

as some of the former imperial powers including France, as well as Germany and Japan. The U.S. was ideally suited for the task of the Cold War in which there was a long-term military threat, unchanging year after year that the public would focus on. Now there are numerous but petty threats—clashes of nationalism—clashes of ethnic origin. The rest of the world does not understand the U.S. Constitution, does not understand separation of powers and does not understand that in this country to conduct foreign policy, we need to have a consensus. We need to have public acquiescence in that foreign policy. It makes the U.S. as the great ruling power of the world somewhat different from anything in the past. Leadership is not an entitlement; it must be earned each year, each decade. And leadership can be costly. As long as offense and expenditures are being maintained in this country, other nations and other groups will be driven to terrorism as the only way to strike at the United States. Terrorism may be unpleasant, but it is less unpleasant than war.

Leadership implies choices—choices that we must avoid being over committed. We have spread forces in recent years; Saddam Hussein had noticed this recently. We have spread our political capital even thinner. Why do I say that? One must not overload the American public with international obligations, for the public will no longer accept it. Whatever we may say, whatever we may proclaim that we're not going to be the world's policemen, too frequently we become the world's policeman. As Sullivan proclaimed it, "A policeman's lot is not a happy one."

We accommodate dependents. And we cannot afford to accumulate dependents. We develop public hatred for them. We cannot come to any accommodations for them. We must shed both. Being the world leader is difficult. We must retain a technological edge. The American public is not eager to sustain high casualties for what appear to be petty purposes. And therefore, in order to hold casualties down it is essential for us to maintain a technological edge. The problem, though, is that we tend to reveal our technologies. We reveal all, as we did during the Gulf War. We showcase our technologies. Everybody now understands the global position that existed. That is the price that must be paid when American forces go to war. We can never rest from our past accomplishments. Finally, ladies and gentlemen, once again, as always, eternal vigilance remains the price of freedom.●

ROMANIAN-HUNGARIAN BILATERAL TREATY

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise to draw the attention of the Senate to the signing by the Governments of Hungary and Romania of a basic bilateral treaty intended to normalize relations and resolve longstanding border disputes and ethnic rivalries between the two countries.

The Prime Ministers of Hungary and Romania signed the bilateral treaty on September 16 marking an important step toward insuring peace and stability in Central Europe. Their signing represents the culmination of several years of difficult negotiations and, when ratified by both countries, will help ease centuries of conflict and tension between these neighbors.

The treaty obligates both countries to respect the basic civil rights and

cultural identities of minorities in each country. Educational and linguistic guarantees and other communal protections are enshrined in the treaty. When ratified and faithfully implemented, the resolution of border disputes and respect for the rights of minorities that are embodied in the treaty will be an important model for other countries with comparable ethnic and nationality problems. Further, the treaty will move each country closer to satisfying requirements set for successful integration into western institutions, including membership in the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

As Romania and Hungary continue to strengthen their democratic institutions, develop free-market economies, and ensure respect for human rights, their governments and the political parties supporting this process are to be commended for taking the political risk required to reach an agreement on this treaty. It is a significant example of two nations putting the best interests of regional stability ahead of domestic political interests.

Therefore, Mr. President, I want to congratulate the governments and peoples of Hungary and Romania for successfully reaching agreement on this historic bilateral treaty.●

DAVID ABSHIRE

● Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, as this Congress and my own career in the U.S. Senate come to an end, I want to pay tribute to a distinguished American who has been of great assistance to me, to the Senate, and to our Nation, Ambassador David Abshire.

During my career in the Senate, David Abshire has been one of the leading figures in the national security field in the United States. Although he is probably best known for his service as our Ambassador to NATO and as the founder and president of the Center for Strategic and International Studies [CSIS], these are just two examples from his career of service to our Nation.

David Abshire was born in Chattanooga, TN in 1926. He graduated from West Point in 1951 and served with distinction in the Korean war, as a platoon leader, company commander and division assistant intelligence officer. His decorations for service as a front line commander included the Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Cluster with V for Valor.

In 1959 he received a Ph.D. in history from Georgetown University, where he returned to serve as an adjunct professor for many years.

