

Mellon Bank, and was instrumental in the growth and development of Pittsburgh. His son, Andrew Mellon, served as Secretary of the Treasury for Presidents Harding and Coolidge. He helped found Gulf Oil, Alcoa, and the Union Steel Co., which later merged into the U.S. Steel Corp. He assembled one of the world's greatest art collections, established the National Gallery of Art, and donated his collection to the gallery where vast numbers of Americans enjoy it every year. Andrew's son, Paul, and other members of the Mellon family have carried on the family's business success and extraordinary philanthropy.

The Scotch-Irish have also been well-represented in the arts. Edgar Allen Poe, Stephen Foster, Horace Greeley, founder of the New York Tribune, and Harold Ross, founder of the New Yorker, were all Scotch-Irish.

The majority of Irish-American Protestants today define themselves as "Irish," not "Scotch-Irish." By and large, the term "Scotch-Irish" fell into disuse over the years as discrimination against Catholics in this country declined.

Immigrants to America from all parts of Ireland, whether Catholic or Protestant, have made brilliant contributions to the success of America. Those of us who are committed to a just and peaceful resolution of the conflict in Northern Ireland know that peace will only be achieved there when both traditions are treated equally and fairly, and when mutual respect and a good-faith political process replace bombs and bullets as the means for settling disputes.

Ireland's extraordinary contributions to America reflect Ireland's two great traditions—Protestant and Catholic—and America honors them both on St. Patrick's Day 1997.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BOND and Mr. CHAFEE pertaining to the introduction of S. 404 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes, if I may, as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HUNGARY'S PROGRESS TOWARD NATO MEMBERSHIP

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today I will deliver the first in a series of statements on the theme of NATO enlargement. In the next 4 months leading up to the Madrid Summit in July, I will examine the rationale for NATO's admitting new members, which countries appear to be leading candidates for admittance to the alliance, how NATO and Russia can define a new

relationship, the responsibilities of our European allies in the process, and how to share the costs of enlargement fairly.

Mr. President, as many of our colleagues are aware, the distinguished foreign Minister of the Republic of Hungary, Laszlo Kovacs is in Washington this week for a series of meetings. I would like to take the occasion of the foreign Minister's visit to note the progress that Hungary has made toward meeting the criteria for membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to thank his government for the assistance it has provided to our forces involved in the Bosnia mission.

Mr. President, the foreign Ministers from the 16 NATO members will meet in Madrid in early July to decide which Central European democracies should be invited to begin accession negotiations with the Alliance.

In the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996, Congress named Hungary—along with Poland, Slovenia, and the Czech Republic—as a leading candidate for NATO membership and, therefore, eligible for transition assistance. I plan to travel to the region over the Easter recess to assess the progress that these countries have made toward meeting the criteria set out in the NATO enlargement study. Today, however, I can already point to several things that indicate to me that Hungary is well on its way toward assuming the responsibilities of NATO membership.

The first is the successful effort by Hungary to conclude bilateral treaties with its neighbors, Romania, Slovakia, and Ukraine. Students of Central European history know how truly important these treaties are for the security of the region. Many had predicted that the end of the cold war would bring with it a resurrection of Hungary's territorial claims against its neighbors, and they predicted an era of instability that would make us wish the cold war had never ended.

Events, and the concerted effort of the Hungarian Government, have proven the pessimists wrong. First, Hungary has succeeded in establishing a stable, open democracy that has allowed the Hungarian people to enjoy the fruits of political and economic freedom.

Equally important, Hungary has recognized that its security and prosperity are dependent upon a resolution of the territorial claims that poisoned relations with its neighbors in the decades after World War I.

For those of my colleagues who have asked: "Why should NATO admit new members?" I ask you to look closely at the Hungarian example. One of the criteria for new members of NATO is that they must resolve all territorial disputes with their neighbors.

Just as common membership in NATO has allowed France and Germany to overcome the enmity and territorial disputes that had resulted in

three wars in 80 years, so too has the prospect of NATO membership led to reconciliation in Central Europe. The Hungarian Government is to be commended for its forward-thinking policies that recognize that cooperation is the key to stability in Europe in the 21st century. I particularly want to recognize the political courage of Hungarian Prime Minister Horn in disregarding the criticism of ultranationalists in his country and signing these treaties.

