

This and other centennial celebrations will ensure that the *Maine* will indeed not be forgotten—nor will those aboard who made the ultimate sacrifice. They answered the call when their country needed them, and we must honor their memories with our respect and remembrance. As a Mainer and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have nothing but the utmost respect for the men and women who throughout history have risked their lives and invested their careers in our armed forces.

In that light, let us keep their memory alive, and let us ensure that future generations will understand and appreciate the legacy of the U.S.S. *Maine*, and the tragic sacrifice of her gallant crew. Let us remember the *Maine*.●

#### OLYMPIAN ERIC BERGOUST

● Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I stand today to recognize an Olympian from the great state of Montana. Eric Bergoust, a Western Montana native from Missoula, will represent our nation next week in the 1998 Winter Olympics in Nagano, Japan.

Eric, 28, is a freestyle aerialist skier—a sport that requires athletes to launch themselves off a snow ski ramp, twist and turn their body in mid-air and land on the slope below. You certainly cannot appreciate the physical requirements of this sport until you are able to see it. And the landings don't always end up feet down. Watch the sport long enough and you are bound to see an unplanned landing.

But Eric is not new to the challenges of freestyle aerial skiing. Eric was profiled on network television earlier this week during a look at the 1998 Winter Olympics. The profile included photos of Eric diving off the roof of his parents' Missoula home into mattresses on the ground below. Mr. President, I am happy to see that Eric's adventurous spirit is now compensated and insured.

When I was a kid, we also had to be creative to fill our time, but my feet stayed on the ground and rarely reached a height higher than the stirrups of a tall horse.

Although he has claimed his share of injuries from the physically demanding sport, I am proud to claim Eric as a native Montanan. He has represented our state well in world class events.

Eric is participating in his second Olympic games and has matured into one of the sport's premiere athletes. Last month, Eric won a World Cup event in British Columbia and is at the top of the World Cup standing entering the Olympics.

I've sent Eric a telegram wishing him well next week in the freestyle aerial events. I wanted to make sure my colleagues and the American people are aware of Eric's roots and the Montana spirit that drives him to be the world's best in his sport.●

#### TRIBUTE TO JANE JOHNSON

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, throughout the years, I have had the opportunity to criss-cross the State of Connecticut countless times, and along the way I have met a number of remarkable individuals. Their occupations and backgrounds may vary, but they are all linked by a common commitment to helping others and making a positive difference in their communities. These are the unsung heroes in our society, and they are the foundation on which our communities are built. Sadly, Connecticut lost one its heroes earlier this month, when Jane Johnson of New Britain died at the age of 59.

Jane Johnson's entire career was dedicated to working with poor and underprivileged children so that they may have a brighter future. A native of New Britain, she spent more than 30 years working in her home town's Head Start program, and for the past 17 years she served as its Director.

I was fortunate to work with Jane over the years, and I, along with everyone else who knew her, had the highest regard for Jane and for her opinions on issues concerning children. Not only was she well-respected throughout the State but her efforts on behalf of young people earned her national recognition. That is why she was invited to several White House Conferences on Head Start.

As if her efforts with Head Start were not enough, Jane also volunteered her free time to serve her community. She was involved with many service organizations, including as a member of the board of directors for the Sheldon Community Guidance Clinic and the United Way of New Britain. She was also active in her church, singing in the choir and actively working with the young people in the congregation.

No one really knows exactly how many children showed up to their first day of school ready to learn and came closer to reaching their full potential because of Jane Johnson's efforts. But everyone in New Britain and throughout the State of Connecticut knows that she was a remarkable woman who touched many young lives and will be dearly missed.

I offer my heartfelt condolences to her friends and family, and I ask that her obituary be printed in the RECORD.

The obituary follows:

[From the New Britain Herald, Feb. 6, 1998]

#### JANE JOHNSON

NEW BRITAIN.—Jane Johnson, 59, of New Britain, Director of the New Britain Head Start Program, died Tuesday, Feb. 3, 1998, at New Britain General Hospital.

Born in New Britain, she was the daughter of Josephine (Gray) Hines of New Britain and the late James Johnson. She was a lifelong New Britain resident. Jane Johnson worked for the New Britain Head Start Program at the Human Resources Agency for 30 years. She began her career in public service as a teacher's assistant in 1965, the first year of the national Head Start Program which was begun by President Lyndon Johnson as a central part of his Great Society Program. In order to fight the "War on Poverty," pro-

grams like Head Start were developed on the national level.

