

in Rochester, New York, who are holding their annual Dance for Love on February 27 and 28.

This is no ordinary college dance but a 24-hour dance marathon to benefit special children. Over the past fifteen years, the Dance for Love has raised hundreds of thousands of dollars to benefit the Teddi Project at Camp Good Days and Special Times. These generous, caring students give of their time and energy each year to make dreams come true for children.

Established by local leader Gary Mervis in 1980, Camp Good Days and Special Times provides a special haven for children who are coping with cancer, HIV, physical challenges, or violence in their lives. Too many of these children spend most of their time in hospitals and doctor's offices, or battling their way through the challenges of everyday activities. Camp Good Days is a loving environment where they can learn that they are not alone and enjoy activities like boating, seaplane rides, horseback riding, canoeing, fishing, and much, much more. Camp Good Days and Special Times gives hope and laughter to children who have been robbed of much of their childhood.

The Teddi Project is one of a number of programs operated by Camp Good Days. Named for Gary Mervis's daughter, Teddi, who suffered from a brain tumor and inspired her father to start the camp, the Teddi Project makes wishes come true for children with life-threatening illnesses. Wishes range from a new bicycle or party dress to a trip to Disney World or meeting a celebrity. The Teddi Project gives sick children and their parents an opportunity to bring the family together and remember good times. Since 1982, over 1000 children and families have benefited from the Teddi Project.

The Teddi Project could not happen without the loving support of people like the St. John Fisher students dancing this weekend. Though they will finish the weekend weary, they can be proud knowing the dance will have raised thousands of dollars for the Teddi Project. These students are truly an inspiration to our entire community about our power to make miracles happen.

SECRETARY OF STATE ALBRIGHT
PRESENTS A CONVINCING CASE
FOR NATO EXPANSION

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1998

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, during the district work period that is just ending, the Foreign Ministers of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic were here in Washington to present jointly the case for the accession of these three countries to the North Atlantic Treaty—Boleslaw Geremek of Poland, Laszlo Kovacs of Hungary, and Jaroslav Sedivy of the Czech Republic. While the chief diplomats of these three countries were here in Washington, they met with our colleagues in the Senate and with some of our colleagues here in the House. Also during the past week, the President formally submitted to the Senate for ratification the documents for the admission of these three countries to NATO.

I welcome, Mr. Speaker, the President's decision which was affirmed by the heads of government of the other fifteen NATO member countries at Madrid in July of last year to invite the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland to become full members of NATO. The admission of these three Central European states to NATO is the next critical step in healing the division of Europe that came about at the end of World War II. As we face the uncertainties of the post-Cold War world, it is critical that the new democratic states of Central and Eastern Europe have the opportunity to join the North Atlantic community of nations—action which will give them the sense of security that will permit them to consolidate the gains of democracy and economic market reform.

Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago, Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright spoke at a conference of the New Atlantic Initiative here in Washington, and joining her on this occasion were the three visiting foreign ministers from Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. In that address, Secretary Albright made the case for the expansion of NATO clearly and convincingly. I ask that excerpts of her outstanding remarks be placed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to give and give thoughtful consideration to her comments.

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF STATE MADELEINE
K. ALBRIGHT BEFORE THE NEW ATLANTIC
INITIATIVE CONFERENCE IN WASHINGTON,
D.C., FEBRUARY 9, 1998

Thank you very much. * * * Let me welcome my colleague Foreign Ministers Geremek, Kovacs, Mikhailova and Sedivy to Washington. And let me thank John O'Sullivan, Jeffrey Gedmin and everyone at the New Atlantic Initiative for all you have done to strengthen America's partnership with its friends and allies in Europe, old new new. * * *

These old and new organizations in Europe are part of a truly hopeful global trend that our country has done more than any other to shape. In every part of the world, we have encouraged the growth of institutions that bring nations closer together around basic principles of democracy, free markets, respect for the law and a commitment to peace.

America's place and I believe, correctly—is at the center of this emerging international system. And our challenge is to see that the connections around the center, between regions and among the most prominent nations, are strong and dynamic, resilient and sure. But it is equally our goal to ensure that the community we are building is open to all those nations, large and small, distant and near, that are willing to play by its rules.

There was a time not long ago when we did not see this as clearly as we do today. Until World War II, we didn't really think that most of the world was truly part of our world. This attitude even applied to the half of Europe that lay east of Germany and Austria. Central Europe and Eastern Europe was once a quaint, exotic mystery to most Americans. We wondered at King Zog of Albania; we puzzled about Admiral Horthy, ruler of landlocked Hungary; we laughed with the Marx Brothers as they sang "Hail, Hail Fredonia."

Jan Masaryk, the son of Czechoslovakia's first president, used to tell a story about a U.S. Senator who asked him, "How's your father; does he still play the violin?" To which Jan replied, "Sir, I fear you are making a small mistake. You are perhaps thinking of Paderewski and not Masaryk. Paderewski plays piano, not the violin, and was presi-

dent not of Czechoslovakia, but of Poland. Of our presidents, Benes was the only one who played. But he played neither the violin nor the piano, but football. In all other respects, your information is correct."