In exchange for renouncing territorial claims, Hungary has secured pledges that its neighbors will respect the rights of the large ethnic Hungarian communities in those countries. As the European Union also begins to expand its membership eastward, I hope that national boundaries in Central and Eastern Europe will matter less and less, and the free exchange of people, products, and ideas will help ensure peace and prosperity for all.

Romania and Slovakia are home to the largest Hungarian communities outside Hungary, and ideally we would like to see them join NATO as well. I am pleased by the recent progress made by Romania, which through free and fair elections has peacefully changed its government. The new ruling coalition, incidentally, includes a party representing the interests of the Hungarian minority.

Slovakia, unfortunately, for the past several years has seemed to be heading in the wrong direction. I must question the commitment of Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar to democracy, particularly to minority rights and a free press. The treaty with Hungary is a step forward, but if Slovakia is to join the community of Western democracies, it must show that it will not water down its commitments to respect the cultural and linguistic rights of its ethnic Hungarian citizens.

The other theme I want to focus on today is the cooperation that Hungary has extended to us and our allies in connection with the ongoing peacekeeping mission in Bosnia. An essential part of that mission has been a staging base in Tazsar, Hungary, which the Hungarian Government has leased to the U.S. military. It is from that base that we have deployed our forces to Bosnia to prevent a return to Europe's worst fighting since World War II. As former Secretary of Defense Perry has stated, without the cooperation of Hungary, the IFOR and SFOR missions would have been immeasurably more difficult.

At Tazsar 1,200 Hungarian troops are working with 3,200 Americans. This cooperation has allowed Hungarian officers and enlisted men to understand how a NATO military functions and what Hungary must do to allow its forces to operate jointly with those of the NATO countries. By all accounts, the work at Tazsar has been a rousing success, both in supporting the IFOR and SFOR missions and in helping the Hungarian military.

The threat to the security of Europe today no longer comes from an easily identifiable Soviet adversary; it comes from the prospect of instability. It comes from the prospect of future Bosnias. NATO must adapt to this new reality and prepare itself to undertake missions outside the territory of its member states.

Our experience at Taszar shows that Hungarian membership in NATO will help us and our allies to carry out these new missions and will enable us together to help maintain the security and stability of the continent as a whole.

Moreover, the Taszar experience shows how NATO enlargement can help reduce costs that we and our allies would face without enlargement. Enlargement will allow us and our allies access to bases like Taszar in times of crisis, and it will allow the central European democracies to rely on others for part of their security, thereby reducing the cost to them of restructuring their militaries.

Let me reiterate that the prospective new members of NATO must agree to make the financial sacrifice necessary to modernize their militaries. We will, of course, do our fair share to help. In that regard, the 15 percent of the direct enlargement costs that last month's Pentagon cost study envisages the United States will assume seems an equitable proposal. But the prospective new members and the non-U.S. current NATO members must shoulder the largest share of the costs.

My meeting with Mr. Kovacs today to discuss Hungary's progress toward NATO membership was extremely fruitful, and, as I mentioned earlier, I will visit Budapest later this month to help me ascertain for myself if Hungary is ready to join the Atlantic alliance.

I commend the Hungarian people on the progress they have made in creating a successful democracy and free-market economy over the past 8 years and for their determination to ensure their security through cooperation with their neighbors and other democracies.

I hope that Hungary will continue in this direction and will meet the criteria for membership in NATO so that in July it will be in the group of prospective members invited to begin accession negotiations with the alliance.

I thank the chair and yield the floor.

I thank my colleague from Alabama for giving me the opportunity to take the floor.

Mr. SHELBY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator from Alabama.

#### NOMINATION OF MR. ANTHONY LAKE

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise tonight to give to the Senate the status on the confirmation process in the Intelligence Committee of Anthony

Lake, who has been nominated by President Clinton to be the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

As I have said on many occasions, I intend to treat the confirmation of Anthony Lake, President Clinton's nominee to be Director of Central Intelligence in a serious, thorough and fair manner.

