXLER, Florida
NICK SMITH, Michigan	JIM DAVIS, Florida
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York	ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
JAMES A. LEACH, Iowa	WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT, Massachusetts
DAN BURTON, Indiana	BARBARA LEE, California
ERIC CANTOR, Virginia	JOSEPH CROWLEY, New York
MARK GREEN, Wisconsin	

VINCE MORELLI, *Subcommittee Staff Director*

VALERIE VAN BUREN, *Democratic Professional Staff Member*

PATRICK PRISCO, *Professional Staff Member*

FRAN MARCUCCI, *Staff Associate*

ANNA KRUSE, *Legislative Fellow*

CONTENTS

	Page
MARKUP OF	
H. Res. 468, Affirming the importance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), supporting continued United States participation in NATO, ensuring that the enlargement of NATO proceeds in a manner consistent with United States interests, and for other purposes	1
H. Con. Res. 116, Recommending the integration of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)	30
H. Res. 253, Recommending the integration of the Republic of Slovakia into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)	30
LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC., SUBMITTED FOR THE MARKUP	
The Honorable Elton Gallegly, a Representative in Congress from the State of California, and Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe: Prepared statements on H. Con. Res. 116 and H. Res. 253	37
The Honorable Doug Bereuter, a Representative in Congress from the State of Nebraska: Prepared statement on H. Res. 468	24
The Honorable John Shimkus, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois: Prepared statement on H. Con. Res. 116	38
The Honorable Bart Stupak, a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan: Prepared statement on H. Res. 253	38

**AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF NATO, AND
FOR OTHER PURPOSES; RECOMMENDING
THE INTEGRATION OF LITHUANIA, LATVIA
AND ESTONIA INTO NATO; AND
RECOMMENDING THE INTEGRATION OF THE
REPUBLIC OF SLOVAKIA INTO NATO**

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2002

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m. in Room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Elton Gallegly [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I call the hearing of the Europe Subcommittee to order. Pursuant to notice. I call up for the purposes of markup H. Res. 468. The clerk will report the bill.

Mr. PRISCO. H. Res. 468.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Without objection, the resolution will be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

[H. Res. 468 follows:]

.....
(Original Signature of Member)

107TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. RES. 468

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GALLEGLY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the
Committee on _____

RESOLUTION

Affirming the importance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), supporting continued United States participation in NATO, ensuring that the enlargement of NATO proceeds in a manner consistent with United States interests, and for other purposes.

1 *Resolved,*

2 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

3 This resolution may be cited as the "Transatlantic

4 Security and NATO Enhancement Resolution of 2002".

1 **SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

2 The House of Representatives makes the following
3 findings:

4 (1) Since 1949 the North Atlantic Treaty Orga-
5 nization (NATO) has played an essential role in
6 guaranteeing the security, freedom, and prosperity
7 of the United States and its partners in the Alliance.

8 (2) NATO, founded on the principles of democ-
9 racy, individual liberty, and the rule of law, has
10 proved to be an indispensable instrument for forging
11 a trans-Atlantic community of nations working to-
12 gether to safeguard the freedom and common herit-
13 age of its peoples and promoting stability in the
14 North Atlantic area.

15 (3) NATO is the only institution that promotes
16 a uniquely transatlantic perspective and approach to
17 issues concerning the security of North America and
18 Europe and remains the only multilateral security
19 organization demonstrably capable of conducting ef-
20 fective military operations and preserving security
21 and stability of the Euro-Atlantic region.

22 (4) The security, freedom, and prosperity of the
23 United States remain linked to the security of the
24 countries of Europe.

25 (5) NATO remains the most visible and signifi-
26 cant embodiment of United States engagement in

1 Europe and therefore membership in NATO remains
2 a vital national security interest of the United
3 States.

4 (6) NATO enhances the security of the United
5 States by providing an integrated military structure
6 and a framework for consultations on political and
7 security concerns of members which could impact
8 the Alliance.

9 (7) The security of NATO member countries is
10 inseparably linked to that of the whole of Europe,
11 and the consolidation and strengthening of demo-
12 cratic and free societies on the entire continent is of
13 direct and material importance to the NATO Alli-
14 ance and its partners.

15 (8) The sustained commitment of the member
16 countries of NATO to a mutual defense has been a
17 major contributing factor in the democratic trans-
18 formation of Central and Eastern Europe.

19 (9) Members of the Alliance can and should
20 play a critical role in addressing the security chal-
21 lenges of the post-Cold War era and in creating the
22 stable environment needed for Central and Eastern
23 Europe to successfully complete political and eco-
24 nomic transformation.

1 (10) NATO should remain the core security or-
2 ganization of the evolving Euro-Atlantic architecture
3 in which all countries enjoy the same freedom, co-
4 operation, and security.

5 (11) NATO's military force structure, defense
6 planning, command structures, and force goals must
7 be sufficient for the collective self-defense of its
8 members, and should be capable of projecting power
9 when the security of a NATO member is threatened,
10 and provide a basis for ad hoc coalitions of willing
11 partners among NATO members to defend common
12 values and interests.

13 (12) NATO must act to address new post-Cold
14 War risks emerging from outside the treaty area in
15 the interests of preserving peace and security in the
16 Euro-Atlantic area, including—

17 (A) risks from rogue states and non-state
18 actors possessing nuclear, biological, or chem-
19 ical weapons and their means of delivery;

20 (B) transnational terrorism and disruption
21 of the flow of vital resources; and

22 (C) conflicts outside the treaty area stem-
23 ming from unresolved historical disputes and
24 the actions of undemocratic governments and

1 sub-state actors who reject the peaceful settle-
2 ment of disputes.

3 (13) All NATO members should commit to im-
4 proving their respective defense capabilities so that
5 NATO can project power decisively and sustain op-
6 erations over distance and time.

7 (14) The requirements to provide collective de-
8 fense, to project power, and to sustain operations
9 dictate that European NATO members possess mili-
10 tary capabilities to rapidly deploy forces over long
11 distances, sustain operations for extended periods of
12 time, and operate jointly with the United States in
13 high-intensity conflicts.

14 (15) NATO's Defense Capabilities Initiative,
15 which is intended to improve the defense capabilities
16 of the European Allies, particularly the deployability,
17 mobility, sustainability, and interoperability of Alli-
18 ance forces, must continue to be pursued by all
19 members of the Alliance in order to develop balanced
20 capabilities.

21 (16) With a few exceptions, European members
22 of NATO have been deficient in maintaining re-
23 quired military capabilities and providing defense
24 spending at levels adequate to meet these capability
25 shortfalls. Failure of the European NATO members

1 to achieve the goals established through the Defense
2 Capabilities Initiative could weaken support for the
3 Alliance in the United States over the long term.

4 (17) Members of the Alliance must also recog-
5 nize that the campaign against new and emerging
6 threats to the security of the Alliance requires other
7 non-military capabilities and efforts to be effective.
8 Thus, the need to enhance intelligence-sharing and
9 cooperation, both bilaterally between Alliance mem-
10 bers and partners and within the Alliance collec-
11 tively, the facilitation of enhanced coordination
12 among Alliance member's law enforcement agencies,
13 and improved police and judicial cooperation and in-
14 formation exchanges are critical to the overall effort.

