

# IN SUPPORT OF ENLARGING NATO TO INCLUDE THE NEW INVITEES AND THE BALTIC COUNTRIES

• Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of enlarging the NATO alliance to include the current invitees of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic during this round, and the Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia during the next round. For the past few weeks, various Senate committees have been reviewing the costs of bringing Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic into NATO. The administration estimates the entire cost for this first round of NATO enlargement at \$27-\$35 billion in the 13-year period from 1997 to 2009. Opponents suggest that the actual costs might actually be much higher, although we will really not have a clear picture until after new estimates are made early next year based on a commonly agreed-upon set of military requirements that NATO ministers will decide on in December. In any case, two things are clear. First, most of these costs would have to be paid anyway—even if NATO did not enlarge. Second, the U.S. share of the total costs will be relatively small.

As part of the present effort to enlarge NATO, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic must restructure and modernize their armed forces. However, they would need to do this in any case and the costs of doing so would probably be much higher without enlargement, since they would have to rely entirely on their own resources to protect themselves. Additionally, current European NATO members must reconfigure their forces so they are more flexible and more easily deployed; but these changes result from the requirements of NATO's New Strategic Concept agreed on by all alliance members in 1991, and not from enlargement as such. These enlargement costs will be paid for by our allies and not by us. From our perspective, these enlargement costs should really be seen as benefits—improvements to NATO's security paid for by our allies, not by us.

The only extra costs of the current round of NATO enlargement are the so-called direct costs of enlargement, which include such things as upgrading communications, air defenses, and infrastructure for rapid reinforcement. These costs would be borne jointly by all NATO members with the United States paying roughly one-quarter of the cost. This means that for every dollar we put toward these direct costs, our allies, old and new, would put in three. You can't get better value for your money than that. Thus, the range of costs the United States would have to pay for the present round of enlargement over the next 13 years would be somewhere between \$2 billion—if you believe the administration's figures—and \$7 billion—if you believe the recent report by the CATO Institute. Given the millions of lives lost in World War I and II, and the billions of dollars spent during these conflicts, the cold

war and now in Bosnia, NATO enlargement is the cheapest single investment we can make.

Aside from the costs, we get real benefits from NATO enlargement. As Secretary Albright and other administration officials have repeatedly and convincingly pointed out, NATO enlargement will deter future threats, prevent the development of a dangerous power vacuum in the heart of Europe, make border and ethnic conflicts far less likely and solidify democratic institutions and free markets in Europe. Just as importantly, the United States will be gaining strong new allies in Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, who between them will add 300,000 troops to the alliance. The costs of enlargement will fall heaviest on them, but these countries know the price of freedom. Each country has been invaded more than once this century and each suffered under Communist domination for over 40 years. They understand that their own security is indivisible from that of the rest of Europe and have already expressed their commitment to be producers of security, and not merely consumers, by cooperating with NATO forces to implement the Dayton accords in Bosnia.

If we refuse to enlarge NATO, we would have told these countries that despite their epic and inspiring struggle to liberate themselves from communism, the West had once again turned its back on them. Even worse, we would leave Central Europe without an effective security system, creating a heightened sense of insecurity in these countries, forcing them to devote more resources to military expenditures, and lowering their potential for economic growth. Under these circumstances, a backlash against Western values might very well develop, yielding a vicious cycle of authoritarianism, militarism, economic stagnation, and greater conflict between neighbors—a pattern this region has seen in the past. This would inevitably bring more problems for the United States in Europe.

Some have asked what's the hurry over NATO enlargement. Surely, the end of the cold war gives us plenty of time to contemplate so momentous a decision. However, if we don't enlarge now when it's relatively easy and inexpensive, how can we be sure that we'll be ready to respond to a crisis in time? We were slow to respond to World War I, World War II, and Yugoslavia out of the fear of the costs. If we wait until a crisis develops, our capacity to deal with it early on will be less, the costs will be higher and our reluctance will be greater. Let's make the decision to enlarge now.

I would remind my colleagues that as the debate over this issue draws near, we must also look beyond the present round of enlargement. In particular, we must pay especially close attention to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Given their geography and history, the Baltic countries are a weather vane indicating which way the winds from

Russia will blow. Any ambiguity in our commitment to the Baltic countries can only encourage those forces in Russia which have not reconciled themselves to the transformation of the Soviet Union. We must make it clear that Russia is welcome to cooperate with the undivided, free, prosperous, and secure Europe that is being built. However, it can only do so if it is prepared to recognize one of the cardinal principles of the new Europe, articulated by Secretary of State Albright during her visit to Lithuania last July: that all States, large and small must have the right to choose their own alliances and associations.

