Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to the North Atlantic Alliance. One of the key players in the process of admitting these three newly democratic states of Central Europe to NATO was Robert E. Hunter, who served for most of the past five years as the United States Ambassador to NATO in Brussels. Ambassador Hunter was a highly articulate and extremely effective representative of our government in this critical post at that critical time, and we owe him a debt of gratitude for his constructive and productive efforts.

As the Senate debate began last week, Mr. Speaker, two opinion pieces which were published in The Washington Post—one by David Broder and the other by Jim Hoagland—questioned the extent to which the enlargement of NATO has been thoroughly discussed and evaluated prior to the Senate vote on this critical issue. I strongly disagree with the point of view that these two experienced journalists have expressed on this matter. While I could express the reasons for my disagreement with their positions at some length, Ambassador Hunter has done a much more effective and concise job than I could do in responding to the issues raised in the two Post articles.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Ambassador Hunter's excellent response, published in The Washington Post on Monday, March 23, be placed in the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to read his thoughtful article.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 23, 1998]

THIS WAY TO A SAFER EUROPE

(By Robert E. Hunter)

David Broder and Jim Hoagland [op-ed, March 18 and 19] see a rush to judgment in the impending U.S. Senate vote to admit Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to NATO. They are right that full debate is critical to create the potilical underpinning for the most important U.S. commitment abroad in a generation. They are wrong that the Senate is acting ''in haste'' (Hoagland) or ''outside the hearing of the American people'' (Broder). Rarely has any major foreign policy have been developed over such a long period, displayed so fully before the public and considered so comprehensively with so many members of Congress.

The commitment to enlarge NATO was made by all 16 allies at the January 1994 NATO summit in Brussels, fully 50 months before today's Senate deliberations on whether to ratify the accession of the first new members. In the intervening period, every aspect of the issue has been ventilated in the media and with our elected leaders. As ambassador to NATO, I welcomed to its Brussels headquarters a stream of congressional visitors and immersed them in discussion with the allies, the Central Europeans and the Russians. During the past several months, Congress has held a score of hearings and been bombarded by arguments by all sides. Doubts may remain about NATO enlargement, but adequate information and debate are not the problem.

Hoagland argues that the administration is engaging in ''strategic promiscuity and impulse'' and ''has not taken seriously its responsibility to think through the consequences of its NATO initiative.'' Not so. During the past 50 months, the United States—indeed, all the allies—carefully and thoughtfully has sought to take advantage of the first opportunity in European history to craft a security system in which all countries can gain and, potentially, none will lose. After a century of three wars, hundreds of millions killed and a nuclear confrontation, no other test can suffice.

Thus the 16 allies understand that security cannot just be based on accepting Russia's viewpoint, which includes leaving Central Europe in limbo (the practical result of the views Broder reports); nor can it be based on rushing all of Central Europe, unprepared, into a Western alliance which freezing Russia out and thus eroding allied strength and cohesion. Hard as it is to achieve, the perspectives of both Russia and the Central Europeans must be accounted for. They and the current allies must all end up more secure, and the alliance must be as strong and robust in the future as it is now.

This is an agenda of unprecedented scope, but one NATO allies set out to achieve four years ago. This is why enlargement is only one part of the ''new NATO'' and the overall, root-and-branch reform of European security to meet the realities of the 21st century. The integrated grand strategy devised by the alliance includes renovating the NATO command structure, creating new combined joint task forces (and validating the principles in Bosnia) and making it possible for the Europeans to take more responsibility through a Western European union able for the first time to take military action.

This strategy also explains why NATO created the Partnership for Peace, which is both a program for NATO aspirants to meet the military demands of membership—a valid matter for Senate scrutiny—and a means for those who do not join to have practical engagement with the alliance instead of feeling considered to a security gray area. It is why NATO created a special partnership with Ukraine, whose independence is a critical test of any European security arrangements. It is why the alliance undertook responsibility for preserving peace in Bosnia, and why the United States has pressed the European Union to expand its membership.

And this grand strategy is why the allies negotiated the NATO-Russia Founding Act. No one coerced President Boris Yeltsin into signing it, nor dragooned the Russions into the practical cooperation now taking place at NATO headquarters, nor drafted the 1,500 Russian soldiers who serve with the Stabilization Force in Bosnia, within an American division under NATO command. And remarkably, while NATO's actions in Central Europe can resolve Russia's historic preoccupation with stability on its western frontier, the alliance's effort to forge a strategic partnership with Moscow has elicited not one charge of a ''new Yalta'' from Central Europe.

Thus, despite Hoagland's assertion, NATO allies do have a clear sense of ''strategic mission.'' If the NATO plan can secure the full backing of the Senate and thus of American power and purpose, it offers hope for a lasting security that Europe and its peoples have never known.

