

pioneering work to advance Geography Awareness Week, the Geography Bee, and state geography alliances, has dramatized the need for quality geography education in America's classrooms.

I want to commend Mr. Grosvenor for his lifetime commitment to the advancement and dissemination of geographic knowledge and understanding. Under the leadership of Gil Grosvenor, National Geographic has done more to make geography alive and interesting than any other organization. We all owe Mr. Grosvenor and the National Geographic Society a huge debt of gratitude for their tremendous contributions over the years.

Mr. President, hundreds of geographers from across the country will converge on the Southwest Texas campus today to inaugurate the new Center. Lady Bird Johnson is also an expected guest, along with elected officials and many alumni from the Department of Geography and Planning. In the evening, Mr. Grosvenor will serve as a special guest at a dinner in the ballroom of the LBJ Student Center. On Friday, Mr. Grosvenor will have the honor and distinction of delivering the 1st Annual Grosvenor Lecture at the Alkek Library Teaching Theater on campus. Mr. Grosvenor is expected to focus his address on the critical importance of providing quality geography education in America's schools.

It is with great pleasure that I join in the celebration of the dedication of Southwest Texas's new Grosvenor Center. I congratulate all those involved in making this effort a reality and ensuring that geography education plays an important and integral role in the classrooms of today, as well as tomorrow.●

#### L.F. "TOW" DIEHM

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today and ask my colleagues to join me in extending condolences to the family and loved ones of one of New Mexico's most outstanding citizens, L.F. "Tow" Diehm, who died last week. Mr. Diehm leaves a proud and indelible legacy for his family, profession, and community. He spent his professional life dedicated to athletics in New Mexico, and while he will be missed, his reputation will live on.

Tow came to the University of New Mexico in 1957 and held the job of athletic trainer for 31 years. As friends and family will attest, Tow was a man who never forgot that the young student athletes in his charge were people. Throughout his 31 years, not a day went by when Tow did not touch the lives of the people around him. As a gesture to Tow of respect and affection, the University of New Mexico named its new athletic complex after him when it was completed in 1997. Indeed, the honors that were bestowed on Tow throughout his life were numerous: he is a member of the University of New Mexico Athletic Hall of Honor, the

Helms Trainers Hall of fame, and in 1980, he became the first person, who was not an athlete or a coach, ever inducted into the Albuquerque Hall of Fame.

Whether generating funding for the athletic department or acting as a confidante to the many student athletes he helped every day, Mr. Diehm did everything in his life, personal and professional, with honor and integrity. His influence on athletes, his colleagues and friends, to say nothing of his family, is immeasurable. The standard of excellence that he embodied will live on in each life that he touched.●

#### DISABLED HIKERS FROM IDAHO ATTEMPT MT. EVEREST CLIMB

● Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to share a story about an extraordinary group of Idahoans.

As I drove into work this morning, my thoughts were with this group of my constituents in Nepal, very far away from home and even farther away from Washington, D.C. These Idahoans are attempting to climb Mt. Everest. Only a handful of people have climbed the mountain over the years and succeeded. Others have failed in their attempt, but very few people have ever tried to climb the mountain at all. It is a challenge that could mean death at every turn. For this group of Idahoans, however, the climb means life around every corner.

The climbers are all physically disabled. These disabled trekkers are affiliated with the Cooperative Wilderness Handicapped Outdoor Group at Idaho State University, affectionately known as HOGs. This group's philosophy is, "Hey, just because you're disabled, it doesn't mean that your life is over." And they are proving exactly that. The group's journey is being documented on the internet, so that updates on their progress can be found frequently. On their website they write, "Disabled people are ignored, not really discriminated against, but ignored. I've seen families where a relative is newly disabled and they didn't let him do anything. This at first is a well-meaning attitude, but later it effectively takes a disabled person's power away to make choices. We're making a choice with this Everest Trek. It's going to be really hard, but we are going to give it our best."