15 (18) NATO has embarked upon an historic mis-
16 sion to share its benefits and patterns of consulta-
17 tion and cooperation with other nations in the Euro-
18 Atlantic area through both enlargement and active
19 partnership.

20 (19) NATO has enlarged its membership on
21 four different occasions since 1949.

22 (20) The NATO summit meeting to be held in
23 the fall of 2002 in Prague will provide an historic
24 opportunity to chart a course for NATO in the new
25 millennium by reaffirming the importance of NATO

1 to the collective security of the Euro-Atlantic region,
2 by addressing new threats, developing new capabilities,
3 and by extending invitations to additional countries
4 of Europe to become members of the Alliance.

5 (21) The governments of NATO member countries
6 have stated that enlargement of the Alliance is
7 a further step toward the Alliance's basic goal of
8 enhancing security and extending stability throughout
9 the Euro-Atlantic region.

10 (22) The enlargement process of NATO helps
11 to avert conflict, because the very prospect of
12 membership serves as an incentive for aspiring members
13 to resolve disputes with their neighbors and to push
14 ahead with reform and democratization.

15 (23) The Partnership for Peace, created in
16 1994 under United States leadership, has fostered
17 cooperation between NATO and the countries of
18 Central and Eastern Europe, and offers a path to
19 future membership in the Alliance.

20 (24) At the Washington Summit of the NATO
21 Alliance in April 1999, the NATO heads of state
22 and government issued a communique declaring
23 "[we] pledge that NATO will continue to welcome
24 new members in a position to further the principles

1 of the [North Atlantic] Treaty and contribute to
2 peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic area”.

3 (25) In 1999 NATO launched a Membership
4 Action Plan designed to help interested Partnership
5 for Peace countries prepare for membership by offer-
6 ing advice and assistance on programs and member-
7 ship-related issues.

8 (26) The Membership Action Plan establishes
9 certain political, economic, social, and military-re-
10 lated goals that aspiring candidate nations are ex-
11 pected to meet, including the peaceful resolution of
12 territorial disputes, respect for democratic proce-
13 dures and the rule of law, human rights, democratic
14 control of the military and other military reforms,
15 and a commitment to stability and well-being
16 through economic liberty and social justice.

17 (27) In May 2000 in Vilnius, Lithuania, nine
18 nations of Europe issued a statement (later joined
19 by a tenth) declaring that their countries will co-
20 operate in jointly seeking NATO membership in the
21 next round of NATO enlargement and since then
22 have taken concrete steps to demonstrate this com-
23 mitment, including their participation in Partnership
24 for Peace activities and their commitment to the
25 concept of the Membership Action Plan.

1 (28) On June 15, 2001, in a speech in Warsaw,
2 Poland, President George W. Bush stated “[all] of
3 Europe’s new democracies, from the Baltic to the
4 Black Sea and all that lie between, should have the
5 same chance for security and freedom—and the
6 same chance to join the institutions of Europe”.

7 (29) The enlargement of the NATO Alliance to
8 include as full and equal members additional democ-
9 racies in Europe will serve to reinforce stability and
10 security in Europe by fostering their integration into
11 the structures which have created and sustained
12 peace in Europe since 1945.

13 (30) As new members of NATO assume the re-
14 sponsibilities of Alliance membership, the costs of
15 maintaining stability in Europe will be shared more
16 widely. The concurrent assumption of greater re-
17 sponsibility and development of greater capabilities
18 by new members of NATO will further reinforce
19 burdensharing.

20 (31) The membership of the Czech Republic,
21 Hungary, and Poland has strengthened NATO’s
22 ability to perform the full range of NATO missions
23 by providing bases, airfields, and transit rights for
24 NATO forces during Operation Allied Force in the
25 Balkans, by their contributions of military forces to

1 NATO missions in Bosnia and Kosovo, and by their
2 support for Operation Enduring Freedom.

3 (32) The Czech Republic, Hungary, and Po-
4 land, due to their similar recent history, have bol-
5 stered NATO's capability to integrate former com-
6 munist nations into a community of democracies and
7 have served as mentors to other countries that as-
8 pire to join NATO.

9 (33) In supporting NATO enlargement all can-
10 didate countries must be fully aware of the costs and
11 responsibilities of NATO membership, including the
12 obligation set forth in Article X of the North Atlan-
13 tic Treaty that new members be able to contribute
14 to the security of the North Atlantic area, and fur-
15 ther to ensure that all countries admitted to NATO
16 are capable of assuming those costs and responsibil-
17 ities.

18 (34) For those candidate countries that receive
19 an invitation to join NATO at the Prague Summit,
20 the process of joining NATO does not end with the
21 invitation but rather with meeting the full respon-
22 sibilities of a NATO member, including the comple-
23 tion of issues identified by the Membership Action
24 Plan, which will continue beyond Prague.

1 (35) In considering the enlargement of NATO
2 at Prague and in issuing invitations to the candidate
3 countries who have made significant progress toward
4 achieving their objectives in the Membership Action
5 Plan established by NATO, there is a recognition
6 that each country invited to join NATO should ac-
7 cede on a common date but before the date on which
8 the next announced NATO summit is to take place.

9 (36) The countries that will be invited to begin
10 accession negotiations with NATO at the NATO
11 summit in Prague should not be the last such coun-
12 tries invited to join NATO and there should be a
13 continuing process and progress toward the admis-
14 sion of additional democracies in Europe beyond
15 2002 depending on the degree to which those coun-
16 tries meet the criteria set forth in NATO's Mem-
17 bership Action Plan.

18 (37) The process of NATO enlargement entails
19 the consensus agreement of the governments of all
20 19 NATO member countries and ratification in ac-
21 cordance with their constitutional procedures.

22 **SEC. 3. COOPERATION BETWEEN NATO AND THE RUSSIAN**
23 **FEDERATION.**

24 The House of Representatives makes the following
25 findings:

1 (1) The admission into the North Atlantic
2 Treaty Organization (NATO) of new members from
3 countries in Eastern and Central Europe, such as
4 the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland, will not
5 threaten any other country.

6 (2) Since the end of the Cold War, NATO has
7 attached particular importance to the development
8 of constructive and cooperative relations with the
9 Russian Federation in order to overcome remaining
10 vestiges of confrontation and competition in order to
11 strengthen mutual trust and cooperation between
12 NATO and the Russian Federation.

13 (3) In 1994, building on previous efforts at co-
14 operation, Russia joined the Partnership for Peace
15 Program, further enhancing the emerging NATO-
16 Russian Federation dialogue.

17 (4) On May 27, 1997, in an expression of
18 strong commitment to work together to build a last-
19 ing and inclusive peace in the Euro-Atlantic area,
20 the heads of state and government of NATO and the
21 Russian Federation signed the ground-breaking
22 “Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation
23 and Security Between NATO and the Russian Fed-
24 eration”.

