

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 17, 1997, I appreciated being granted an excused absence due to a serious illness in my family. Due to that absence, I missed several rollcall votes.

Had I not been unavoidably absent on June 11, I would have voted in the following manner pertaining to H.R. 2160, the Agriculture Appropriations Act: "Aye" on rollcall vote No. 285, a motion for the Committee to rise; "no" on rollcall vote No. 284, a motion for the Committee to rise; "no" on rollcall vote No. 283, a motion for the Committee to rise; "aye" on rollcall vote No. 282, a motion to table the motion to reconsider the vote; "aye" on rollcall vote No. 281, a motion to resolve into Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

NATO ENLARGEMENT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention my monthly newsletter on foreign affairs from July 1997 entitled "NATO Enlargement."

I ask that this newsletter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

NATO ENLARGEMENT

At an early July summit in Madrid, President Clinton and leaders from the 16 member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) invited the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland to enter talks to join the Alliance. The goal is to complete negotiations in 1997 and treaty ratification by 1999, so that these three countries can join in time for NATO's 50th anniversary.

A decision to forge a new system of international security by enlarging NATO has been long in coming—but came as no surprise. NATO established a program of co-operation with former Warsaw Pact countries in 1994, the Partnership for Peace, and President Clinton made clear at that time that the question was when—not if—NATO would expand. NATO outlined a strategy for enlargement in a 1995 report, and announced in 1996 that invitations would be extended to new members in 1997. Two months ago, Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin signed the NATO-Russia Founding Act. This document spells out future relations between NATO and Russia, sets up a Joint Council for regular consultation, and seeks to ally Russia's concerns about enlargement. The Founding Act paved the way for Madrid, where there were some differences between the U.S. and its allies about those not invited to join NATO (Romania and Slovenia)—but no suspense about the three invited.

The spotlight on enlargement now shifts to parliaments and public opinion. So far, the U.S. debate on NATO enlargement has been a narrow one, attracting little interest outside of ethnic communities. The President's task now is to persuade the American people that it is in our national interest to defend the countries of Central Europe.

From my perspective, there are five major questions about NATO enlargement—commitments, costs, relations with Russia, what happens to countries not invited to join, and the impact of enlargement on the Alliance itself.

Commitments.—Twice in this century Europe exploded into world wars because of events in Central Europe. The United States intervened in 1917 and 1941 to protect its vital interests on the European continent, and formed NATO in 1949 to protect western Europe against the Soviet threat. The question now is whether countries in Central Europe should have the same security guarantee as current NATO members. This guarantee, which requires NATO allies to treat an armed attack against one as an attack against all, would come at a time when U.S. troop levels in Europe have been cut from 300,000 to 100,000 in the past six years. The threat to peace in Europe today is remote, but NATO enlargement means a pledge to intervene in tomorrow's unforeseen crises. The bet is that the promise of sending NATO troops to defend countries in Central Europe will make it unnecessary to do so.

Cost estimates of NATO enlargement vary widely, from \$5 billion to \$125 billion. The Pentagon's own estimate is \$27 to \$35 billion spread over 13 years, with a U.S. share of up to \$2 billion. There is reason for skepticism about all cost estimates, because military budgets across Europe have been declining. The three countries invited to join NATO spend a total of \$4 billion annually on defense, or less than Belgium spends. Current NATO members see little threat, and most are under pressure to cut spending to meet budget targets for European Monetary Union. If Europe won't pay, the U.S. Congress also will be reluctant to pay. More burdensharing disputes with Europe are likely.

Relations with Russia.—Opponents of a larger NATO stress that expansion will provide hostile reaction from Russia, creating a new line of division across Europe. Russia opposes enlargement, but has acquiesced in its initial stages. It remains to be seen how enlargement will impact on key U.S. interests in Russia's ratification of the START II nuclear arms reduction treaty and the Chemical Weapons Convention, or the future of reform in Russia. Much of the success of NATO enlargement will depend on how the U.S. manages relations with Russia.

Those Not Invited To Join.—Twelve countries emerging from communism applied to join NATO, and only three got what they wanted in Madrid. The challenge ahead for NATO is to enhance military and political cooperation with non-members. The Alliance has also made clear that the door is open to future members. No one knows how far NATO enlargement will go, but the first wave will not be the last. The toughest question here will be the Baltic States.