In the early 1970's, he served as Assistant Secretary of State and later as chairman of the U.S. Board for International Broadcasting. He was a member of the Murphy Commission on the Organization of the Government, the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, and headed President Reagan's National Security transition team.

During the Reagan administration he served with distinction as the U.S. Ambassador to NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Dr. Abshire served in this position during a very challenging period when the Soviet deployment of SS-20 missiles led to NATO's deployment of the cruise missiles and the Pershing missile. Ambassador Abshire's efforts bore fruit when the U.S. deployment led to the first major arms reduction treaty, the INF treaty. For his service as Ambassador he was awarded the Defense Department's highest civilian award, the Distinguished Public Service Medal.

I had the opportunity of working with David Abshire during his tenure as Ambassador on several important issues, including my amendment to force our NATO allies to contribute their fair share to our common defense, and on the NATO Cooperative Research and Development program.

In 1987, after finishing his service as Ambassador, he served as Special Counsellor to President Reagan. It is not surprising that a man to whom so many of us have turned for wise counsel and advice should be called on by the President of the United States as a Special Counsellor.

David Abshire's contributions to the national security field are not limited to his Government service. In recent years Dr. Abshire and CSIS have continued to stimulate debate and discussion on important foreign policy issues such as our policies toward Bosnia and China.

Dr. Abshire's talents have extended beyond Government service and academia to benefit our Nation in other areas as well. He is a member of the Council on Competitiveness, the Council on Foreign Relations and the International Institute for Strategic Studies, to name but a few of the organizations who have sought out his talents.

Dr. Abshire is also an author, and I want to call special attention to his most recent book, "Putting America's House in Order." This book demonstrates Dr. Abshire's keen grasp not just of matters of national security, but of the whole range of issues from deficit reduction to investments in, and reforms of, our education and training policies, that are necessary to put our Nation's house in order.

In 1991, under Dr. Abshire's leadership, CSIS created the Strengthening of America Commission to address these issues. I was honored that Dr. Abshire asked me and my friend and colleague from New Mexico, Senator PETE DOMENICI, to serve as co-chairs of this commission. I am very proud of the Strengthening of America report that our commission released in September of 1992 and am grateful to David Abshire for his leadership in creating this commission and seeing it through to a successful conclusion.

The work of the CSIS Strengthening of America Commission exemplified the best of David Abshire—long-term thinking and a keen insight into the

fundamental issues facing our Nation. Our report challenged not just Government but our schools, our businesses and our parents to take the steps needed to secure a prosperous future for our Nation. We laid out a plan of action to get our fiscal house in order; to raise our level of national savings and our level of public and private investment in both physical and human capital; and to improve the way Washington works.

It is with great pleasure that I end my Senate career with a public thank you to a man who has contributed so much to U.S. national security and foreign policy and to me personally, David Abshire. I wish David, his wife Carolyn, and his family all the best. ●

GRAZING OPERATIONS IN GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK

● Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise to express my desire to work with the National Park Service to address the issue of open space in the Teton Valley and its interrelationship with grazing in Grand Teton National Park. Since establishment of the park in 1950, a limited number of local ranchers, who had grazing privileges within the boundaries of Grand Teton Park before its establishment, have been allowed to continue to graze within the area. These grazing permits were given for the life of the designated heirs of the permit holders who were local ranchers that required the summer range to maintain their ranches.

This arrangement has not only benefited the ranch families involved, but helped support the ecology in the park and preserved open space in Jackson Valley for visitors to this unique region. Unfortunately, in the past few years, both of the designed heirs to these grazing permits have died. Although both families have expressed their interest in continuing to ranch in Jackson Valley, the Park Service may be forced to terminate these grazing permits unless a reasonable solution can be found. Without the summer range available in the park, these ranchers may be forced to end their operations and sell their ranches. If these ranches are sold, they would be immediately subdivided and developed and the open space provided by these areas would be gone forever.

It is an imperative environmental issue that we work to ensure that open space is preserved in and around Grand Teton National Park. This region is truly unique and it is vital for both the wildlife living in and around the park and the environment throughout the region that open space is protected. Unless the ranchers are allowed to continue grazing in the park, the region will be threatened with development that will harm the wildlife and the ecology in and around the park.