Ms. Johnson was an exemplary model of the program. She began participating as a client through the Parent Involvement Component of the Head Start Program. From 1965-67, she worked directly with the children as a teacher's assistant. The first director of the program, John E. Francisco, recognized Ms. Johnson's talent and promoted her. For the next five years, she worked first as an assistant, and then as the coordinator in the Social Service component of the Head Start Program. During the mid-1970's, she returned to school and earned an Associate Degree from Tuxis Community College in 1976.

Mr. Francisco promoted Ms. Johnson again in 1977, when she became his Administrative Assistant. She continued her education, earning a Bachelor of the Arts Degree from Central Connecticut State University in 1979. She graduated with honors and was named to Alpha Kappa Delta National Honor Society.

From 1980-98, Ms. Johnson was the Director of the Head Start Program. During this period, her innovative public policy initiatives earned National recognition. She was selected as a Johnson and Johnson Management Fellow and attended an honorary program at the University of Southern California in 1995.

In addition to her brilliant work as a leader in the National Head Start Program, Ms. Johnson served her community as a volunteer. She served as a member of the Board of Directors at the Sheldon Community Guidance Clinic and at the United Way of New Britain. She was a member of the Connecticut and National Association of Head Start Directors. Ms. Johnson also volunteered as a coordinator for the Conference on Coordinated Child Care For The State of Massachusetts.

Ms. Johnson was a member of the McCullough Temple C.M.E. and during the 1960's, was active as a choir member and served as a Junior District and Secretary Delegate to their young people's conference.

Throughout her life, she made countless contributions to the children and their families who came to the New Britain Head Start Program. The staff, the children, and the families who were involved with the program for the past 30 years will miss her loving guidance, her wonderful sense of humor and, most of all, her kind heart. She will continue to inspire them to serve their community with hard work and commitment.

In addition to her mother, she is survived by three children, Carnell Small of New Britain, Cheryl Small-Parris and her husband, Colin Parris of New Britain, and Wayne Small of Calif.; two sisters, Beatrice Walker of New Britain, and Margaret Johnson of Hartford; two grandchildren, Torey Small and Tia Parris; a great granddaughter, Taryn Fudge; and several nieces and nephews. She was predeceased by an infant son, Todd Anthony Small.

Funeral services will be held on Monday, 11 a.m. at the Spottswood AME Zion Church. Burial will take place at Fairview Cemetery, New Britain. Calling hours are Sunday evening from 6 to 8 p.m. at the church. Memorial donations may be made to the HRA Head Start Program, 180 Clinton St., New Britain, CT 06053. Erickson-Hansen Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.●

#### JOHN HAMRE'S SPEECH ON NATO ENLARGEMENT

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, few have had as distinguished a career in the Senate as Howell Heflin, our former colleague from the great state of Alabama. One of the ways through which I

came to know and appreciate the indomitable optimism and warmth of Senator Heflin was through our work together as chairmen of the Senate Delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly.

The NAA brings together on a regular basis parliamentary and legislative leaders of NATO's 16 nations to discuss matters of transatlantic concern, generate initiatives addressing key challenges, and reinforce this strategic partnership.

Senator Heflin was not only an outstanding representative of the Senate to the Assembly and an ardent supporter of the NATO Alliance, but he was also an energetic and persuasive leader on an important initiative before us today, NATO enlargement.

I recently corresponded with Senator Heflin. He brought to my attention a speech on NATO enlargement by Deputy Secretary of Defense John Hamre delivered on Veteran's day before an audience in Birmingham.

Senator Heflin suggested that I submit this speech for the RECORD, and I gladly do so. It's a strong articulation of the moral and strategic underpinnings of NATO enlargement. It decisively addresses the key concerns voiced by those who still harbor reservations about this policy.

I urge my colleagues to take Senator Heflin's advice and read this speech.

The speech follows:

REMARKS BY DEPUTY SECRETARY HAMRE AT BIRMINGHAM WORLD PEACE LUNCHEON, 11 NOVEMBER 1997

Senator Jeff Sessions, Senator Howell Heflin, Congressman Spencer Bachus, and Mayor Richard Arrington. It is great to be in Birmingham on Veterans' Day. The sons and daughters of Birmingham have served our nation both on the battlefield and on the homefront. So many served in World War II that this area was known as the "great arsenal of the South."

November 11th is set aside to honor all veterans of American wars. But I would like to single out two individual veterans today because their feats in uniform are a tribute to all veterans. In fact, their names are inscribed in the Hall of Heroes at the Pentagon, which honors America's Medal of Honor winners. We are fortunate to have these two heroes seated with us today: Bill Lawley and Lee Mize. Bill received his Medal of Honor after World War II for flying his damaged B-17 and his crew to safety in spite of his terrible wounds and continued enemy attacks. Lee received his Medal of Honor after the Korean War for almost single-handedly defending a strategic outpost from brutal and continuous enemy assaults, and then leading the counterattack that drove the enemy off. Ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of all veterans here and everywhere, let's show our appreciation to these two American heroes.