1 (5) On March 18, 1998, the Russian Federa-
2 tion formally established its mission to NATO and
3 appointed a senior military representative to facili-
4 tate military and defense-related cooperation be-
5 tween NATO and the Russia Federation.

6 (6) Since 1998, NATO and the Russian Fed-
7 eration have worked cooperatively with each other in
8 the Balkans and elsewhere setting the stage for the
9 ability of an enlarged NATO to continue the cooper-
10 ative spirit embodied in the Founding Act.

11 (7) On May 28, 2002, in an historic step to-
12 ward the Alliance's long-standing goal of building a
13 secure, cooperative, and democratic Euro-Atlantic
14 area, NATO took the decisive and substantial step
15 of deepening the NATO-Russian Federation rela-
16 tionship by establishing the new NATO-Russia
17 Council.

18 **SEC. 4. UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD NATO.**

19 The House of Representatives declares the following
20 to be the policy of the United States:

21 (1) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization
22 (NATO) should remain the primary institution
23 through which European and North American allies
24 address security issues of transatlantic concern.

1 (2) The member states of NATO should reaffirm, at the Prague Summit in the fall of 2002, the continued importance of NATO, renew their commitment to strengthen the transatlantic partnership, reinforce unity within NATO, maintain a vigorous capability to carry out collective defense, and harmonize security policies and strategies for transatlantic affairs.

9 (3) At the Prague Summit, the Alliance, while maintaining collective defense as its core function, should as a fundamental Alliance task, continue to strengthen national and collective capacities to respond to new threats wherever such threats occur, including from abroad.

15 (4) The Alliance, in addition to the strategic concept adopted by the Allies at the summit meeting held in Washington in 1999, must recognize the need to develop new capabilities, and agree to consider acting upon the threats posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism by intensifying consultations among political and military leaders, and by developing comprehensive capabilities to counter these threats to the international community.

1 (5) The Alliance should make clear commit-
2 ments to remedy shortfalls in areas such as logistics,
3 strategic airlift, command and control, modern
4 strike capabilities, adequate shared intelligence, and
5 the other requirements identified by NATO's De-
6 fense Capabilities Initiative necessary to provide the
7 ability to carry out the full range of NATO's mis-
8 sions.

9 (6) The Alliance must ensure a more equitable
10 sharing of contributions to the NATO common
11 budgets and to overall national defense expenditures
12 and capability-building.

13 (7) The President, the Secretary of State, and
14 the Secretary of Defense should fully use their of-
15 fices to encourage the NATO allies to commit the
16 resources necessary to upgrade their capabilities to
17 rapidly deploy forces over long distances, sustain op-
18 erations for extended periods of time, and operate
19 jointly with the United States in high intensity con-
20 flicts, thus making such NATO allies more effective
21 partners.

22 (8) The member states of NATO should com-
23 mit to enhanced intelligence-sharing, law enforce-
24 ment, police, and judicial cooperation, and expanded
25 information exchanges within and among Alliance

1 members in order to meet the challenges of new and
2 emerging threats.

3 **SEC. 5. POLICY WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERA-**
4 **TION.**

5 It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

6 (1) while maintaining its essential and inherent
7 right to make its own decisions, the North Atlantic
8 Treaty Organization (NATO) should seek to
9 strengthen its relations with the Russian Federation
10 as an essential partner in building long-term peace
11 in Europe, and to that end, the new NATO-Russia
12 Council, in which member states and the Russian
13 Federation will work as equal partners on mutually-
14 agreed matters, should be welcomed and supported;

15 (2) while retaining its primary commitment to
16 collective defense, NATO enlargement should be car-
17 ried out in such a manner as to underscore to the
18 Russian Federation that NATO enlargement will en-
19 hance the security of all countries in Europe, includ-
20 ing the Russian Federation; and

21 (3) in seeking to demonstrate NATO's defen-
22 sive and security-enhancing intentions to the Rus-
23 sian Federation, it is essential that neither funda-
24 mental United States security interests in Europe

1 nor the effectiveness and flexibility of NATO as a
2 defensive alliance be jeopardized.

3 **SEC. 6. POLICY WITH RESPECT TO NATO ENLARGEMENT**
4 **AND DESIGNATION OF COUNTRIES ELIGIBLE**
5 **FOR NATO.**

6 It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—
7 (1) at the Summit to be held in Prague in the
8 fall of 2002, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization
9 (NATO) should extend invitations for accession ne-
10 gotiations to any appropriate candidate country that
11 meets the objectives and targets for NATO member-
12 ship as outlined in the Membership Action Plan
13 process established by NATO in 1999, including—

14 (A) a commitment to the basic principles
15 and values set out in the Washington Treaty;

16 (B) the capability to contribute to collec-
17 tive defense and the Alliance's full range of mis-
18 sions; and

19 (C) a firm commitment to contribute to
20 stability and security, especially in regions of
21 crisis and conflict, and to be willing and able to
22 assume the responsibilities of NATO member-
23 ship;

24 (2) the candidate countries of Albania, Bul-
25 garia, Croatia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the

1 Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Romania,
2 Slovakia, and Slovenia should be commended on the
3 significant progress such countries have made thus
4 far in political and economic liberty and military re-
5 form necessary for meeting the objectives for pro-
6 spective members of NATO as set out in their own
7 Membership Action Plans;

8 (3) each candidate country, despite recognized
9 Membership Action Plan deficiencies requiring fur-
10 ther refinement, could in its own way contribute to
11 stability, freedom, and peace in Europe as a whole,
12 as many of such countries have done thus far in the
13 Balkans and in Afghanistan, and would make a
14 positive contribution toward furthering the goals of
15 NATO should it become a NATO member country;

16 (4) having made significant progress in reform-
17 ing their societies and their military forces, and hav-
18 ing developed reasonable, affordable, and sustainable
19 plans to be able to work within the Alliance struc-
20 ture and to contribute positively to the collective de-
21 fense of the Alliance and other NATO missions, the
22 most qualified candidate countries, as recommended
23 by the Committee on International Relations of the
24 House of Representatives, should be invited to begin

1 the accession process to join the Alliance at the
2 Prague summit;

3 (5) with respect to candidate countries invited
4 to join NATO, such countries should accede on a
5 common date before the next announced NATO
6 summit is to take place;

7 (6) after the Prague summit those candidate
8 countries invited to join the Alliance should continue
9 to participate in the Membership Action Plan until
10 accession, and the accession process should take into
11 account work conducted under the Membership Ac-
12 tion Plan; and

13 (7) the process of NATO enlargement should
14 continue beyond the inclusion of such candidate
15 countries invited to join NATO at Prague, to include
16 those candidate countries not so invited at Prague
17 as well as other democratic European countries
18 which may express interest in joining the Alliance,
19 and which agree to utilize the Membership Action
20 Plan to facilitate such NATO enlargement.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I have an opening statement, and then I will defer to other Members.