In the coming months, the Wyoming congressional delegation plans to work with the National Park Service, the ranch families, the environmental

community and local citizens to develop a solution to this situation. By working together, I am hopeful we can continue to protect the open space in this magnificent region and continue an activity that has been monitored and managed by the Park Service for over 45 years. Make no mistake about it, ending grazing operations in Grand Teton National Park will be harmful to park resources, wildlife in the area and will destroy open space for visitors to this outstanding region. I look forward to working with the National Park Service in the coming months to address this critical matter. ●

MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an issue that has troubled me greatly over the years and has recently become an even greater problem as our Nation strives toward a balanced budget. This is the issue of the quality of life of our service men and women.

As a former enlisted sailor in the Navy, a commissioned officer in the Marine Corps, and Under Secretary and Secretary of the Navy, I have a particular empathy for our men and women in uniform. These men and women make sacrifices every day, throughout their careers, in defense of our nation. However, the pay and benefits that they receive, which in some cases are woefully inadequate, are constantly under attack by people and organizations that are too focused on the bottom-line and not on the morale and readiness of our Armed Forces. It is for this reason that I, as a senior member of the Armed Services Committee, sleep with one eye open in order to protect the benefits which our service members and veterans have earned through loyal and patriotic service to our Nation.

I have worked hard, together with my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, to provide increased funding to improve the quality of life of our Armed Forces. In particular, we have been concerned about the lack of adequate funding for the maintenance of military housing. Many of our service members and their families are forced to live in substandard housing. In testimony before the Armed Services Committee this year, Department of Defense officials testified that a full 80 percent of military housing falls below Department of Defense standards. The result of years of diverting maintenance funds to other requirements is military housing units with leaky plumbing, flaking paint and broken appliances. Our service members deserve better!

That is why I was so concerned to see two articles in the most recent editions of the Navy and Army Times which describe further inequities for our service members in the area of military housing. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

The first article concerns a report by the General Accounting Office, dated

September 17, 1996, which recommends that military families should begin paying rent for living in Government quarters. The report suggests that the rental payments are not primarily to raise money from military families, but to treat all service members equally whether they live on or off base. It is unfortunate that GAO's recommended solution to fix what they perceive to be an inequity is to raise the out-of-pocket expenses of the families living on-base, rather than increase the housing allowances to an adequate level for those living off-base. GAO's first response is to cut benefits to our Armed Forces.

I was pleased to see that the Pentagon opposes this idea. I will work with my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee to ensure that this GAO recommendation is not adopted.

The second article concerns a recent ruling by the General Accounting Office that a service member who is required to move because of renovation or construction of their base housing, is not eligible for a dislocation allowance to cover the expenses of that move. This is an issue of basic fairness. How can the Government, in good conscience, order a military service member to uproot and move his or her family and all of their possessions, but not pay the expenses of that move? This is another example of the constant attack on the benefits of our service members.

I will work with the Pentagon to try to find a solution to this problem. It is my understanding that the Pentagon had been paying service members a dislocation allowance for these moves prior to the GAO ruling. I am hopeful that a quick solution can be found so that service members will not have to bear the cost of these moves. If necessary, I will introduce legislation next year to correct this unfair practice.

Mr. President, it is time that we end this continuous assault on the quality of life of our Armed Forces. It is a question of fairness and respect for those that so selflessly serve our nation and defend the freedom that we all hold dear.

[From the Navy Times, Sept. 30, 1996]

PAYING RENT ON BASE? GOVERNMENT REPORT SAYS ALL SHOULD PAY

(By Rick Maze)

Military families should begin paying a modest rent for living in government quarters, according to a new congressional report.

The rental payments are being suggested not so much to raise money from military families as they are to treat all service members equally, whether they live on or off base.

But the underlying reason is that the rental payments would eliminate the attraction of living on base for many military members, and that would result in huge savings for the government.

The "rent" would vary by rank and location, but would average \$2,016 a year, according to the Sept. 17 General Accounting Office report. That is the same amount as the average out-of-pocket cost for service members with families living off base, whose housing