It took the horror of World War II and the Holocaust to get across the message that this region mattered; that it was the battleground and burial ground for Europe's big powers; that the people of Paris and London could neither be safe nor free as long as the people of Warsaw and Riga and Sofia were robbed of their independence, sent away in box cars, and gunned down in forests.

President Bush certainly understood this when, after the fall of the Berlin Wall, he inspired us to seek a Europe whole and free. And President Clinton understood it when, in 1993, he set in motion a process that would bring that ideal to life.

Part of our challenge was to adapt NATO to master the demands of the world not as it has been, but as it is and will be. This meant adopting a new strategic concept, streamlining NATO's commands, accepting new missions and asking our European allies to accept new responsibilities. It also meant welcoming Europe's new democracies as partners, and some eventually as members, in a way that preserves NATO's integrity and strength. For NATO, like any organization, is defined not just by its mission, but by its makeup. The preeminent security institution in an undivided Europe cannot maintain the Iron Curtain as its permanent eastern frontier.

And so last July, after three years of careful study, President Clinton and his fellow NATO leaders invited three new democracies—Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic—to join our alliance, while holding the door open to others. This month, Canada and Denmark became the first NATO members to ratify the admission of our future central European allies. On Wednesday, President Clinton will send the instruments of ratification to the United States Senate.

The strategic rationale for this policy is straightforward. First, a larger NATO will make us safer by expanding the area of Europe where wars do not happen. By making it clear that we will fight, if necessary, to defend our new allies, we make it less likely that we will ever be called upon to do so. It is true that no part of Europe faces an immediate threat of armed attack. But this does not mean we face no dangers in Europe. There is the obvious risk of ethnic conflict. There is the growing threat posed by rogue states with dangerous weapons. There are still questions about the future of Russia.

And while we cannot know what other dangers might arise in ten or 20 or 50 years from now, we know enough from history and human experience to believe that a grave threat, if allowed to arise, would arise. Whatever the future may hold, it will not be in our interest to have a group of vulnerable, excluded nations sitting in the heart of Europe. It will be in our interest to have a vigorous and larger alliance with those European democracies that share our values and our determination to defend them.

A second reason why enlargement passes the test of national interest is that it will make NATO stronger and more cohesive. Our Central European friends are passionately committed to NATO. Experience has taught them to believe in a strong American role in Europe. They will add strategic depth to NATO, not to mention 200,000 troops. Their forces have risked their lives alongside ours from the Gulf War to Bosnia. Without the bases Hungary has already provided to NATO, our troops could not have deployed to Bosnia as safely as they did. Here are three qualified European democracies that want us to let them be good allies. We can and should say yes.

A third reason to support a larger NATO is that the very promise of it has given the nations of Central and Eastern Europe an incentive to solve their own problems. Aspiring allies have strengthened democratic institutions; made sure soldiers serve civilians, not the other way around; and resolved virtually every old ethnic and border dispute in the region.

I have been a student of Central European history, and I have lived some of it myself. When I see Romanians and Hungarians building a real friendship after centuries of enmity; when I see Poles, Ukrainians and Lithuanians forming joint military units after years of suspicion; when I see Czechs and Germans overcoming decades of mistrust; when I see Central Europeans confident enough to improve their political and economic ties with Russia, I know something amazing is happening. NATO is doing for Europe's east precisely what it did for Europe's west after World War II.

I know that there are serious critics who have had legitimate concerns about our policy. We have grappled with many of the same concerns. Some revolve around the cost of a larger NATO, which will be real. But NATO has now approved estimates which make clear that the costs will be manageable, that they will be met, and that they will be shared fairly.

I certainly understand the concern some have expressed about Russian opposition to a larger NATO. But as Secretary of State, I can tell you that Russia's disagreement on this issue has not in any way hurt our ability to work together on other issues. On the contrary; we have made progress on arms control; Russia now has a permanent relationship with NATO; it has improved its ties with the Baltic states, even as those nations have made clear their desire to join NATO. Russia has a better relationship with Central Europe now than at any time in history; and the differences we still have with Russia would certainly not disappear if we suddenly changed our minds about enlargement.

We need to keep Russia's objections in perspective. They are the product of old misperceptions about NATO and old ways of thinking about its former satellites. Instead of changing our policies to accommodate Russia's outdated fears, we need to concentrate on encouraging Russia's more modern aspirations.

Others have argued that we should let the European Union do the job of reuniting Europe, or at least tell Central European countries that they cannot join NATO until they join the EU. I want the EU to expand as rapidly as possible. But the EU is not in the business of providing security; NATO is. And we saw in Bosnia what a difference that makes.

As for tying membership in one institution to membership in another, it is not in America's interest to subordinate critical security decisions of NATO to another institution. We are a leader in NATO; we're not even members of the EU. The qualifications for joining the EU are vastly different from the qualifications for becoming a member of NATO. Forcing the two processes to move in lock-step makes no sense, neither for the EU nor for NATO.