STATEMENTS BY SECRETARIES ALBRIGHT AND COHEN, AND BY CHAIRMAN SHELTON OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, ON U.S. POLICY IN BOSNIA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1998

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with last week's debate on House Concurrent Resolution 227, Secretary of State Albright and Secretary of Defense Cohen sent a letter in opposition to that resolution. I believe that their letter, and the letter I received from General Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, detail the importance of the NATO mission in Bosnia, and detail the very harmful consequences for the United States and for peace in Bosnia if U.S. troops were to be pulled out at this time.***P***The text of their letters follow:

HONORABLE RICHARD GEPHARDT,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. GEPHARDT: We are informing you of our strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 227, as amended, directing the withdrawal of United States forces in Bosnia. The House will consider this matter on March 18.

We oppose this concurrent resolution for both policy and legal reasons. As a policy matter, this resolution would fundamentally undermine our efforts in Bosnia. It would encourage those who oppose Dayton and would send the wrong signal to Serbia about U.S. resolve at exactly the time that concerns about destabilization in Kosovo are mounting. It would totally undercut our ability to implement the Dayton Accords and thereby dramatically lessen regional stability.

The President's decision that the United States should participate in a NATO-led multinational force in Bosnia after SFOR's current mandate expires has already begun to affect the calculations of even the most hardened Bosnian opponents of the peace accords. If we disengage militarily from Bosnia now, the momentum we have built will stop. The result could be a return to war.

As a legal matter, the resolution is based on a part of the War Powers Resolution—section 5(c)—that is unconstitutional. We recognize that there have long been differences of opinion about the constitutionality and wisdom of the 60-day withdrawal provisions of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution. But there has been widespread agreement that section 5(c) is inconsistent with the Supreme Court's 1983 decision in *Chadha v. INS.* Under *Chadha,* Congress cannot create a legal requirement binding on the Executive branch through a concurrent resolution, but may only act through a resolution passed by both Houses and submitted to the President for signature or veto.

We also note that, even if section 5(c) were constitutional, it would not apply here because by its own terms it applies only to situations where U.S. forces are ''engaged in hostilities''. In fact, U.S. forces in Bosnia are performing peacekeeping functions and are not engaged in hostilities. The Dayton Peace Accords, which ended the previous armed conflict in the former Yugoslavia, were initialed on November 21, 1995—before the deployment of IFOR or SFOR. From that point to the present, there have been only sporadic criminal acts against U.S. forces which do not constitute ''hostilities'' for the purpose of the War Powers Resolution, and there have been no U.S. fatalities from these acts. Our presence in Bosnia is with the consent of the relevant parties under the Dayton Accords.

Finally, one stated purpose of the proposed resolution is to provide a basis for a federal court suit to address the constitutionality of various aspects of the War Powers Resolution. In the past, federal district courts have declined to accept such suits on a variety of legal grounds, including standing, ripeness, political question, and equitable discretion. Whatever the district court's response might be in this case, such a proceeding—and the appeals that might follow—would create a prolonged period of considerable uncertainty about U.S. intentions with respect to Bosnia that would have a serious harmful effect on the stability of the situation in that country during a critical time.

For all these reasons we urge you and other Members of Congress to oppose this

concurrent resolution and thereby avoid putting in jeopardy the important work of stabilizing the troubled Balkan region.

Sincerely,

MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT,
Secretary of State
WILLIAM S. COHEN,
Secretary of Defense.
CHAIRMAN OF THE
JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,

Washington, DC, March 18, 1998.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,
Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: Thank you for your letter of 18 March and the opportunity to express my thoughts on the importance of our mission in Bosnia.

Pulling US forces out of Bosnia would cripple the mission at a critical time when we are achieving success in that troubled country. A US withdrawal would send the wrong signals to our NATO allies and the wrong signals to those who wish our efforts ill. Beyond that, US leadership within the Alliance would suffer a severe blow.

Europe's stability and America's security are joined. There is no more volatile region in Europe than the Balkans. Failure to see our mission in Bosnia through to full implementation of the Dayton Accords would send a harmful message to states throughout the Balkans—a message that the United States lacks resolve.

Our troops know they have made a difference in Bosnia. Their presence, together with that of our NATO allies and other partners in this effort, stopped the killing and ethnic cleansing. They see the signs of progress in Bosnia every day.

We have a strategy for success in Bosnia. A US military presence coupled with US leadership are essential to the achievement of a self-sustaining peace in that country.

Sincerely,

HENRY H. SHELTON,
Chairman,
of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

IN HONOR OF DANIEL G. SAJNER ON HIS ATTAINMENT OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1998

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Daniel Sajner of Strongsville, Ohio, who will be honored on March 22, 1998 for his attainment of Eagle Scout.

