

guarantee workers very little in the way of real training.

Two amendments to be offered today will go a long way in providing workers with real training. The Breaux amendment will provide support for one of the most innovative training tools—training vouchers. Under his amendment, dislocated workers will be empowered to make key decisions about training.

Senator MOYNIHAN will offer an amendment to restore the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. Repealing TAA, as this bill does, breaks a covenant with America's workers, many of whom have felt the dark side of free trade. I believe strongly that free trade is, on balance, good for America and our workers. But it is clear there must be assistance in helping workers transition to, train for and locate jobs in growing industries.

Finally, I remain concerned about maintaining a Federal commitment to adult education. Adult education has provided thousands of needy Americans with assistance in gaining literacy skills that make them better citizens, better parents and better workers. For these Americans, these dollars provide dignity. I think we must assure that these adults continue to receive these critical services through this new system.

I want to come back to the big picture for a moment. Education and training have always been bipartisan issues and I hope they can be on this bill. Through the amendments today, it is clear we can work through some of the concerns that remain to fashion consensus legislation that will be good for American workers and good for American students. I pledge to be a part of that dialog and am hopeful that at the end of the day, this will be legislation that I can support.

Mr. KENNEDY. I see the hour of 11:30 has approached.

---

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, we will be in a period for morning business for not to exceed 1 hour to be divided equally between the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN].

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

---

#### NATO EXPANSION

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, Senator NUNN's plane is late, so I am going to start this dialog. Senator NUNN and I and other Democrats and Republicans have been talking about NATO expansion. We are very concerned that the debate needs to take place, that Americans need to understand what is important, what the

questions should be, and what should be the criteria for the expansion of NATO.

After all, all of us understand that NATO is a mutual defense pact. And if we expand NATO, we must ask for and receive from the entering nation defense assurances, and we must also give those same defense assurances. Therefore, we are talking about American troops and American tax dollars, just as all of our NATO allies will be looking at the obligations they must accept.

All of us must realize how very important and crucial this decision is going to be. The expansion of NATO is a strategic decision that must not be made in haste and must not be made before we answer the crucial questions.

So Senator NUNN and I are taking this hour, along with others of our colleagues, to talk about it. Let us raise some of the questions that we think need to be answered, and let us look at potential alternatives, as well as the actual expansion of NATO, and the timetable that we might look at if we decide to make that decision.

The political map of Europe has changed dramatically since the toppling of the Berlin Wall. Just as these changes were a direct result of half a century of American leadership and NATO resolve, so, too, does the future of peace and stability in Europe depend on a strong and enduring NATO.

With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the rise of new governments, along with old ethnic and border disputes in Eastern Europe, a new set of challenges confronts the North Atlantic alliance.

A NATO study just released last week takes a decidedly positive stance toward the possibility of expanding NATO membership. The NATO study is specific in that it asserts that new NATO members will have the same benefits and obligations of all the other members of the alliance.

The study also anticipates no change in NATO nuclear policy or in the forward basing of NATO ground forces. These points are important, as far as they go. However, there are a number of very serious issues raised by the issue of NATO enlargement, and these questions need to be analyzed thoroughly before the United States and our NATO allies commit ourselves to this course of action.

First, although the NATO study talks about expansion leading to increased stability and security, it is largely silent on the real why of NATO enlargement. The real why is the deep concern in Eastern Europe and the Baltic countries about a future threat from Russia and the West's stake in responding to this potential threat.

Second, the study does not address the Russian reaction to NATO expansion. It notes that Russia has raised concerns which NATO is attempting to address, but the fact is that eastward NATO expansion in the near future is almost certain to prompt opponents of

democracy and economic reform in Russia to new heights of paranoia and provocative nationalism. It could weaken the prodemocracy and proreform elements of the Russian polity that we should be striving to support. Rather than strengthening stability and security in Eastern Europe, repercussions in Russia from rapid NATO expansion could undermine our most important national security goal.

Third, full NATO membership for the nations of Eastern Europe has the potential to draw the United States and our NATO allies into regional border and ethnic disputes in which we have no demonstrable national security interest.

Many Americans and many of us in Congress have serious reservations about President Clinton's proposal to commit United States troops to a peacekeeping force in the former Yugoslavia. This is an issue we will debate here at a later date. But disagreements about the wisdom of this commitment within this body across our Nation and within NATO are directly relevant to NATO expansion.

Is it in America's interest to enter into treaty obligations that could end up committing American military and political power to current and future regional border and ethnic disputes in Eastern Europe and the Balkans?

When President Clinton argues that we must put troops on the ground in Bosnia in order to keep faith with our NATO allies and our leadership within the alliance, it illustrates perfectly the very real risks of rapid NATO expansion. Before the United States and our NATO allies take this step to guarantee mutual defense, we must acknowledge that the potential for civil war and border and ethnic strife in Eastern Europe is high. After years of vacillation and debate about what America should do about Bosnia, we must also acknowledge that there has not been a clear policy. To embark on NATO expansion without resolving this crucial question could be disastrous.

Potential flash points in Eastern Europe and the Balkans are easy to identify. Current and potential NATO members are directly involved in every one of them: Serbian opposition to Kosovo's aspirations to independence; Greek opposition to Macedonian independence; longstanding border disputes between Poland and Ukraine; unresolved problems stemming from the breakup of the former Yugoslavia.

If we move ahead rapidly with NATO expansion and the full mutual defense and security commitments that such membership implies, would that set the stage for direct American military involvement in such disputes as we have been drawn into in the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia? That is a very important question that we must answer before we take such a giant step.

Mr. President, there are alternatives to rapid NATO expansion, alternatives