Colonels Lawley and Mize—and all their comrades-in-arms—did a great deal to make America safe, both at home and abroad.

Let me share with you a story—a true story. It now seems so long ago, but let me remind you of events back in 1989 before the Warsaw Pact collapsed and before the Berlin Wall came down. At that time there was an announcement by Hungary that they would not block East German citizens living in Hungary from emigrating to West Germany. Within days of that announcement East German citizens started showing up in Budapest. Some 800 individuals, as I recall, were "camping" in the yard at the West German

embassy in Budapest. It became a crisis—what to do with them all.

After a day or so the West German government rented an entire train and transported these East German refugees to Frankfurt. I recall how CNN was on the scene, showing the train as it slowly moved west.

The night it arrived in Frankfurt a CNN news crew was on the scene and interviewing the refugees. I recall they cornered a young German couple—probably in the mid-20s. The wife was holding an infant. After asking a series of inane questions, the reporter asked the Germans, "Is there anything you would like to say?" The man said, "Yes, there is something I would like to say. I would like to thank America for keeping a place in the world that is free."

For me, it was a stunning moment. The United States decided after painful deliberation to retain troops in Europe. We had spent hundreds of billions of dollars during the Cold War maintaining a tense peace. And just when many Americans were getting tired and forgetting what it was all about, this young German said in such simple words what it all amounted to—"keeping a place in the world that is free."

Right now, America is at relative peace. But it is an uneasy peace because we face new dangers of regional aggression, terrorism, and the spread of weapons of mass destruction. Just look at the headlines—Iraq rattling its saber, North Korea threatening and unstable, conflict brewing just below the surface in Bosnia. The challenge before our nation today was posed recently by a scholar named Donald Kagan in his book, *On the Origins of War*. He writes that: "A persistent and repeated error through the ages has been the failure to understand that the preservation of peace requires active effort, planning, the expenditure of resources, and sacrifice, just as war does."

President Clinton and Secretary Cohen are determined that the United States will not fail to seize the opportunity to preserve peace. Today, I want to talk about how we are going to preserve peace in Europe. The United States has devoted too much blood and treasure in two World Wars and a Cold War. The key to preventing war in Europe in the 21st Century is to spread the democracy, stability, and prosperity of Western Europe into Eastern and Central Europe, all the way to Russia. And the key to that is by enlarging NATO—inviting new members into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Last summer, President Clinton and his 15 NATO counterparts took the historic step of inviting three former communist countries—Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic—to join NATO in 1999. But before this can happen, it must be approved by the citizens of all 16 NATO nations through their elected legislatures, including the United States Senate. This is a very serious decision for American and our Senate to make.

Fifty years ago, when George Marshall proposed the Marshall Plan to help rebuild Europe after World War II, he went around the country explaining the importance of rebuilding Europe. As a result, the Marshall Plan—in Harry Truman's words—was "more than the creation of statesmen. It comes from the minds and hearts of the people." NATO enlargement must also come from the minds and hearts of the people. As President Clinton said, "Because [NATO enlargement] is not without cost and risk, it is appropriate to have an open, full, national discussion."

As the Senate prepares to consider NATO enlargement, it is crucial that all Americans join in this debate. We especially need to hear from our veterans. It is your voice—the voice of the American veteran—that must be heard in support of NATO enlargement.

We must remind America how the fiery hatreds of Europe drew us into World War I. Too many failed to make it to the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month, the anni-

versary we honor today. We all must remind Americans how this "lost generation" served and sacrificed to give America a chance to build a safer Europe for the next generation. We must warn them how, when the guns of November fell silent, American ignored the embers of hatred that still smoldered in Europe, and we missed the opportunity to prevent another war.

To those who would turn our backs on Europe today, tell them the price our veterans paid in World War II as Hitler stoked the embers of hate into the deadliest war in human history. Tell them how sons returned to the very same terrain that their fathers had died to set free, as they plunged into the crashing surf at Normandy. A reporter for Star and Stripes was there, and filed this searing dispatch: "There have been only a handful of days since the beginning of time in which the direction the world was taking has been changed for the better in one 24-hour period by an act of man. June 6, 1944 was one of them. What the Americans, the British, and the Canadians were trying to do was to get back an entire continent that had been taken from its rightful owners, whose citizens had been taken captive. It was one of the most monumentally unselfish things that one group of people ever did for another." That D-Day observer was today's Andy Rooney of "60 Minutes" fame.