Others ask why we need to enlarge NATO when we already have NATO's Partnership for Peace. When the Partnership for Peace was established in 1994, I went to Central Europe with General Shalikashvili and with my good friend, Charles Gati, who is with us here today, to explain its purpose. I can tell you the Partnership was never intended to be an alternative to a larger NATO. On the contrary, it has always provided both the opportunity to cooperate with NATO, and a program for preparing to join. That is why so

many nations have participated in it so enthusiastically, whether they aspire to membership or not. If we want the Partnership to thrive, the last thing we should do is to tell some of its members that they can never be allies, no matter how much progress they make.

NATO is a military alliance, not a social club; but neither is it an in-bred aristocracy. That is one reason why today every NATO ally agrees that NATO doors must remain open after the first three new allies join. Let us be clear—we have made no decisions about who the next members of NATO should be or when they might join. But let us also have some humility before the future.

How many people—even in this room of experts—predicted in 1949 that Germany would so soon be a member of the Alliance? Who could have known in 1988 that in just ten years, members of the old Warsaw Pact would be in a position to join NATO? Who can tell today what Europe will look like in even a few years? We should not erect artificial roadblocks today that will prevent qualified nations from contributing to NATO tomorrow.

This Administration opposes any effort in the Senate to mandate a pause in the process of NATO enlargement. This would be totally unnecessary, since the Senate would, in any case, need to give its advice and consent to any new round of enlargement. It would also harm American interests by surrendering our leverage and flexibility, fracturing the consensus NATO has reached on its open door, and diminishing the incentive Central European countries now have to cooperate with the Alliance.

Some critics have said NATO enlargement would draw a destabilizing dividing line in Europe. A larger NATO with an open door will not. One round of enlargement with a mandated pause would. President Clinton and I will keep on addressing these concerns, and others, in the days ahead. The debate has been joined, and it will continue.

But already an extraordinary coalition has come together to say NATO enlargement is right and smart for America. It includes American veterans, who do not want their country to have to fight another war in Europe; American business, which understands the link between security and prosperity; American labor, which aided freedom's victory in Europe and wants it to endure. It includes every living former Secretary of State, a half a dozen former National Security Advisors and five Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs.

The debate about a larger NATO might easily have provided an opportunity for skeptics to praise isolationism. Instead, it has given the American people and the Congress an opportunity to bury it. And I have confidence that is what will happen.

If the Senate says yes to a larger NATO—and I believe it will—that will be a vote for continued American engagement in Europe. It will be a signal that America will defend its values, protect its interests, stand by its allies and keep its word.

We'll need that same spirit to prevail when the Congress faces its other foreign policy tests this year. For example, the President and I are asking the Congress to pay what our country owes to the International Monetary Fund and to the United Nations. At issue is a very simple question. Will we stand alone in the face of crises from Gulf to Rwanda to Indonesia, asking American soldiers to take all the risks and American taxpayers to pay all the bills? Or will we support organizations that allow us to share the burdens of leadership with others? This is not least an issue in our relationship with Europe. When we challenge our allies to meet their responsibilities to us, it hurts our

case when we are seen as not meeting ours. . . .

It is my great hope that Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic will be part of a transatlantic partnership that is not only broader, but deeper as well; a partnership that is a force for peace from the Middle East to Central Africa; a partnership that has overcome barriers to trade across the Atlantic; a partnership strong enough to protect the environment and defeat international crime; a partnership that is united in its effort to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction, the overriding security interest of our time.

However old or new the challenges we face, there is still one relationship that more than any other will determine whether we meet them successfully, and that is our relationship with Europe. The transatlantic partnership is our strategic base—the drivewheel of progress on every world-scale issue when we agree, and the brake when we do not.

In cultivating that partnership and extending it to those free nations that were too long denied its benefits, I pledge my continued best efforts, and respectfully solicit all of yours.

CONGRATULATIONS TO
ROOSEVELT HIGH SCHOOL

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1998

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Fresno Unified School District's Roosevelt High School for winning the California School Board Foundation's Golden Bell Award. Fresno Unified's Roosevelt High School was recognized for this prestigious award for its Family and Community Program. Additionally, Roosevelt High has been successful in creating other programs and activities to draw parents and community members into the school.

The Golden Bell Awards program promotes excellence in education by recognizing outstanding programs in school districts and county offices of education throughout California. The Golden Bell Awards reflect the importance of the education necessary to address the changing needs of students. This awards program contributes to the development and evaluation of curriculum, instruction and support services. It seeks out and recognizes innovative or exemplary programs which have been developed and successfully implemented by California teachers and administrators. The program also focuses on recognizing and supporting educators who invest extra energy and time to make a demonstrated difference for students.

Roosevelt High, built in 1928 for a student body of 1,700, now houses 3,669 young people of diverse backgrounds. Approximately 60% of the student body is Hispanic, 20% Asian, 10% African American, and 10% are white. The remainder of the students are Native American and come from other countries including India. In 1983, Roosevelt School of the Arts was created for the purpose of desegregation. Roosevelt School of the Arts provides quality visual and performing arts opportunities for nearly six hundred students from all over Fresno. The faculty and administrative staff consist of educators who are also talented artists.