By their actions, the Baltic States have clearly made their choice known. They have applied for membership in NATO and the European Union, they participate in NATO's Partnership for Peace program and they are contributing directly to NATO's security by cooperating on a regional airspace initiative. By providing troops for NATO-led operations in Bosnia and by participating in the Vilnius Conference on good neighborly relations hosted by Lithuania in September, they have shown their willingness to be producers, not just consumers, of security. Having been invaded by both Stalin and Hitler and having suffered 50 years of Communist occupation, the people of the Baltic countries, no less than the people of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, know the price of freedom and are willing to pay for it.

If we are serious about our commitment to create a Europe that is whole and free, than the Baltic countries must be included. For that reason, the United States must make it absolutely clear at the earliest possible moment that it supports NATO membership for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. •

## THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MADONNA UNIVERSITY

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to Madonna University on the occasion of its 50th anniversary. As a school which emphasizes academic, social, and spiritual development, Madonna has established a tremendous presence in southeast Michigan, enhancing the quality of life for its students through an excellent array of campus activities and academic programs.

Having converted to a 4-year liberal arts college in 1947, Madonna rapidly continued its expansion of academic services. It was recognized by the Michigan Board of Education in 1954, and just a short time later added nursing, gerontology, religious studies, criminal justice, and radiologic technology to its list of 4-year programs. Thereafter other programs have been added, though there are too many to mention by name. In 1975, Madonna College opened special services to students with hearing and other disabilities. In 1991, changed its name to Madonna University, and 1 year later the

school reached an enrollment high of over 4,400 students.

Of the university's many accomplishments, the one which Madonna achieves year after year is a rapport among students of being a school big enough to offer a vast selection of educational opportunities, but small enough to offer them in a personal manner. When most universities are looking to cut costs through larger class sizes, I'm pleased to say Madonna University is one place where the professors still know their students by name.

Mr. President, on behalf of the U.S. Senate, I commemorate the outstanding tradition of excellence maintained by the faculty, staff, students, and alumni of Madonna University.●

#### RETIREMENT OF DR. HARRIETT G. JENKINS

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD a joint statement by myself and Senator JEFFORDS on the retirement of Dr. Harriett G. Jenkins. The statement follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR PATRICK LEAHY AND SENATOR JAMES JEFFORDS ON THE RETIREMENT OF DR. HARRIETT G. JENKINS

On September 30, 1997, Dr. Harriett G. Jenkins officially retired after twenty-five years of service in the executive and legislative branches of our government. Her outstanding contributions in the field of education, at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices, the Senate Committees on Agriculture, Labor, and Judiciary, and at the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) have won her the respect and admiration of everyone who has been privileged to work with her. Her impressive career in public service spanned 19 years as a public school educator in Berkeley, California, and carried through her most recent and superior performance as Special Assistant to Commissioner Reginald Jones of the EEOC. In appreciation of her outstanding service, we want to recognize her many achievements.

Dr. Jenkins was born in Fort Worth, Texas, and received a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Mathematics from Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee. She earned a Master of Arts Degree in Education and a Doctorate of Education in Policy, Planning and Administration, both from the University of California at Berkeley. She completed the Advanced Management Program of the Harvard Business School; obtained a law degree from Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., and was awarded an Honorary Doctorate of Science Degree from Fisk University.

Dr. Jenkins began her career as a public school educator in Berkeley, California, and rose through the ranks to become vice-principal, principal, and Director of Elementary Education before reaching the post of Assistant Superintendent for Instruction in 1971. She assisted with the integration of the school system, fully involving parents and the community, and with the implementation of many exemplary educational programs. In 1973, Dr. Jenkins moved to Washington, D.C., accepting the position of consultant to the District of Columbia school system for the Response to Educational Needs Project.

In 1974, Dr. Jenkins joined the staff at NASA. She served for eighteen years as As-

sistant Administrator for Equal Opportunity Programs at NASA. She helped NASA integrate its workforce and ensure equal opportunity in personnel transactions. During this period, she helped initiate a significant increase in the number of female and minority employees, particularly in the non-traditional positions of engineers, scientists and astronauts. She also assisted with the expansion of educational programs and scientific research for minority universities.