We cannot turn our backs on Europe today. The generation that won the second World War gave us a second chance to build a safer world. The Marshall Plan offered an American hand of help and hope, to lift Europe out of the slough of despair and snuff the embers of war forever. Western Europe embraced the Marshall Plan and built strong democracies, strong economies, and a strong alliance called NATO. But the other half of Europe was denied the Marshall Plan when Joseph Stalin slammed down the Iron Curtain on America's helping hand. But still, America did not turn its back.

Through the long winter of the Cold War, we stood again with the free people of Europe. And today, having emerged victorious from that long, twilight struggle, we have an historic opportunity and a very sober challenge. We must complete George Marshall's vision for a Europe healed, whole, and free to ensure that Americans never again have to fight and die on European battlefields. The key is for NATO to reach out across the old Cold War divides, to nurture the new democracies in Eastern and Central Europe that have emerged from the iron grip of Soviet domination, and, when these countries are ready, willing, and able to join the Western Alliance, to invite them to join NATO.

That is what NATO has done. And today, when you visit the old capitals of the former Warsaw Pact nations, you can see a new spring in the air—of liberty, prosperity, and national security. The lines of commerce and communications are criss-crossing the old Cold War fault lines, knitting the continent closer together. Former NATO enemies are seizing every opportunity to meet, engage, and exercise their militaries with NATO—and three of these nations are now ready to join the Alliance.

This is a major step and we must have a full national debate. Some will argue that making NATO larger is going to make NATO weaker and therefore weaken America. I believe the reverse is true; a larger NATO reflects a wider allegiance to our values. Veterans of our European wars know the power of military alliances in deterring and defeating a common enemy. It was the creation of NATO in 1949 that halted Soviet designs on

Western Europe. It was the enlargement of NATO with Greece, Turkey, West Germany, and Spain that helped to strengthen the wall of democracy. And thanks to NATO, no American blood has been shed fighting another war in Europe for more than 50 years. So enlarging NATO with Poland and Hungary and the Czech Republic is going to carry that promise into the next century.

Some argue that these countries aren't ready to bear the burdens of membership. But in the past few months, our national security leaders have visited these nations and they came away convinced that the Poles, the Hungarians, and the Czechs fully intend to carry their responsibilities to contribute to the Alliance, not just benefit from it.

Some argue that by enlarging NATO we are going to be creating new lines of division in Europe. But in fact, NATO is at the center of a new dynamic in Europe that is rapidly erasing these old lines and bridging over old divisions. The mere prospect of joining NATO has unleashed a powerful impetus for peace on that continent. Old rivals have settled their historic disputes and they have struck new accords and arrangements. Poland and Lithuania, Poland and Ukraine, Hungary and Romania, Italy and Slovenia, Germany and the Czech Republic—all have healed border disputes and other kinds of controversies that in the past have erupted into war. More than that, these old rivals are sealing these new ties by working together in the conference rooms and the training fields under NATO auspices.

Some argue that enlarging NATO is going to create new tensions and divisions in Russia and jeopardize Russia's move to democracy and its cooperation with the West. But in numerous actions, large and small, NATO and Russia are forging new links to overcome these old divisions. NATO and Russian air forces are now making authorized observation flights over each other's territory. Last spring, NATO and Russia signed a Founding Act that gives Russia a voice in—but not a vote or a veto over—NATO deliberations. And for the past two years, Russian and American troops have been serving together in Bosnia, going out on joint patrols to settle disputes before they ignite into conflict.

Finally, there are those who claim that NATO enlargement will cost too much. But alliances actually save money because they promote cooperation, interoperability, and they reduce redundancy. Simply put, it costs America less to defend our interests in Europe if Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic are in alliance with us, just as it costs them less to defend their interests by joining hands in the alliance itself. And we estimate that the cost to the United States each year over the next decade will be less than one-tenth of one percent of our defense budget. The costs of enlarging NATO are meager when weighed against the cost of potential instability and aggression in Europe if we fail to enlarge.

George Marshall knew the cost of war in Europe. He said it is "spread before us, written neatly in the ledger, whose volumes are grave stones." Well, today, there are more than 70,000 such volumes written across Europe, the grave stones of Americans who rest where they fell, liberating a continent. And so their sacrifice echoes down to us through the decades from the hillsides in Florence, from the sloping green in Luxembourg, from the dignified rows on a cliff overlooking the Normandy shore. They did not serve, they did not sacrifice, they did not die for us so that we could walk away from the lands that they freed. It's their voices that we have to heed and the voices of every veteran of every conflict that we have ever fought. You know it is better to pay the price for peace than suffer the cost of war.