Impact of Enlargement on the Alliance.—There is a tension between keeping NATO's door open, and keeping the Alliance func-

tional. NATO decisions require unanimity, and so far the Alliance has been able to function well on the basis of consensus. It is an open question whether this round, or future rounds of enlargement, will affect the cohesion and integrity of the Alliance and its decision-making process.

CONCLUSIONS

NATO enlargement is going to happen. I still have many questions about it, and we have not had sufficient debate or consideration of its impact. Yet the risks of proceeding with NATO enlargement are less than the risk of not going forward. Sixteen governments cannot take a decision of this magnitude and then reverse course. The alternative to expansion—freezing NATO in its cold war membership—also carries risks of irrelevance or even dissolution.

NATO enlargement can increase the security of all of Europe, and decrease the chances of future wars. NATO enlargement certainly will assure new democracies in Central Europe and reinforce their democratic reforms. If done right, it can bring Russia into a cooperative relationship with Europe. The President needs to answer questions and address lingering doubts. If he articulates the case forcefully, the President can win the support of the American public—and the advice and consent of the Senate—for NATO enlargement.

A RESOLUTION TO PROMOTE THE VIRTUES OF OUR NATION'S YOUTH

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join Representatives DUNCAN, ETHERIDGE, HALL of Ohio, and WOLF in introducing House Concurrent Resolution 127.

Traditionally, colleges and universities were founded on the premise of developing intellectual minds and moral character. Today, colleges and universities continue to play a vital role in these areas. Some of these institutions have been applauded for their success in fostering high moral values. However, we must not rest until all schools place proper focus on character.

Parents should be the primary developers of character in our Nation's children, but the role of education in character-building becomes increasingly important with every divorce, drug deal, juvenile crime, and teen-age pregnancy, which continue to undermine our Nation's moral code. The fact is, most Americans support the teaching of core values and basic morals such as trustworthiness, respect for self and others, responsibility, fairness, compassion, and citizenship. It is time for Congress to encourage these activities in our Nation's schools.

I would like to thank the John Templeton Foundation for its leadership and efforts on the subject of character-building in education across our Nation. The foundation has been a leading proponent of this issue since 1989,

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

when it began sponsoring the "Honor Roll for Character-Building Colleges" guide book. This annual publication recognizes superior character-development in post-secondary institutions. I am grateful for the foundation's voice on this pressing issue.

Our children will shape our future. Society must work to ensure that their moral foundation does not crumble. I call on all people who care about our future to promote the virtues of our Nation's youth and support this resolution.

COMMENDING SHERWOOD KERKER
ON HIS UNIQUE CONTRIBUTIONS
TO LABOR JOURNALISM

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Sherwood Kerker's retirement from the St. Louis/Southern Illinois Labor Tribune.

The editor of the *Labor Tribune* has received several awards from the International Labor Communications Association for journalistic excellence, and is acknowledged for 40 years of loyalty in serving the members and families of the trade union movement throughout the Greater St. Louis/Southern Illinois Region.

Publisher Edward M. Finkelstein and the staff of the *Labor Tribune* will honor Sherwood Kerker at a "We Love You Sherwood" retirement luncheon to be held in St. Louis, MO, on August 28, 1997. I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Sherwood Kerker's unique contributions to labor journalism.

THE NEW MEXICO STATEHOOD
AND ENABLING ACT OF 1997

HON. STEVEN SCHIFF

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as well as in the other body, for passage of S. 430 the New Mexico Statehood and Enabling Act of 1997.

This bill, introduced and supported by the entire New Mexico delegation, approves the changes made to the State constitution by the voters of New Mexico on November 6, 1996, which are specific to the New Mexico Land Grant Permanent Fund—established by the enabling act of 1910.

With these changes in place, New Mexico will be able to safeguard against the eroding effects of inflation to ensure that the fund will be able to help us meet tomorrow's educational needs.

This fund, which has grown to be the third largest educational endowment in the world, now comprises almost 14 percent of our State budget, and is a critical part of a better future for our children. So again, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues for their support.

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLES M.
SPRAFKA

HON. JIM RAMSTAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a stellar public servant who passed away recently.

Charles M. Sprafka, a native of Detroit Lakes, MN, and the associate Hennepin County administrator for human resources, died on June 24 following a long and courageous battle with pancreatic cancer.