On September the 7th, 2001, in the aftermath of the tragedy of September 11th and during the campaign against the al Qaeda and Taliban forces in Afghanistan, the House of Representatives debated and passed by a vote of 372 to 46 H.R. 3167, the Gerald B.H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001. That legislation explicitly endorsed the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance and implicitly reaffirmed the Congress's continued support for NATO.

This coming November 21 and 22, the heads of state and government of the 19 members of the NATO Alliance will gather in Prague in what will arguably be the most important meeting of the Alliance in a decade. At Prague, the future of the Alliance will be thoroughly debated, including the critical issue of whether the Alliance can agree on what threats the Alliance is likely to face in the future and whether the Alliance members will make a serious and credible commitment to develop the military capabilities necessary to meet those threats.

In addition, the summit will reaffirm the new relationship with Russia and will make history by likely issuing invitations to the largest number of new members to join the Alliance. At the time of the House vote on the Solomon bill, we were entering the beginnings of a debate within the Congress, the Bush Administration, the media, and the expert community and among our own NATO partners over the future of the Alliance and what kind of alliance we would be inviting new members to join. Consequently, I felt the Committee should take some time to address several of the questions being raised regarding the Alliance.

Some of those questions included: Was NATO still relevant to Euro-Atlantic security? Were the Alliance's roles and missions in need of new definition? What was the ability of the Alliance to carry out those missions? What was the rationale for adding new members, and what could those new members provide the Alliance? And finally, what would be the impact of an enlarged NATO on a West-leaning but still somewhat skeptical Russia?

In an attempt to find answers to those questions, I laid out a comprehensive plan to gather the necessary information to make an informed judgment to present to the House.

The Subcommittee held three comprehensive hearings on the future of NATO and enlargement. We heard from outside experts, the Bush Administration, our SACEUR and the Ambassadors of the 10 candidate countries seeking NATO membership. I met with numerous foreign visitors, both Alliance members and candidates alike. I travelled to three of the candidate states to review the commitment they are making to becoming responsible members of the Alliance.

The Subcommittee staff has attended countless meetings, including several with the Administration's NATO Working Group, attended numerous briefings, twice travelled to NATO headquarters in Brussels, visited several of the candidate states, and have reviewed as much of the literature as there is available. All of this was designed to ensure that the Subcommittee, and subsequently

the whole House, would feel comfortable supporting the NATO Alliance and endorsing new countries wishing to join the Alliance.

H. Res. 468 is the work product of the Subcommittee's efforts to address the importance of the events which will take place at Prague. H. Res. 468 reaffirms the need for and our commitment to the NATO Alliance. It addresses the need for upgrading NATO's military capabilities. It addresses the need for a strong NATO-Russia cooperative partnership. And finally, it affirms that the further enlargement of the Alliance is appropriate and welcome.

In a few moments I will offer an amendment which will endorse several of the candidate states which I believe have met the criteria for NATO membership. Given the importance of NATO to the United States and the upcoming Prague Summit, I believe the House of Representatives should play an active role in expressing our views on NATO and providing our input on which countries should be admitted into the Alliance. I believe H. Res. 468 provides the mechanism for such an expression of the will of the House, and I urge its adoption.

At this time the gentleman from Nebraska will be recognized for the purposes of an opening statement.

Mr. BEREUTER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to first express my appreciation to you for your efforts as we work together in drafting H. Res. 468, which is an important and historic resolution before the Subcommittee on Europe today. I also want to express my appreciation quite sincerely to our staff for their exceptional work and to our Legislative Fellow, Ms. Anna Kruse, who contributed significantly to this work as well.

If you take a look at the background in your folder today under tab 2, there is an excellent presentation of the issue and the background and the course ahead of us as I think you will find.

Indeed, as original cosponsor of this resolution, as a strong supporter of NATO and NATO enlargement, and as Chair of the House delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I am pleased that H. Res. 468 enjoys bipartisan cosponsorship, including support from the House leadership and from the full International Relations Committee leadership. I hope the resolution will quickly move to the House Floor for its consideration and passage in this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go to some of the questions that have been asked about NATO enlargement, and I will do that directly, but I would ask unanimous consent that my entire statement be made part of the record.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Without objection.

Mr. BEREUTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Why the interest in enlarging NATO membership? Why does NATO remain relevant and even crucial? What are the benefits of and concerns about enlargement? Why should Congress, the American people and the NATO member nations support a robust NATO expansion for countries at the Prague Summit? Well, despite the demise of the Soviet Union and positive changes in Russia, a resilient and vital NATO is needed, one, to perform its core function as a mutual defense pact against the possibility of direct aggression against NATO or a member state; two, to provide a forum to facilitate a greater degree of consultation, cohesion and cooperation

among NATO members; and three, to serve as a source of integrated military strength to address conventional or unconventional threats or demands for out-of-area peacekeeping activities that are vital to NATO's interest.

Next, NATO is the only multilateral security organization in place potentially to be augmented by non-NATO participants in NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP), capable of conducting effective military operations and preserving the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic region.

Furthermore, an expanded NATO provides the stable environment needed by its new member-nations and aspirant countries in Central and Eastern Europe to successfully complete the political and economic transformation for integration into Europe and the community of Western democracy.

Already NATO membership requirements have been absolutely crucial in moving aspirant nations to civilian control of their militaries, transparency in military budgeting, interoperability of their military forces with NATO, resolution of internal ethnic conflicts and territorial disputes, greater respect for human rights, reduced governmental and business corruption, judicial reform, market-oriented economies and functioning parliamentary democracies. It is not that these countries didn't want to move in that direction, but I think this provided some encouragement and opportunities for them to take the leadership and to put things in place.

Additionally, NATO military force structure with its enhanced level of interoperability, joint defense planning, command, control and communication intelligence systems, and common force goals and doctrines provide the crucial basis for forming ad hoc coalitions of willing NATO countries to take on combat, peacekeeping or humanitarian relief missions, supplemented by those Partnership for Peace participants as in Bosnia and in Kosovo.

Next, NATO membership motivates member states generally to sustain their commitment to collective defense, and in particular to meet the goals of NATO's defense capabilities initiative, which goes by the initials DCI. Thus our allies improve their military capabilities and are less dependent upon American forces.

Also, NATO has accepted a new role in the war against terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems among rogue states and nonstate actors. Success will require more than the capability for a rapid and effective military response. It will also require an enhanced level of intelligence-sharing; coordination among NATO members, law enforcement agencies; improved police, judicial and financial agency cooperation and general information exchanges.

Next, Russian civilian leadership has gradually recognized in that NATO is not a threat, but, rather, a forum where Russia can most effectively communicate with their Western neighbors. Additionally, Russia civilian leadership is beginning to understand that an effective relationship in the NATO Russia Council and the confidence-building and cooperative steps that follow from the new Council can lead to the economic prosperity and security of the community of Euro-Atlantic democracies.