John F. Kennedy once said, "A nation reveals itself not only by the individuals it produces, but also by those it honors, those it remembers." Here, today, on behalf of every man and woman who serves in the Department of Defense, let me say thank you to Birmingham. Thank you for remembering. Too many Americans observe Veterans Day in shopping malls. Too many school kids think of Veterans Day as a holiday. Too few cities pause to honor their native sons and daughters—the quiet heroes of freedom. But not Birmingham. It is because of Birmingham that America still keeps places in the world that are free. Every Veterans Day, America reveals its commitment to our armed forces by honoring and remembering the sacrifices of America's veterans. So I want to thank all the citizens of Birmingham for hosting this special event for 50 years and for making veterans everywhere feel like the heroes they are. And I want to thank all our veterans for keeping our nation safe and our citizens secure. God bless our veterans . . . God bless Birmingham . . . and God bless the United States of America. ●

#### DUNGENESS CRAB CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT ACT

●Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, soon after the upcoming recess, I will join my colleague, Senator SLADE GORTON, to introduce the Dungeness Crab Conservation and Management Act. The ocean Dungeness crab fishery in WA, OR, and CA has been successfully managed by the three states for many years. The states cooperate on season openings, male-only harvest requirements, and minimum sizes; and all three states have enacted limited entry programs. Although the resource demonstrates natural cycles in abundance, over time the fishery has been sustained at a profitable level for fishermen and harvesters with no biological problems.

The fishery is conducted both within state waters and in the federal exclusive economic zone (EEZ). Although state landing laws restrict fishermen to delivering crab only to those states in which they are licensed, the actual harvest takes place along most of the West Coast, roughly from San Francisco to the Canadian border. Thus, it is not unusual for an Oregon-licensed fisherman from Newport to fish in the EEZ northwest of Westport, WA, and deliver his catch to a processor in Astoria, OR.

In recent years, federal court decisions under the umbrella of U.S. versus Washington have held that Northwest Indian tribes have treaty rights to harvest a share of the crab resource off Washington. To accommodate these rights, the State of Washington, has restricted fishing by Washington-licensed fishermen. This led Washington fishermen to request an extension of state fisheries jurisdiction into the EEZ. The Congress partially granted this request during the last Congress by giving the West Coast states interim authority over Dungeness crab, which expires in 1999 (16 U.S.C. 1856 *note*). The Congress also expressed its interest in seeing a fishery management plan established for Dungeness crab and asked the Pa-

cific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) to report to Congress on this issue by December, 1997.

The PFMC established an industry committee to examine the issues, which developed several options. At its June meeting, the PFMC selected two options for further development and referred them for analysis to the Tri-State Dungeness Crab Committee which operates under the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. After lengthy debate, the Tri-State Committee recommended to the Council that the Congress be requested to make the interim authority permanent with certain changes, including a clarification of what license is required for the fishery, broader authority for the states to ensure equitable access to the resource, and clarification of tribal rights. The Tri-State Committee agrees that each state's limited entry laws should apply only to vessels registered in that state. I ask unanimous consent to include the report of the Tri-State Dungeness Crab Committee and the membership list of the Committee in the RECORD following my remarks.

On September 12, 1997, the PFMC unanimously agreed to accept and support the Tri-State Committee recommendation. The Council agreed that the existing management structure effectively conserves the resource, that allocation issues are resolved by the restriction on application of state limited entry laws, that tribal rights are protected, and that the public interest in conservation and fiscal responsibility after better served by the legislative proposal than by developing and implementing a fishery management plan under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. This legislation will fully implement the Tri-State Committee recommendation and ensure the conservation and sound management of this important West Coast fishery.

I look forward to the Senate's timely consideration of this bill.

REPORT OF THE TRI-STATE DUNGENESS CRAB COMMITTEE TO THE PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL ON OPTIONS FOR DUNGENESS CRAB FISHERY MANAGEMENT, AUGUST 7, 1997

The Tri-State Dungeness Crab Committee met on August 6-7, 1997 to review the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) Analysis of Options for Dungeness Crab Management. A list of the attending Committee members, advisors, and observers is attached. After completing that review, the Committee discussed the merits of each option and offered the following comments for PFMC consideration.

There was general agreement within the Committee that Option 1, No Action, would not satisfy the current needs of the industry. There was unanimous opposition, however, among Oregon and California representatives to Option 3, Development of a Limited Federal Fishery Management Plan (FMP). Washington representatives were not strongly in favor of a FMP, but viewed it as the only realistic means to address their concerns for the fishery. After an extended discussion, it