The Central Intelligence Agency and the intelligence community deserve a strong and independent leader to carry them into the 21st century. I believe that everyone in the Senate recognizes that.

This leader must be able to guide the fine men and women that serve our country and keep watch on our adversaries, sometimes under the most trying and dangerous of circumstances.

And, this leader must be deserving of the confidence of the President, the Congress, and the American people.

This is a controversial nomination, we have known this from the beginning. And it is essential that we address all of the issues associated with Mr. Lake's fitness to lead the intelligence community, and his ability to make the transition from White House insider to apolitical provider of intelligence information.

I'd like to comment on the six areas in which the committee has considerable work to complete as we proceed with Mr. Lake's confirmation hearings which will begin on Tuesday. We want to get the process moving, but it is important that we have the fullest cooperation from the White House.

These six areas are, among others: First, investigation of the role the National Security Council, under Mr. Lake's leadership, had in questionable DNC fund-raising practices, as well as any knowledge Mr. Lake may have had, if any.

Second, Mr. Lake's use and interpretation of intelligence provided to him as National Security Advisor, including how he helped translate this intelligence into administration policy.

Third, the Justice Department's settlement of Mr. Lake's ethics violations and the potential irregularities in this settlement.

Fourth, the way in which Mr. Lake handled the "no instructions" policy toward Iranian arms shipments through Croatia to Bosnia.

Fifth, review of Mr. Lake's FBI background investigation.

Sixth, review of written answers Mr. Lake provided to the committee's questions for the record, many of which require further explanation than was provided.

#### NSC INTERACTIONS WITH DNC CONTACTS

We will continue our investigation into the role of the NSC staff, under Mr. Lake's direction, in the expanding controversy over foreign campaign contributions.

At issue is the extent to which Mr. Lake knew of the ties the White House was building with questionable fund-raisers and foreign contributors and what effect this might have had on administration foreign policy.

It is apparent that his staff had knowledge of the involvement, and although on many occasions advised against it for either political or foreign policy reasons, never seemed to raise the flag of illegality.

And if Mr. Lake was fully informed, did he participate in decisions to continue this involvement or were any admonitions he might have given regarding the nature of these meetings completely ignored?

This question goes to the heart of Mr. Lake's ability to be an effective Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The committee must consider this issue in great detail and determine if Mr. Lake could become embroiled in a potential independent counsel investigation into these matters, as we read in the press.

The intelligence community deserves a leader that will not be distracted by such an investigation, if it occurs.

The information supplied by Mr. Lake could be the tip of an iceberg, and more inquiry is required. For example, Mr. Lake does not appear to shed any light as to why his staff met with Pauline Kanchanalak, the Thai businesswoman and lobbyist whose contributions to the DNC were eventually returned.

New allegations about Ms. Kanchanalak appear in the press every day all over America, and perhaps the world.

For example, last Tuesday, the New York Times reported, and I quote: "One Justice Department official said subpoenas also were served on the United States-Thai Business Council, a trade-promotion group formed in part by Pauline Kanchanalak, a lobbyist who helped raise \$250,000 in political donations that have since been returned by the Democratic National Committee."

The article goes on to say: "Government officials said the Justice Department two weeks ago subpoenaed records from the Export-Import Bank concerning Ms. Kanchanalak's efforts to help Thai investors \* \* \*"

I ask for unanimous consent that this and other articles about Ms. Kanchanalak be entered into the RECORD at this point in their entirety.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 25, 1997]

INQUIRY INTO GIFTS TO DEMOCRATS WIDENS

(By Christopher Drew)

The Justice Department today subpoenaed the records of Johnny Chung, a California businessman who gave \$391,000 to the Democratic Party, and others who made large donations while seeking access to the White House, Government officials said.

One Justice Department official said subpoenas also were served on the United States-Thai Business Council, a trade-promotion group formed in part by Pauline Kanchanalak, a lobbyist who helped raise \$250,000 in political donations that have since been returned by the Democratic National Committee.