At a time when overt threats from Russia to its neighboring states to the west have declined or disappeared, and when intense

opposition to NATO expansion by the civilian Russian leadership has noticeably declined, there should be less reticence among NATO members to accept Baltic nation members and to willingly bear the mutual defense costs and concerns related to their prospective NATO membership.

Furthermore, with a careful redirection of some of NATO's focus away from meeting a massive Soviet Russian attack against NATO/Europe and toward a new task of peacekeeping, responding rapidly to out-of-area military or terrorist actions, and fighting the war on terrorism in NATO countries, the aspirant countries with fewer resources and generally smaller populations than most NATO members can bring specialized military capability to the table for use in the new NATO missions.

Finally, we must recognize that NATO is adapting to meet new threats to its member nations and its collective interest. With the implementation of the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) concept for assembling effective coalitions of the willing, NATO now has far more flexibility to address a range of new and very different threats. When the U.S. must defend its interest out of area, we are more likely to have some friends from NATO at our side who can effectively operate with us despite a very troubling U.S.-European military capabilities gap.

In conclusion, bringing new qualified nations to NATO is not on balance a burden. It is not a burden. Aspirant countries' vigorous interest in membership and their commitment to democracy, peace and stability will make NATO a more vital organization in the Eastern European neighborhood. These countries have been striving to meet NATO membership qualifications and to finally join the ranks of the prosperous, peaceful, democratic nations of the Euro-Atlantic region.

My question is to my colleagues: How morally can we deny them this tremendous step toward those worthy goals some 57 years after the end of World War II?

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution as it will be amended by Chairman Gallegly. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Bereuter follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DOUG BEREUTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

H. RES. 468

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation to you for your efforts as we worked together in drafting H.Res. 468, the Transatlantic Security and NATO Enhancement Resolution, which is an important and historic resolution before the Subcommittee on Europe today. I also want to express my appreciation to our Subcommittee staff and Legislative Fellow, Ms. Anna Kruse, for their exceptional background work on this resolution. Indeed, as an original co-sponsor of this resolution and as a strong supporter of NATO and NATO enlargement, I am pleased that H.Res. 468 enjoys bipartisan co-sponsorship, including support from the House Leadership and from the full International Relations Committee. I hope that this resolution will quickly move to the House Floor for its consideration and passage.

The disintegration of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, with dramatic changes in Russia, have necessitated the evolution of NATO as an organization—a process of change that is accelerating. Among three of the most notable changes are—Alliance enlargement, a new focus on terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the creation of the NATO-Russia Council.

The first post-Cold War legislation endorsing NATO enlargement was the NATO Participation Act of 1994, which the House of Representatives approved on October 7, 1994. The Senate, which has responsibility for ratifying the necessary changes to the NATO Treaty, shortly followed suit. At the NATO Madrid Summit of 1997, the Alliance began the process of expanding its membership from the lineup of eager former Warsaw Pact nations. The Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland became full members in March of 1999. Overall this expansion has been very positive for NATO and for these three countries.

The Alliance is headed for a second enlargement round, with accession decisions expected at the Prague Summit in November. There are formally ten aspirant countries: all of the remaining Warsaw Pact satellite partners of the Soviet Union, the Baltic States, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Croatia. (Because it did not begin the formal accession process until May 2002, Croatia will not be eligible to receive an invitation to join NATO this year.) Our European and Canadian allies acknowledge that in the upcoming Summit the U.S. assessments of the readiness of the aspirant countries will be crucial. The consensus emerging in the Alliance is that seven new members will be invited to formally begin the accession process in Prague.

The House in November 2001 passed the Gerald B.H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act, which I introduced and named for our esteemed, departed colleague, a committed and active supporter of NATO. The Act, which had strong bipartisan support from House leadership, expressed congressional support for a robust second expansion round at Prague. It also authorized U.S. foreign military financing for seven aspirant countries: Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia. After an appeal from President Bush, the Senate's limited but influential opposition to a second expansion round relented, and the Senate approved the House bill by a vote of 85-6 on May 17, 2002.

On June 27, 2002, Chairman Gallegly and I introduced H.Res. 468, with the initial original co-sponsorship of Representatives Tom Lantos and Chris Cox. As introduced, the resolution was intentionally silent on which countries the House would recommend for accession invitations at the Prague Summit. Like leaders in our Executive Branch, we want to keep the pressure on the leading aspirant countries to address remaining deficiencies in their individual Membership Action Plans (MAPs) and in meeting the commitments that are important for NATO membership.

Today, with my full support and consultation, the Chairman of this Subcommittee will offer an amendment which will express the sense of the House of Representatives that the seven most qualified countries be offered invitations to join NATO. We anticipate that before the end of this Congress, the House will debate and vote on the measure. The resolution's passage will signal to the world U.S. House support and membership recommendations for the enlargement decisions at the Prague Summit. It also will demonstrate to the American electorate our support for our Senate colleagues as they assume their treaty ratification responsibilities to implement the Prague enlargement decisions during the next Congress.

Why the interest in enlarging NATO membership? Why does NATO remain relevant and even crucial? What are the benefits of and concerns about enlargement? Why should Congress, the American people, and the NATO member nations support a robust NATO expansion round countries at the Prague Summit?

- Despite the demise of the Soviet Union and positive changes in Russia, a resilient and vital NATO is needed (1) to perform its core function as a mutual defense pact against the possibility of direct aggression against NATO or a member state, (2) to provide a forum to facilitate a greater degree of consultation, cohesion and cooperation among NATO members, and (3) to serve as a source of integrated military strength to address conventional or unconventional threats or demands for out-of-area peacekeeping activities vital to NATO's interests.
- NATO is the only multilateral security organization in place, potentially to be augmented by non-NATO participants in NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP), which is capable of conducting effective military operations and preserving the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic region.
- An expanded NATO provides the stable environment needed by its new member nations and aspirant countries in Central and Eastern Europe to successfully complete the political and economic transformation for integration into Europe and the community of Western democracies. Already, NATO membership requirements have been absolutely crucial in moving aspirant nations to civilian control of their militaries, transparency in military budgeting, interoperability of their military forces with NATO, resolution of internal ethnic conflicts and territorial disputes, greater respect for human rights, reduced

governmental and business corruption, judicial reform, market-oriented economies, and functioning parliamentary democracies.