In 1992, Harriett Jenkins was chosen by the Majority and Minority Leaders and appointed by the President pro tempore of the United States Senate to be the first Director of the newly established Office of Senate Fair Employment Practice. In 1996-1997, she served as counsel and professional staff member on the Senate Committees on Agriculture, Forestry and Nutrition, Labor and Human Resources, and Judiciary. In June, 1997, she was appointed as Special Assistant to Commissioner Reginald Jones of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission until her retirement on September 30, 1997. In this position, she made critical contributions to the report of the EEOC task force on the "Best" Equal Employment Opportunity Policies, Programs and Practices in the Private Sector.

Dr. Jenkins has received numerous awards throughout her prestigious career. In 1977, Dr. Jenkins received NASA's highest award, the Distinguished Service Medal. Also during 1977, she chaired the Task Force on Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, one of nine task forces of the Personnel Management Project which led to the Civil Service Reform Act. For this work, she received the Civil Service Commissioner's Award for Distinguished Service. Dr. Jenkins received the President's Meritorious Executive Award in 1980; NASA's Outstanding Leadership Medal in 1981; and the President's Distinguished Executive Award in 1983.

In 1986, Dr. Jenkins was elected to the National Academy of Public Administration; and in 1987, she received the Black Engineer of the Year Award for Affirmative Action. In 1988, she received a second Distinguished Service Medal from NASA; in 1990, the Women in Aerospace Lifetime Achievement Award; in 1992, NASA's Equal Employment Opportunity Medal, and the President's Meritorious Executive Award; and in 1994, NASA's Equal Employment Opportunity Medal. In September, 1997, she was awarded a citation by the EEOC for her distinguished service to the Task Force on the "Best" Equal Employment Opportunity Policies, Programs and Practices in the Private Sector.

Integrity, intelligence, and commitment to doing the best job possible are characteristics that describe Dr. Jenkins. She has worked tirelessly to advance the goals of protecting the American worker from discrimination in the workplace and tear down the barriers preventing women and minorities from reaching full employment potential.

Dr. Jenkins is leaving government service, but her legacy of dedication to fairness and equality in the workplace will enrich and enlighten workers for generations to come. We personally want to thank Dr. Jenkins for her long career in government service as a friend and advisor and wish her the very best in her retirement years.●

#### FISCAL YEAR 1998 INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT

● Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, on October 24, I submitted for the RECORD, a list of objectionable provisions in the

fiscal year 1998 Interior appropriations bill. Among the projects mentioned were three items which should not have been listed. They are as follows: \$1.5 million for the home energy rating system; \$1 million for the weatherization assistance program; and \$25,000 for State energy program grants.

Mr. President, these three line items do not violate the criteria I use for determining low-priority, unnecessary, or wasteful spending that was not reviewed in the appropriate merit-based prioritization process. Unfortunately, these three items were inadvertently included on the list. I regret this error, and withdraw my recommendation that these items be line-item vetoed.●

#### TIME TO RECONSIDER 'RACIST' RHETORIC

● Mr. ABRAHAM. I would like to bring to my colleagues, attention a recent article in Asian Week by Susan Au Allen, president of the United States Pan Asian American Chamber of Commerce, who points out Senator BROWNBACK's significant work on behalf of Asian Pacific American families. It was Senator BROWNBACK who stood up in the House of Representatives last year and opposed those who wanted to slash family immigration. If the elimination of the brothers and sisters and adult children categories had passed, tens of thousands of Asian Pacific families would have been unable to reunite with their loved ones. Ms. Allen writes, "When the chips were down last year, he came through to preserve freedom for our close family members to immigrate to the United States. And for that Asian Pacific American families across America are grateful to him."

I ask that the text of the article by Susan Au Allen be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

#### TIME TO RECONSIDER 'RACIST' RHETORIC (By Susan Au Allen)

No pain, no gain. No money, no talk. No raise money, no get bonus. Are these offensive words? Several Asian Pacific American organizations think so. The Organization of Chinese Americans, the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus Institute, and the Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium have been complaining unfairly about a phrase that Sen. Brownback, R-Kan., uttered during a recent Senate Governmental Affairs Committee hearing on the Democratic Party's campaign finance scandal.

The argument is that the "So no raise money, no pay bonus" phrase is racist. I saw the videotape of the occasion and did not find it offensive.

Sen. Brownback was speaking to an educated white male, Richard Sullivan, former finance director of the Democratic National Committee. The senator neither mimicked nor changed the tone of his voice. He was drawing a conclusion to a series of questions he asked Sullivan, who was playing escape, evasion, and dissemble. The senator wanted Sullivan to tell the truth about the unusual compensation package that former DNC fundraiser John Huang negotiated with the Democratic Party—the same truth Sullivan told investigators in an earlier deposition.