The attainment of Eagle Scout is a high and rare honor requiring years of dedication to self-improvement, hard work and the community. Each Eagle Scout must earn 21 merit badges, twelve of which are required, including badges in: lifesaving, first aid; citizenship in the community; citizenship in the nation; citizenship in the world; personal management of time and money; family life; environmental science; and camping.

In addition to acquiring and proving proficiency in those and other skills, an Eagle Scout must hold leadership positions within the troop where he learns to earn the respect and hear the criticism of those he leads.

The Eagle Scout must live by the Scouting Law, which holds that he must be: trustworthy, loyal, brave, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, clean, and reverent.

And the Eagle Scout must complete and Eagle Project, which he must plan, finance and evaluate on his own. It is no wonder that only two percent of all boys entering scouting achieve this rank.

My fellow colleagues, let us recognize and praise Daniel for his achievement.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1998

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times continues to clearly spell out the problem facing those of us who support campaign finance reform. In an editorial in yesterday's paper the Times described the campaign finance reform bill which will be considered this week as ". . . sham legislation dressed up to look like reform, with no chance for members to vote on the real thing."

Mr. Speaker, the hard work of many members of this House is being destroyed by the highly partisan legislation being offered by the majority. The bill being considered contains poison pills designed to insure the failure of campaign reform. There are better alternatives. If the majority would allow an open rule on the floor these alternatives could be considered. Failure to allow a free, open debate on campaign finance reform would be a terrible disservice to the public and to our democratic process.

I open over the next several days the leadership of the House will reconsider their decision and allow an open rule on campaign finance reform. We need real campaign finance reform. The people of my district will not accept "no" for an answer.

IN RECOGNITION OF MONIQUE WRIGHT, TRACEY A. ROBERTS AND THE DAYTON METROPOLITAN HOUSING AUTHORITY MARCH 19, 1998

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1998

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize and honor the work of the Dayton Metropolitan Housing Authority (DMHA) for its successful efforts and dedication to improving the quality of life for people in the Dayton area. The programs provided by DMHA are helping people move away from dependency to self-sufficiency. The success of these programs is highlighted by the uplifting stories of two remarkable women who reside in my district.

Ms. Monique Wright has always been determined to improve her life and provide a good future for her children. As a single mother, Monique received public assistance while she attended school full-time at Central State University in Ohio. After the birth of her second child, it became very difficult to give her children the nurture and care they needed and attend school at the same time. Moniques' priority was her children.

Because of her devotion as a mother, Monique pro-actively sought ways to provide for her two children. She worked at various jobs. But as we in Congress know all too well, jobs for the working poor often do not provide enough even for a family to eat. Monique was just making it from day to day. She wanted more for herself and more for her two precious children. That is why she enrolled in DMHA's Job Shadowing Program which provides job training, mentoring, and employment to its participants. Through her initiative, and with the assistance of DMHA, Monique received the training she needed to move her in the right direction.

Today, Monique is a full-time employee of DMHA. She is giving back to the community by helping others who are in need. By taking advantage of DMHA programs, Monique has also moved her family into a better housing situation. In addition, Monique has gone back to school to earn an Associate Degree in Liberal Arts with a concentration in Social Work.

Ms. Tracey A. Roberts is another wonderful woman who took advantage of these opportunities. As a single mother with two children, Tracey moved to Dayton in search of better job opportunities to improve the lives of her children. Tracey participated in DMHA's Family Self-Sufficiency Program. This program provides people with the tools necessary to move themselves away from dependency on the government and enables them to be self-sufficient. Case managers work with participants to develop a comprehensive plan for change.

Tracey enrolled in the program with the belief that a combination of hard-work, training, and motivation would help her take control of her own life. That is exactly what she did. Two years after enrolling in the Family Self-Sufficiency Program, Tracey now holds a rewarding job and has moved her family into a new home which she owns.

The programs of the Dayton Metropolitan Housing Authority work. They provide people with opportunities for self improvement.

Like Monique and Tracey, Americans who struggle with poverty want to lead more rewarding lives. They want to provide a brighter future for their families and they are willing to work to achieve it. With the help of organizations like the Dayton Metropolitan Housing Authority, many more people like Monique and Tracey will have the opportunity to improve their own lives.

It is with much pride that I recognize and commend Monique Wright and Tracey A. Roberts along with the Dayton Metropolitan Housing Authority for their outstanding achievements.

SCHOOLS NEED A HELPING HAND

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1998

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, parents throughout Arlington, Texas, which is in my congressional district, received a scare earlier this month when school inspectors revealed that the floor was near collapse in the north wing of Arlington High School. The school, which was constructed in 1955, had to have classes and students rerouted because of the potential danger.

The floor damage was noticed by school inspectors who were preparing for a summer renovation of the building. Recognizing the accelerated rate however, at which the floor was