

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