

IN HONOR OF RABBI ALLEN &
ALISA SCHWARTZ

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1998

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend members of my community for their outstanding service, Rabbi Allen and his wife, Alisa Schwartz. This will mark the 125th anniversary of Congregation Ohav Zedek along with the 10th anniversary of the arrival of Rabbi and Mrs. Schwartz to the fold.

Since Rabbi Schwartz joined Congregation Ohav Zedek, things have not been the same. In ten years, membership has increased 600 percent. Under his direction, the Congregation has instituted countless charitable programs such as food delivery for the homebound, hospital visits and clothing, food and toy drives. His presence and service have helped to guide the 125 year old congregation into becoming a vibrant part of the upper West Side community.

Mrs. Schwartz has been equally successful in her activities at the Congregation. She has been very active in her efforts to develop a children's program at Ohav Zedek as well as a Shiurim for women of the congregation. Mrs. Schwartz has worked diligently side by side Rabbi Schwartz to create a true sense of community among the congregants.

In addition to being senior rabbi at Ohav Zedek, Rabbi Schwartz finds time to teach Bible at Yeshiva University, where he was also ordained. He is currently working on his doctoral thesis on the Methodology of Rashi and has published numerous themes on Bible, Rabbinics, Halakha and Jewish thought. He also manages to find time to write Bible curriculum for Jewish Day Schools and lectures on behalf of the Board of Jewish Education in New York.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend both Rabbi and Mrs. Schwartz for their limitless generosity to the congregants of Ohav Zedek. Their devotion to the community and effort to promote Jewish education is admirable. I wish them the best on this ten year anniversary with Ohav Zedek and to the congregation, many more great years of fellowship.

CONGRATULATING ELIZABETH
AMES AS WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1998

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Elizabeth Ames, of Stewartville, New Jersey, on being named "Woman of the Year" by the Warren County Commission for Women. Mrs. Ames has had a distinguished career as a volunteer in many areas of community life but has been especially dedicated to the cause of public education. She has served on local school boards for nearly three decades, been active in the Warren County School Boards Association and has been on the New Jersey School Boards Association's board of directors for 20 years. She has been

called upon by the state Department of Education many times for her expertise in a variety of subjects. In all of this work, Mrs. Ames' goal has been to improve the quality of education for the children of our community. As a former teacher and school board member myself—and the mother of children who attended public schools—I can attest to the importance of this work. This high honor is well deserved.

Mrs. Ames holds a degree in bacteriology from the University of Pennsylvania, where she met her husband, veterinarian Sherman Ames II. She worked several years as a research chemist at General Aniline and Film Corp. before becoming business manager of her husband's practice. She was also a research fellow at the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania, where she conducted government-sponsored research on hepatitis.

Mrs. Ames has been a member of the Warren Hills Regional Board of Education since 1969, serving twice as president, currently as vice president and chairing a variety of committees over the years. She has been a member of the Franklin Township Board of Education since 1974, serving three times as president, chairing several committees and serving on the Community Council. She is a former president of the Warren County School Boards Association and served on the board of directors of the New Jersey School Boards Association from 1975–1996.

The state Department of Education called on Mrs. Ames to serve on its High School Graduation Requirements Committee in 1977 and to participate in its retreat to study reorganization of the department in 1991. She worked with the department's Northwest Educational Improvement Center from 1973–1979, serving one year as chairwoman. In 1985, she participated in the Executive Academy for School Board Members.

Mrs. Ames is a former chairwoman of the Warren County Economic Commission and has been involved in career education coordination, family life planning and the student foreign exchange program. She is a trustee of the Charles Smith Foundation.

A former ballet dancer, Mrs. Ames is also an avid swimmer. She and Dr. Ames live in Stewartville. They have five children and nine grandchildren.

I would like to take this occasion to bring attention to the achievements and service of this outstanding woman and add the recognition of my colleagues in this House for all she has done for Warren County. She deserves this honor for her many years of hard work and dedication.

IN HONOR OF DANIEL J. GARNEK
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 J. Garnek of Cleveland, Ohio, who will be honored March 29, 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 an 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 congratulate Daniel for his achievement.

TRIBUTE TO CARL STEPHENS—
ALABAMA BROADCAST LEGEND

HON. TERRY EVERETT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1998

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that one of Alabama broadcasting's best loved personalities will soon retire after 40 years behind the microphone and television camera.

A native Alabamian, Carl Stephens was practically born into his profession. A radio sportscaster at the age of ten in his native Gadsden and student manager of the college radio station while at the University of Alabama, Carl Stephens began his television career at the Alabama Educational Television Network before settling in as one of the states' best-known on-camera personalities at WSFA TV in Montgomery.

At WSFA, Carl Stephens forged a 38-year career witnessing and reporting some of Alabama's and the nation's most historic events during the 1960s. Despite his contribution to news reporting in Alabama, it is noteworthy that Carl is best known by many Alabamians for his other roles. As host of a popular children's cartoon show in the late 1950's and co-anchor of the Auburn Football Review for many years, Carl's genteel charm and warm personality best shown through the television screen, earning him wide respect and many loyal fans.

Carl will begin his well-deserved retirement effective this Thursday, but his voice will continue to be heard, as it has been for many years, over the public address system of Auburn University football and basketball games.

I join with all Alabama in wishing Carl, his wife Mary, and all his family the very best in the years ahead.

AMBASSADOR ROBERT E. HUNTER
ON NATO ENLARGEMENT

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1998

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, last week the Senate began the debate on the admission of

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 potlitical 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 Russians 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 Gen-

eral 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 initiated 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