- NATO's military force structure, with its enhanced levels of interoperability, joint defense planning, command/control/communication/intelligence systems, and common force goals and doctrine, provides the crucial basis for forming ad hoc coalitions of willing NATO countries to take on combat, peacekeeping, or humanitarian relief missions—supplemented by Pfp participants, as in Bosnia and in Kosovo.
- NATO membership motivates member states generally to sustain their commitment to collective defense and, in particular, to meet the goals of NATO's Defense Capabilities Initiative (DCI). Thus, our allies improve their military capabilities and are less dependent on American forces.
- NATO has accepted a new role in the war against terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems among rogue states and non-state actors. Success will require more than the capability for a rapid and effective military response. It also will require: an enhanced level of intelligence-sharing; coordination among NATO members' law enforcement agencies; improved police, judicial and financial agency cooperation; and information exchanges.
- Russian civilian leadership is gradually recognizing that NATO is not a threat but rather a forum where Russia can most effectively communicate with her western neighbors. Additionally, Russian civilian leadership is beginning to understand that an effective relationship in the NATO-Russia Council and the confidence-building and cooperative steps that follow from the new council can lead to the economic prosperity and security of the community of Euro-Atlantic democracies.
- At a time when overt threats from Russia to its neighbors immediately to the west have declined or disappeared, and when intense opposition to NATO expansion by the civilian Russian leadership has noticeably declined, there should be less reticence among NATO members to accept Baltic nation members and to willingly bear the mutual defense costs and concerns related to these prospective NATO members.
- With the careful redirection of some of NATO's focus away from meeting a massive Soviet/ Russia strike against NATO Europe, and toward new tasks of peacekeeping, responding rapidly to out-of-area military or terrorist actions, and fighting the war on terrorism in NATO countries, the aspirant countries, with fewer resources and, generally, smaller populations than most NATO members, can bring specialized military capabilities to the table for use in these new NATO missions.

We must recognize that NATO is adapting to meet new threats to its member nations and to its collective interest. With the implementation of the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) concept for the assemblage of effective coalitions of the willing, NATO now has far more flexibility to address a range of new and very different threats. When the United States must defend its interests out of area, we are more likely to have some friends from NATO at our side who can effectively operate with us, despite a very troubling U.S.-Europe military capabilities gap.

Finally, and in conclusion, bringing in new qualified nations to NATO is not, on balance, a burden. Aspirant countries' vigorous interest in membership and their commitments to democracy, peace and stability will make NATO a more vital organization in an eastern European neighborhood. These countries have been striving to meet NATO membership qualifications and to finally join the ranks of the prosperous, peaceful, democratic nations of the Euro-Atlantic region. How, morally, can we deny them this tremendous step toward these worthy goals—some 57 years after the end of World War II? I urge my colleagues to support the resolution as amended by Chairman Gallegly.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Green, do you have an opening statement?

Mr. SMITH from Michigan, do you have an opening statement?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, just very briefly. NATO is extremely important to the United States. The United States participation is important. My interest is making sure that the United States does not carry an undue burden of the responsibilities, financially or militarily, as we work together to accomplish mutual ends in NATO. Likewise, as we consider additional countries becoming part

of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, those countries should carry their fair share in terms of contribution and military support. And I yield back.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

The gentleman from New York, Mr. Gilman, do you have a statement?

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you and Congressman Bereuter for bringing the importance of NATO to our attention. I know that Congressman Bereuter for many years has worked diligently as Chairman of our NATO delegation, and I would like to voice my support as a cosponsor of this resolution.

It is my firm belief that NATO enlargement will not only further contribute to the stability and security of Europe, but preserve and enhance its ability to effectively combat the scourge of terrorism.

Today the case for NATO enlargement is stronger than ever before. The September 11th attacks have reminded us of the common interest we all share with our European allies. Thus not only will NATO enlargement contribute to the process of integration that so stabilized Europe over the past 50 years, it will also help promote the development of strong new allies in our war on terrorism. Far from backing away from NATO enlargement, we should welcome all these European democracies whose political stability, military contributions and commitment to NATO's solidarity will be an asset to the Alliance.

Each of the candidate countries have made remarkable progress in transitioning to Western-style democracies and free-market economies. While each Nation's challenge is different, they share a common thread, the desire to adopt a pluralistic form of democracy that respects human and civil rights, practices tolerance for ethnic and religious diversity, and demonstrates the health and respect for the rule of law. They should be commended for both their accomplishments in their continued pursuit of these goals.

Accordingly, I am pleased to support the integration of the Republic of Slovakia into NATO and recommending the integration of the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia into NATO. It is my firm belief that the integration of those nations into NATO is in our own Nation's best interest.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I thank the gentleman from New York.

The gentlelady from California, Ms. Lee, do you have an opening statement?

The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Cantor, do you have an opening statement?

Mr. CANTOR. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Okay. With that, the Chair offers an amendment. Will the clerk please read.

Mr. PRISCO. Amendment to H. Res. 468 offered by Mr. Gallegly. Page 18 beginning on line 11, strike "the most qualified candidate countries" and all that follows through "House of Representatives, should" on line 14 and insert the following:

"the candidate countries of Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia have met in a satisfactory manner the criteria established by NATO through the

Membership Action Plan process, would likely make a positive contribution to NATO, and should.”

Mr. GALLEGLY. I yield myself 5 minutes for the purpose of explaining the amendment. This amendment is pretty self-explanatory. It endorses seven of the candidates for NATO membership. Yesterday each Member of the Subcommittee received a report prepared by the Subcommittee staff detailing the candidacies of each of the Vilnius 10 countries.

This report was compiled after reviewing the extensive information available to the staff from numerous sources, including the Administration and NATO itself. The report is modelled after the issues addressed by NATO through the Membership Action Plan, or MAP, and focuses on the political, economic and social development of each democracy, its ability to develop a military structure capable of providing for the overall security of the Alliance, and a commitment to provide the resources necessary to ensure the military capability.

This analysis by no means is exhaustive, but it is intended to provide the Members with an overview of what issues are important to NATO and what issues were important to the staff in order to make an informed assessment of each candidate.

Overall, the 10 candidates should be congratulated on the efforts they have made thus far to meet the criteria for becoming a member of NATO. Progress in every aspect, from political and military reform to resources commitment, to ensuring the support of the population, has been impressive. Each have displayed a level of enthusiasm and commitment to the Alliance, as we saw demonstrated when the Ambassadors of the 10 testified before this Subcommittee. Each has already displayed its willingness to be a fully participating member of the Alliance through its action in the Balkans and with respect to the campaign against terrorism.

These attributes make them all desirable members, either now or in the future. Each candidate brings with it its own individual strengths. Each is a vital democracy which shares a pro-Euro-Atlantic view. Each is committed to market economies. All have embraced military reform. Each provides a unique geopolitical perspective or geostrategic location.

On the other hand, each candidate has its weaknesses. Not all have truly stable political systems or strong institutions. Some have weak economies and structural deficiencies needing attention. Not all have sufficiently addressed corruption. Some possess military structures in need of further reform. Some need more modern equipment. All need to spend more money.

Nevertheless, it is our judgment that each of the seven countries listed in the amendment have thus far met the MAP criteria in a most satisfactory way, and each have been judged to be a potential net contributor to Alliance security. Does this mean they have nothing left to do? Far from it. Each has plenty more work to be done, and that work must continue up until Prague and beyond Prague, whether they receive an invitation to join or not.

To conclude, I want to say a word about the three we did not recommend. Croatia has been working very hard for the past 2 years on MAP criteria, even though they have only just become a formal MAP participant. In terms of the process, Croatia is basically in

the first phase of the MAP, where all the others are entering the fourth phase. Croatia, I believe, understands that they are too far behind to be offered an invitation at this time.

