one application in their country and in their language—receive protection by each member country of the Protocol.

There is opposition neither to the legislation, nor to the substantive portions of the treaty. The State Department continues its attempts to resolve differences between the Administration and the European Union regarding the voting rights of intergovernmental members of the Protocol in the Assembly established by the Protocol. More specifically, the European Union receives a separate vote in addition to the votes of its member states. While it may be argued that the existence of a supra-national European trademark issued by the European Trademark Office justifies this extra vote, the State Department views the provision as antithetical to the fundamental democratic concept of one vote per state. The State Department also has raised concerns that this voting structure may constitute a precedent for deviation from the one-state-one-vote principle in future international agreements in other areas.

These differences need to be settled before the Secretary of State will recommend to the President that a ratification package be presented to the Senate. The State Department is working closely with the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property of the Committee on the Judiciary, which I chair, to formulate a proposal to the European Union, and subsequently to the members of the Protocol, to amend the Assembly voting procedures in a way which would provide for input by the European Union without circumventing the one-member-one-vote principle.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to move this legislation forward at this time to encourage negotiations between the State Department and the European Union; and to assure American trademark holders that the United States stands ready to benefit from the Protocol as soon as it is ratified.

IN HONOR OF FOUR OUTSTANDING JERSEY CITY POLICE OFFICERS

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1999

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of James Crampton, Paul Pawchak, Jr., Edward Bergin, and John Riggs; four outstanding Jersey City police officers who are retiring from the force after 25 years of service to their community.

Before being appointed to the Jersey City Police Department, Officer James Crampton proudly served our country in the Navy and served as a Patrolman in the Plainfield Police Department. Over his remarkable career, Officer Crampton earned twelve Excellent Police Service Awards, one commendation, and one POBA Valor Award. James Crampton was also recognized by Police Director Michael Moriarty for his excellent work on the Wegman Parkway homicide and was commended by Police Chief William J. Thynne for apprehending a dangerous criminal.

Officer Paul Pawchak Jr. has served with distinction for over twenty five years on patrol, as a Police Academy instructor, on the Narcotics Unit and as a member of the Neighborhood Task Force Unit. His achievements include three commendations, five Excellent Police Service Awards, and one POBA Valor Award. Officer Pawchak has also earned multiple training certificates from the Department of Justice, the New Jersey State Police, and the Jersey City Police Department.

Officer Edward Bergin has enjoyed great success as a police officer, but he has also been recognized for his community service. In particular, he has been commended by the Jersey City Chief of Police for his work on National Night Out and relief efforts following Hurricane Georges. Officer Bergin has also received two commendations, five Excellent Police Service Awards and one POBA Valor Award.

During Detective John Riggs' successful career he has served on patrol and on the Crimes Against Property and Special Investigations Units. Many of this country's most profitable companies owe a large debt to Detective Riggs for his remarkable efforts to investigate property crime. The companies which have commended his work include Rolex Watch USA, Inc., for enforcing trademark infringements; Bell Atlantic and AT&T for breaking a stolen phone ring; and Twentieth Century Fox, Universal, Walt Disney and Parmount Pictures for the apprehension of individuals associated with motion picture theft. Detective Riggs has also distinguished himself through his work on security detail for both the President and Vice President. John Riggs has earned seventeen Excellent Police Service Awards, five commendations, and one Combat Cross.

These four officers have served Jersey City and my district proudly for 25 years. I am sure I speak for the entire Congress when I say thank them for their work and wish them the best in their retirement.

INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT—WHY WE NEED TO STAY THE COURSE

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1999

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1999, I had the privilege to address all of America's National Guard Adjutants General here in Washington. I spoke about the need for America to stay engaged in the world. My speech to that group is set forth as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT—WHY WE NEED TO STAY THE COURSE

It has been more than ten years since the fall of 1988, when the communist government of Poland agreed, under great popular pressure, to permit free elections—elections which ultimately led to the ''velvet revolution'' throughout Eastern Europe. It has been nine years since the historic fall of 1989, when the border between Hungary and Western Europe opened, and thousands of East Europeans first swept aside the Iron Curtain and then brought it crashing down. It has been eight years since the two Germanies agreed to reunification, and seven years since the Soviet Union disintegrated.

For the United States, the events of a decade ago were the beginning of the end of long struggle—a struggle that was characterized by terrible sacrifices in Korea and Vietnam; by periods of great national confidence and occasional episodes of uncertainty; by debates in the halls of Congress that were sometimes historic and solemn and sometimes partisan and shrill; and, above all, by a widely shared sense of national purpose that endured despite occasionally bitter internal divisions.

The constancy with which the United States carried out its global responsibilities over the long course of the Cold War is a great testimony to the character of the American people and to the quality of the leaders who guided the nation through often trying times. In spite of the costs, in the face of great uncertainties, and despite grave distractions, our nation showed the ability to persevere. In doing so, we answered the great question about America that Winston Churchill once famously posed—''Will you stay the course?'' he asked, ''Will you stay the course?'' The answer is, we did.

Today, I think we need to raise a similar question once again, but this time for ourselves and in a somewhat different form. Churchill's question, ''Will you stay the course?'' implied that there might some day be an end to the struggle, as there was, indeed, to the Cold War, though no one foresaw when and how it would come. Today the key question is perhaps more challenging, because it is more open-ended. It is ''Will we stay engaged?''

The term ''engagement,'' to be sure, has not yet captured as broad a range of support among political leaders and the public as those who coined it, early in the Clinton Administration, evidently hope it would. But neither did the notion of ''containment'' capture broad public support until several years after it was articulated during the Truman Administration. Indeed, some political leaders who later championed containment as the linchpin of our security initially criticized the notion as too passive and even timid.

''Engagement,'' while not yet widely embraced as a characterization of our basic global posture, seems to me to express quite well what we need to be about today—that we need to be engaged in the world, and that we need to be engaged with other nations in building and maintaining a stable international security system.

Engagement will not be easy to sustain. Indeed, as has become clear in recent years, it will be as challenging to the United States to remain fully engaged today as it was to stay the course during the Cold War.

We now know much more about the shape of today's era than we did eight or four or even two years ago.

We know that we have not reached the end of history.

We know that we face challenges to our security that in some ways are more daunting than those we faced during the Cold War.

We know that it will often be difficult to reach domestic agreement on foreign affairs because legitimate, deeply held values will often be hard to reconcile.

We know that we will have to risk grave dangers and pay a price to carry out our responsibilities, and because of the costs, it will sometimes be tempting to think that we would be more secure if we were more insulated from turmoil abroad.

We know that we will have to struggle mightily not to allow domestic travails to divert us from the tasks that we must consistently pursue.

But we also know that our political system, which encourages open debate, and which constantly challenges leaders to rise to the demands of the times, gives us the opportunity, if we are thoughtful and serious about our responsibilities, to see where our interests lie and to pursue our values effectively.