Disability comes in different forms for the participants. Kyle Packer, an Idaho State University student of the year, has Cerebral Palsy. Isaac Gayfield set many Idaho State University track records. He now has Degenerative Bone Disease. Tom McCurdy is an Idaho State University student who happens to be a paraplegic. Steve DeRoche is a weight lifting coach and a double amputee. Sheila Brashears lost a leg to cancer. Carla Yustak, who has Cerebral Palsy, is an Olympic trainee for cycling when she isn't climbing mountains.

And then there is Tom Whittaker. The founder of the CW-HOG organization, Tom lost his foot in an automobile accident in 1979, shortly after finishing his Masters degree at Idaho State University. An avid outdoor adventurer, Tom felt as if his life had come to an end—but he overcame his disability, and then some. Now a professor of adventure education at Prescott College in Arizona, Tom is poised to become the first amputee to stand on the summit of Everest. While the rest of the team plans to end its journey upon reaching the base camp of the summit, Tom will travel the final stage to the peak as the sole disabled participant.

I want to personally congratulate this group for their efforts so far. They are expected to reach the base camp today and Tom is set to reach the summit later this month. It is indeed a defining moment for disabled people in America and around the world.

Mr. President, let me share what was written about Tom Whittaker in his online profile: " \* \* \* [he] reminds us, when setbacks occur in our personal and professional lives, it is not the falling down, but the getting back up that matters. The essence, in the heart of the American Dream, is not money, status or power, but the freedom to dream and the courage to embrace those dreams—for all people. As a people, we love to compete and we love to win. But more than anything, Americans applaud the grit and spirit it takes to get back up and finish the race."

In closing, I want to recognize their spirit today. It is my hope that everyone who hears their message might be inspired to face and conquer their own challenges, and by so doing, become not only better persons but better Americans.●

#### NATO ENLARGEMENT

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, last week, the Senate engaged in a particularly important debate about the expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I particularly want to commend the leadership and dedication of my colleague from Oregon, Senator GORDON SMITH. Senator SMITH managed this important legislation on the floor with great competence, and the people of Oregon should be proud of how he handled this difficult assignment. Despite my colleague's persuasive efforts, however, I have decided to oppose this treaty.

Mr. President, a new era in world affairs demands new forms of international cooperation. There is indeed a clear and immediate imperative to bring the new democracies of Eastern Europe into the family of freedom-loving nations.

What is less clear is that the best way to do this is through the new military alliance proposed by this treaty. My reservations about this treaty are

three, and I would like to outline them briefly.

First, the treaty redefines NATO's fundamental mission from protecting against a known threat into something much more nebulous. The initial purpose of this alliance was to contain communism and staunch the threat of the Soviet Union spreading its sphere of influence over the entire continent. With four decades of sound leadership, consistent vision, and unflinching strength, the alliance succeeded in that endeavor, bringing the West safely through the Cold War, and allowing the people of Eastern Europe to finally reassert their long-suppressed desire for freedom.

But what is NATO's role in a new environment, with the Soviet Union relegated to history? I don't think that question has been sufficiently debated, or an answer sufficiently defined, for us to be rushing into this expansion. Is there really some strategic end that would be served by the United States pledging to treat any conflagration in the turbulent realm of Eastern Europe as an attack against our own sovereignty?

It may well be that there are circumstances in which the cause of world peace and security would be best served by an American commitment to turn back an aggressor or defend a fragile democracy. But in the absence of a well-defined threat or clearly articulated strategic mission, it is hard to see how this expansion of NATO is anything other than a gamble that an institution created for one purpose is equally suited for the yet-to-be-determined purposes of a new time.

Second, I believe that this expansion will have a deleterious effect on our relationship with Russia. At this critical time—when what was once our most formidable adversary stands at a delicate point between the continued climb toward democracy and freedom on the one side, and a fall backwards into heavily-armed nationalism on the other—I'm especially troubled that this proposed NATO expansion will push future Russian leaders in the wrong direction.

As the end of this century approaches, Russia is still in possession of one of the world's most powerful military arsenals. A Russia with reborn territorial designs on her neighbors is the greatest imaginable potential threat to European stability and security.

That is why it is so vital that we seek ratification and implementation of the START II treaty with Russia, which would actually reduce the size of its nuclear arsenal. The Russian Duma has so far refused to take this step, but appears to be moving in that direction. If they interpret this expansion, however, as a hostile gesture in their direction, they may well refuse to ratify, leaving us all less safe than we might otherwise have been.