Macedonia has worked hard on all the aspects of MAP, but the recent conflict in that country has set their candidacy back. The fact that NATO forces are present in that country, in effect as a peace guarantor, indicates that politically, economically and militarily they just have too much work yet to do.

Similarly, Albania has made impressive progress given where they were just a few years ago. However, political uncertainty of the kind we witnessed in 1997 and again earlier this year still plagues their candidacy. Their economy remains weak, and scarce resources may require more attention to domestic needs. Finally, their military, while strongly committed to reform, does not seem far enough along to contribute to the Alliance.

All three countries should be commended for their commitment and efforts thus far and should be encouraged to continue to work on their criteria in order to be prepared for the next round of enlargement, which I am sure NATO is already contemplating.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the need to be brief here, but I did want to say that I agree totally with your assessment and your sentiments about future members. I would say also that the NATO Parliamentary Assembly endorsed these same seven states at its Sofia meeting over the Memorial Day recess. The U.S. and several delegations abstained, but we abstained only because we wanted to keep, frankly, the seven moving along and progress continuing and encouragement given to them. But without exception, the House delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, which has some ideological breadth and is bipartisan, is supportive of these seven. I would call our colleagues' attention and the public's attention to the last paragraph of the basic resolution which says that the process of NATO enlargement should continue beyond the Prague Summit. And so those three countries and others we certainly will encourage for future membership. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, move the resolution.

Mr. GALLEGLY. First of all, are there any other amendments?

Hearing no further requests, then the question occurs on the amendment. All in favor, say aye.

All opposed, nay.

The ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted.

The Chair will now entertain a motion that the bill be reported favorably to the Full Committee.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move we report the resolution favorably as amended.

Mr. GALLEGLY. The question occurs on the motion to report the resolution, H. Res. 468, favorably as amended. All in favor, say aye.

All opposed, no.

The motion is approved, and the bill will be reported favorably to the House.

The staff is directed to make any technical and conforming amendments.

Mr. GALLEGLY. We have two additional measures on the schedule, H. Con. Res. 116, introduced by Mr. Shimkus, which endorses the integration of the Baltic states into NATO, and H. Res. 253, introduced by Representative Stupak, which endorses the integration of Slovakia into NATO. Without objection, I ask that both of these be adopted and favorably reported to the Full Committee.

[H. Con. Res. 116 and H. Res. 253 follow:]

107TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. CON. RES. 116

Recommending the integration of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 26, 2001

Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself, Mr. COX, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. ENGLISH) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Recommending the integration of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

Whereas the Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are undergoing a historic process of democratic and free market transformation after emerging from decades of brutal Soviet occupation;

Whereas each of these Baltic countries has conducted peaceful transfers of political power—in Lithuania since 1990 and in Latvia and Estonia since 1991;

Whereas each of these Baltic countries has been exemplary and consistent in its respect for human rights and civil liberties;

Whereas the governments of these Baltic countries have made consistent progress toward establishing civilian control of their militaries through active participation in the Partnership for Peace program and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) peace support operations;

Whereas Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are participating in the NATO-led multinational military force in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo;

Whereas Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia are consistently increasing their defense budget allocations and have adopted laws providing that such allocations for defense will be at least 2 percent of their gross domestic product (GDP) by 2002 for Lithuania and Estonia and by 2003 for Latvia;

Whereas each of these Baltic countries has clearly demonstrated its ability to operate with the military forces of NATO nations and under NATO standards;

Whereas former Secretary of Defense Perry stipulated five generalized standards for entrance into NATO: support for democracy, including toleration of ethnic diversity and respect for human rights; building a free market economy; civilian control of the military; promotion of good neighborly relations; and development of military interoperability with NATO;

Whereas each of these Baltic countries has satisfied these standards for entrance into NATO; and

Whereas NATO will consider at its 2002 summit meeting in Prague the further enlargement of its alliance: Now, therefore, be it

- 1 *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate*
- 2 *concurring)*, That it is the sense of Congress that—

1 (1) Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are to be
2 commended for their progress toward political and
3 economic liberty and meeting the guidelines for pro-
4 spective members of the North Atlantic Treaty Or-
5 ganization (NATO) set out in chapter 5 of the Sep-
6 tember 1995 Study on NATO Enlargement;

7 (2) Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia would make
8 an outstanding contribution toward furthering the
9 goals of NATO should they become members;

10 (3) extension of full NATO membership to
11 these Baltic countries would contribute to stability,
12 freedom, and peace in the Baltic region and Europe
13 as a whole; and

14 (4) with complete satisfaction of NATO guide-
15 lines and criteria for membership, Lithuania, Latvia,
16 and Estonia should be invited in 2002 to become full
17 members of NATO.

○

107TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 253

Recommending the integration of the Republic of Slovakia into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OCTOBER 3, 2001

Mr. STUPAK submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

RESOLUTION

Recommending the integration of the Republic of Slovakia into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

Whereas the Republic of Slovakia came into existence with its peaceful separation from the Czech Republic in 1993;

Whereas the Republic of Slovakia has demonstrated the maturity of its democracy by the recent peaceful transition of power;

Whereas the Government of the Republic of Slovakia has shown a clear desire to continue and progress with improvements in the areas of the human rights, civil society, and a free market economy;

Whereas the Republic of Slovakia has made significant strides in addressing its human rights record with the placement of three ethnic Hungarians in the cabinet of

the government, including the Deputy Premier for Human and Minority Rights and has stated its determination to conform to the standards of the Council of Europe;

Whereas the Republic of Slovakia has continually worked to retain civilian control of its military through participation with North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) forces, and has shown willingness to work with North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces through activities such as the Partnership for Peace program, peacekeeping missions to Bosnia, and United Nations operations to Rwanda and Liberia;

Whereas members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization community have been involved in the development of the military of the Republic of Slovakia;

Whereas one of the stated goals of the Government of the Republic of Slovakia is to “create all of the conditions necessary for the Republic of Slovakia to become a standard democratic state and a stable element in the region”;

Whereas the Republic of Slovakia is geographically located in a strategically significant position between the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland, all three of which were included in the first round of North Atlantic Treaty Organization expansion;

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been a pillar of peace, stability, and freedom in Europe since 1949; and

Whereas the Republic of Slovakia has stated as one of its strategic priorities becoming a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as quickly as possible: Now, therefore, be it

1 *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Rep-
2 representatives that—

3 (1) the Republic of Slovakia should be com-
4 mended for progressing toward political and eco-
5 nomic liberty and for its efforts to meet the guide-
6 lines for prospective North Atlantic Treaty Organi-
7 zation (NATO) members set out in Chapter 5 of the
8 September 1995 Study on NATO Enlargement;

9 (2) the Republic of Slovakia would make signifi-
10 cant contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Or-
11 ganization;

12 (3) extension of the North Atlantic Treaty Or-
13 ganization to include the Republic of Slovakia would
14 significantly benefit the security and peace of Eu-
15 rope and the region as a whole; and

16 (4) the Republic of Slovakia should be invited
17 to be a full member of the North Atlantic Treaty
18 Organization alliance at the earliest opportunity.

