

enough to keep them at their job, why did we hire them in the first place in the agencies?

What concerns me here is that as an appropriator I have the responsibility to follow up on these matters, and I take that very seriously. I do not think we are asking anything unreasonable and certainly do not want to just pile on the President. But this is taxpayer money and we have a right to make sure it is being spent wisely. We need to verify that the White House is not using appropriated funds for the President's personal legal defense. It is already illegal for any Government entity to use appropriated funds for anything other than what Congress appropriated the money.

In addition, there are many Government regulations from the Office of Government Ethics and the Justice Department which support the position that Government attorneys are to provide their services for Government interests only and not personal ones. That seems pretty clear and pretty well cut and dry to me. I do not request the answers to the questions that I believe are unnecessary. And I do not make frivolous requests. These are very important questions, plain and simple.

Finally, Mr. President, I announce that our committee intends to hold a hearing on the Executive Office's fiscal year 1999 request before the Easter recess and fully expect their response to this inquiry prior to that hearing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter that we did send to Mr. Erskine Bowles, the Chief of Staff to the President, on March 13, 1998.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, March 13, 1998.

MR. ERSKINE B. BOWLES,
Chief of Staff to the President,
White House, Washington, DC

DEAR MR. BOWLES: This letter is in reference to the size of the legal staff at the Executive Office of the President (EXOP). As you are aware, there has been recent public concern about the use of appropriated funds for the private legal defense of the President.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury and General Government, which funds the Executive Office of the President, I have a responsibility to respond to these concerns. I understand that my staff has made repeated requests to the Office of Administration for information relating to this issue, for which the office has not provided a response, but instead excuses and delays.

Specifically, my staff has requested that the following questions be answered: Has the size of the legal staff within all of EXOP, funded by appropriations, changed significantly during FY1997 and FY1998? And, what is the current number of Justice lawyers detailed to EXOP and has that number changed significantly during FY1997 and FY1998? In addition, I want to know the total number of lawyers detailed to all EXOP agencies and their detailing agency. Your responses should include all of the agencies falling under the EXOP and provide the specific FTE counts with a breakout of the employee and detail classification by EXOP agency.

I remind you that my staff acts on behalf of the Appropriations Committee and I expect that any request they make to you for information to be dealt with expeditiously. Because this request is now more than a week old, I expect that this information will be on my desk by March 18, 1998 at 12:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

BEN NIGHORSE CAMPBELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Treasury,
and General Government.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair and ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5, 6 minutes in morning business.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

NATO ENLARGEMENT

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong support for the protocols of accession to NATO, specifically for Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic.

I think this is truly a historic decision in the sense that it shatters once and for all the artificial division of Europe that occurred at the end of the Second World War. Now, if history is any guide, it ensures and enhances the prospects for peace, prosperity, and harmony throughout Europe.

Mr. President, in the nearly 50 years of its existence, NATO has provided the military security umbrella that has permitted old enemies to heal the wounds of war and to build strong democracies and integrated free economies. Expanding NATO to include the emerging democracies of Eastern Europe will, I hope, produce the same results, that is, stronger and freer economies whose people can live in the same harmony as do the people of France and Germany.

I would also note that the prospect of NATO enlargement has already begun as seen by the process of harmonization in Central and Eastern Europe. Hungary has settled its border and minority questions with Slovakia and Romania. Poland has reached across an old divide to create joint peacekeeping battalions with Ukraine and Lithuania.

Mr. President, an expanded NATO will make the world safer simply because we are expanding the area where wars will not happen. As Secretary of State Albright testified last year before the Foreign Relations Committee, and I quote, "This is the product paradox at NATO's heart: By imposing a price on aggression, it deters aggression." At the same time, we gain new allies, new friends who are committed to our common agenda for security in fighting terrorism and weapons proliferation, and to ensuring stability in places such as the former Yugoslavia.

There is no doubt in my mind that had Soviet troops not in 1945 occupied

Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary, and installed puppet governments, the debate over whether these three countries should be members of NATO would have long ago been resolved in their favor.

The people of these countries have yearned to have freedom, democracy, and peace for more than 40 years, as evidenced by Poland particularly. The blood in the streets of Budapest in 1956, the demonstrations of the people in Prague in 1968 who confronted Soviet tanks, and the public confrontations of Solidarity throughout Poland beginning in the 1970s all laid the foundation for the collapse of communism, which we have seen in our lifetime.

Now as they begin to build institutions of democracy and free enterprise, as they move to further integrate their economies with the rest of Europe, they should participate in the collective security of the continent. I think this will bind these countries closer together far into the future and ensure stability and peace throughout the continent.

Mr. President, there have been expressions of concern by some people that expanding NATO is a mistake because it would somehow be perceived as a threat, a threat to Russia. I find that argument hard to accept. In my opinion, NATO has never been a threat to Russia. Even during the height of the Cold War, no one seriously considered that NATO threatened the Soviet Union. Quite the contrary. NATO stood to defend—defend—against any potential military threat to its members. There is a difference between defense and offense. And NATO is designed for defense. It was never designed as an alliance of aggression—rather, it is an alliance against aggression.

I think the same holds true today, Mr. President. The people of Russia, who are slowly trying to emerge from the darkness and terror of 70 years of communism, have nothing—I repeat, nothing—to fear from NATO. Our goal is not to isolate Russia but to engage and support her in her efforts to develop a lasting democracy and a free market.

The people in the evolving democracies of Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary have earned the right to become full partners in Europe and full partners in NATO. I hope my colleagues will support the dreams, hopes, and aspirations of these people who have struggled for freedom for so long, after so many decades in which they have lived without hope. They have that opportunity today.

NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I listened to my friend and colleague from the State of Nevada speak relative to the movement of high-level nuclear waste across various States. I think it is important to reflect on two points. I won't extend the debate at