Mr. Speaker, Chuck's career in public service was varied and characterized by the pursuit of excellence in every way. The people of my home county in Minnesota were well served by his stewardship and great desire to help people in their time of need.

President John F. Kennedy in his inaugural address on January 20, 1961, just outside this Chamber, declared: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." Chuck Sprafka did a great deal for his country, Mr. Speaker, and today I want to celebrate a dedicated public servant's inspiring commitment to his country and the people of Hennepin County he served so well.

Chuck Sprafka was named Hennepin County personnel director in 1984. In 1994, he was named associate county administrator for human resources, which made him a member of the Hennepin County administration's executive team.

Mr. Speaker, Chuck's record in public service was exemplary. In 1995, he was named recipient of the Twin Cities Personnel Association's "Award of Excellence." In May of this year, Hennepin County created an employee recognition award in his name.

His fellow workers in Hennepin County called Chuck The Rock. That's because, whenever there was a great challenge to be overcome, everyone turned to Chuck. His pioneering efforts produced a program called Quality Partnership Initiatives, a new county approach to improving the quality of service.

Quality is the theme that comes first to mind when you summarize the career of Chuck Sprafka for he truly represented the best in public service.

Mr. Speaker, Chuck was also very active in a numerous community and professional organizations, including the Industrial Relations Center Advisory Council, Minnesota Chapter of the International Personnel Management Association, and the national and Minnesota Public Employer Labor Relations Associations. He was also a member of the Human Resources Executive Council.

Chuck was a great high school athlete at Detroit Lakes High School, one of the best skaters in that school's history. He loved the outdoors, and was an avid sportsman. After receiving a bachelor's degree in mathematics and chemistry from Bemidji State University in 1968, he had a successful career in the business world. He then returned to school and earned a master's degree in industrial relations from the University of Minnesota in 1972, after which he went to work for Hennepin County, Minnesota's most populous county and one of the largest employers in the state. During his tenure at the county, he did graduate work in public administration at Harvard University.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, Chuck Sprafka was a dedicated and loving husband and father. As his lifelong friend Jon Boisclair put it, "Chuck's family meant the world to him, and he loved them dearly." Chuck will forever be missed by his loving wife, Jeannie, and his children, Collette, Rachelle, and Nicholas.

Mr. Speaker, Chuck Sprafka stood for all that's right with America, and his legacy will live on in the hearts and minds of all who were fortunate enough to know him.

ENVIRONMENTAL SLEIGHT OF
HAND IN REPUBLICANS' BUDGET
DEAL

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1997

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, once again the Republican leadership of the Congress has demonstrated its very strong hostility to policies to promote a strong environmental policy for this country.

I am sure that every Member of this House remembers that when the budget agreement was signed by the congressional leadership and President Clinton, it included at the President's insistence sufficient funding to acquire lands threatened with ruinous development that would present severe dangers to California's ancient redwood forest and to our first national park, Yellowstone. These development plans could result in the cutting of some of the most significant trees in North America—one of the very last ancient stands—and in the locating of a massive mine just upstream of Yellowstone Park.

Now, we included in the budget agreement sufficient moneys to acquire these lands, and then to provide additional acquisitions from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. As you know, some \$900 million each year comes into that fund from offshore oil and gas development on Federal lands, and that money by law is to be used for land acquisition. Instead, the Congress has refused to appropriate sufficient funding to keep up with the need to protect our national resources, and a \$12 billion surplus has developed in the fund.

The President thought he had struck a deal with the Republican leadership to provide \$65 million for the New World Mine lands, and another \$250 million for the Headwaters redwood grove, and then an additional \$295 million for other long-awaited acquisitions. That was an important part of the budget deal. And, frankly, I would have thought that a party whose environmental reputation is as justifiably low as the Republican Party's would have honored its commitment and its promise.

But instead, the Republicans have reneged on their agreement and, in the midst of the summer when tens of millions of Americans are enjoying our parks and other public lands, the Republicans in Congress have repudiated their commitment. The House bill provides no funding for these high priority park purchases, and the Senate bill is hardly better, adding additional, unnecessary bureaucratic steps that everyone knows will doom the funding.

I hope the public understands this Republican sleight of hand that clarifies once again that leadership's utter indifference to our national parks and other public lands. And I