○

Mr. GALLEGLY. In addition, I ask that my statements and those of Mr. Shimkus and Mr. Stupak be made a part of the record of the hearing. Is there any objection?

[The prepared statements of Mr. Gallegly follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ELTON GALLEGLY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE

H. CON. RES. 116

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.Con.Res. 116 which was introduced by our Colleague from Illinois, John Shimkus.

In light of the action taken by the Europe Subcommittee and just now by the House which endorsed the Baltic state for membership in NATO, I believe this Resolution is complimentary to H.Res 468 and should be adopted

This Resolution endorses the candidacies of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania for NATO membership and discusses in detail why the three Baltic nations deserve to be invited into the Alliance.

Last year the Baltic nations celebrated the tenth anniversary of the resumption of their independence after a long period of Soviet dominance. The changes which have taken place in those countries has been amazing in every aspect.

In fact, during the August recess, I traveled to all three of the Baltic states to see first hand what they had accomplished and how they were preparing for NATO membership.

The total political, economic, and social transformation they have gone through in preparation for NATO and EU membership have been impressive and they deserve to be recognized for their accomplishments by being invited to join the Alliance.

The author of this legislation, John Shimkus, has long been a supporter and spokesman for the Baltics, serving as Chairman of the Baltic Caucus in the House. He has given tireless devotion to promoting these countries and their accomplishments. Passage of this Resolution is as much about his dedication as it is about theirs.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there could be any better additions to the NATO Alliance than these three nations.

I urge the adoption of the Resolution.

H. RES. 253

H.Res. 253 was introduced by our Colleague from Michigan, Bart Stupak and endorses the candidacy of Slovakia for NATO membership.

In light of the action just taken by the House, I believe this Resolution is complimentary to H.Res 468 and elaborates on the reasons why Slovakia should be included in NATO.

Five years ago, Slovakia was seriously under consideration for NATO membership but was denied due to the government in power at that time. That government was subsequently replaced but it threatened a return to power this year again calling into question Slovakia's candidacy.

However, Slovakia just recently held very important national elections and the current government has been returned to office. The outcome of the elections were one of the keys to the status of Slovakia's application for NATO.

The election results did come out to everyone's satisfaction and this has lessened the apprehensions about Slovakia's commitment to NATO.

I want to congratulate the people of Slovakia for their strong showing in the elections—I am told 70 percent of the voting population actually voted.

I also want to commend the work of our Ambassador Ron Weiser and his entire embassy team for efforts to encourage strong voter turnout.

I urge the adoption of the Resolution.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Shimkus follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN SHIMKUS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

H. CON. RES. 116

Chairman Gallegly, Ranking Member Hilliard, and honorable members of the Subcommittee on Europe, I am sorry I cannot join you this morning for the consideration of H.Con.Res. 116, a sense of Congress that the Baltic countries should be invited to join NATO. I commend this committee for its ongoing leadership and hard work on the issue of NATO expansion and I am pleased that you will be recognizing the Baltics this morning in their journey to become new members of the alliance.

As a member of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and Chairman of the House Baltic Caucus, I have had many opportunities to interact with representatives from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and have never failed to be impressed. In the short time after reasserting their independence, these countries have developed constitutional democracies, the rule of law, and a respect for human rights. Immediately upon the breakout of hostilities in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo, Lithuania deployed troops in support of both NATO missions. Not constrained by the old Soviet force structure, the Baltics are moving to light infantry for deployability and forest defense. The countries' rapid ascent to functioning democracies, tolerance for their Russian minority, and a willingness to put a painful 20th Century history behind them, make them deserving candidates for alliance membership.

A poignant memory from my Spring 2002 NATO Parliamentary Assembly trip I took to Vilnius was the jeweler from the open air historical museum of Rumsiskes. Above the door of his shop were these words in English, "I want to be in NATO, because my family died in Siberia." Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia have been run over numerous times and have suffered great destruction but have never given up. Most recently, at the hands of Germany and the Soviet Union in World War II. No Baltic citizen was untouched by those events. Yet the current governments have energetically sought good relations with all of their neighbors, including Russia.

Why should the Baltics be allowed to join NATO?

For many years the Statue of Liberty has been a symbol of freedom, security, and economic opportunity for many immigrant families. The Statue faces east, welcoming immigrants to our shores. Now I think as she faces east, she also looks east toward Europe at these former captive nations who struggle as newly emerged democracies. Many of us multi-generational immigrants, after years of security and freedom, take our liberties for granted. Many of us are too young to have experienced the fresh air of newly found freedom. My trip to Vilnius revived my senses. Not only could I smell the sweet air of freedom; I could see it, touch it, and taste it. I am a better father, citizen, and representative for it.

This will be true for NATO. For NATO to be relevant, it must expand its current protective umbrella over these new emerging democracies. By expanding, NATO will experience heightened senses—seeing, feeling, touching, and tasting freedom. This will be essential as NATO counteracts the evil of global terrorism.

As President Clinton said, the goal of NATO is to "expand the frontier of freedom." I hope this subcommittee will follow the vision of President Bush when he said: "from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, a Europe whole, free, and secure."

I urge you to pass H.Con.Res. 116 and affirm the House of Representatives' support for the Baltics' efforts to join NATO.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Stupak follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE BART STUPAK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

H. RES. 253

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding today's sub-committee mark-up in support of the expansion of the North American Treaty Organization (NATO).

I appreciate this opportunity to ask for the Sub-Committee's support for my resolution, H. Res. 253, which expresses the sense of the House that the Slovak Republic should be commended for its progress toward political and economic liberty and for its efforts to meet the guidelines for prospective NATO members.

Slovakia, a once authoritarian regime, embraced a pro-Western government in 1998 and freed its citizens from international isolation. Last Saturday, September 21, 2002, the Slovak government successfully held the third free and fair elections since independence. Over 70 percent of eligible voters turned out to express their newfound democratic right.

The Slovak Republic now stands ready to play an integral part in defense of the free world. As a member of NATO, Slovakia would contribute to the protection of member states and significantly benefit the security and peace of Europe and the region as a whole. Slovakia's leaders value the prospect of serving in our military alliance, while its citizens align themselves with NATO's common values and democratic mission.

The NATO Summit to discuss enlargement is scheduled for November 23, 2002, in Prague. Among the other European countries vying for membership, Slovakia boasts the highest Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and a key geographical advantage, surrounded by other NATO member states. Let's send them a clear message that Slovakia would make an excellent partner and deserves to be counted among the newest members of NATO.

Please support H.Res. 253 and urge our international community to give Slovakia's bid for NATO membership due consideration.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, would you have my statement to be part of the record as well?

Mr. GALLEGLY. Without objection, the statement from the gentleman from Nebraska will be made a part of the record of the hearing. And hearing no objection, that will be the order.

The Subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:26 a.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