The United States has made tremendous strides in our relationship with

Russia since the fall of the Soviet system. American diplomacy now should be focused on consolidating those gains, and finding ways to help Russia complete its transition to democracy. Many experts in our own country, as well as many of the most credible pro-Western leaders in Russia itself, have warned us that expanding NATO could inflame nationalist passions, and lead to a turning away from the path of democracy and peaceful relations. That would be the most disastrous of unintended consequences, and must give us pause as we consider this step.

Third, the cost of this initiative is anyone's guess, and must compel us to caution as well, particularly considering that the United States already pays a disproportionate share of NATO's costs. If NATO expansion were vital to our national security, then our country would be resolved to pay any price, in President Kennedy's timeless phrase. But we live in a fundamentally different time, one in which each country's security is determined as much by the quality of its schools and the cleanliness of its air and water than by the might of its armies and navies. Committing to an expanded military alliance which may entail far greater costs than the Administration has estimated could diminish our ability to make the investments that will make us safer and stronger.

The Senate had an opportunity, through the amendment offered by Senator HARKIN, to gain a better sense of the size of this financial commitment. I strongly supported that effort. Unfortunately, it did not prevail, and we are left with burning questions about the size of the financial commitment entailed by this treaty, and the effect that will have on our ability to address those domestic priorities which make us stronger as a nation.

What is true for us is true for these struggling new democracies as well. As Senator MOYNIHAN has pointed out so wisely, these countries are under no immediate threat. Their most pressing challenge is the development of growing economies, and the institutions of democracy. But if they join NATO, these struggling nations will be required to spend billions on the latest in military hardware instead of making critically needed investments in areas that lead to long-term benefit: infrastructure, education, environmental health, and many others.

Decades of a failed communist system left these countries in economic ruin. I believe it is a testament to their energy and determination that they are slowly overcoming this legacy and building up new, vibrant free market economies. We should, in the name of international security, be doing everything possible to help them through this transition.

I do not believe that anyone has properly assessed the impact that joining NATO, and making the necessary investments to participate in that military alliance, will have on our

Eastern European friends' ability to continue a successful transition to market economics. And I do not believe we should jump pell-mell into such an enlargement until we have done so.

The democratization of Eastern Europe is an exciting and hopeful development. As a child of the Cold War, I am awed by the transitions we have seen. The United States has a special responsibility to nurture freedom wherever it is seeking to plant its roots. But in the final analysis, it is not clear that extending NATO membership to Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic is the best way to do it.

In this case, the burden of proof is on the proponents. We should not take so solemn a step as committing American lives to the protection of another country unless we are absolutely certain, beyond any doubt, that it is the wisest of possible courses. I remain unconvinced, and so I opposed the measure.●

#### RECOGNIZING PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. Res. 223, which I introduced yesterday on behalf of myself and Senator STEVENS. Our resolution recognizes the Prince William Sound Community College and its celebration of its twentieth anniversary this Sunday, May 10, 1988.

This is a notable milestone for the College and for the people of the Copper Basin Area. Prince William Sound Community College was established in 1976 as a Learning Center set up by the University of Alaska. It earned community college status just two years later. In 1987, the University of Alaska merged all community colleges in the state into the university system; however, due to overwhelming support from the local community of Valdez, Prince William Sound Community College remained the only individually accredited community college in the University of Alaska system.

Today, after 20 years, the student body of the college has grown to nearly 2,000 students, and the college is a recognized leader in the University of Alaska system.

Mr. President, I commend the Prince William Sound Community College for its 20 years of exceptional service to the people of Alaska and look forward to many more years of growth and contributions to the culture and economy of Alaska.●

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I join Senator Murkowski as a co-sponsor of this Senate resolution commending the Prince William Sound Community College, which is located in Valdez, Alaska, as it celebrates its twentieth anniversary.

In 1971, concerned citizens of Valdez and in the neighboring town of Cordova petitioned the University of Alaska to establish extension offices in each of these communities. In 1976, a Learning Center was established in this area.