

Moscow, in my view, would be compelled to reach the conclusion that they reached in the document that was posited on the Senate floor for the RECORD today.

I do not in any way underestimate the impact of damaged psyches on national policy. I do not in any way, in any sense, underestimate that feelings of isolation on the part of the Russian military, the Russians, might produce an extension of a position that otherwise would have been reached anyway. But I would conclude by saying I do not believe that the strategic document that the Senator spoke to today is as a consequence—notwithstanding that it mentions the expansion of NATO—of the talk of expanding with the inclusion of Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland into NATO.

But my friend from Rhode Island has another urgent meeting he wishes to attend. I am happy to yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN, I, too, yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAIRCLOTH). The Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the treaty be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The treaty will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, two-thirds of the Senators—

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the Resolution of Ratification is printed in the March 6, 1998 edition of the RECORD.)

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2646

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, these are requests I am making on behalf of the leadership. I can only assume they have been agreed to by the minority.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture votes with respect to the education A+ bill occur beginning at 5:45 p.m. on Thursday, March 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I want to remind all my colleagues that, under rule XXII, all first-degree amendments must be filed at the desk by 1 p.m. tomorrow and second-degree amendments must be filed by 4:45 tomorrow in order to qualify under the "timely filed" requirement postcloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROTOCOLS TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY OF 1949 ON ACCESSION OF POLAND, HUNGARY, AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC

The Senate continued with the consideration of the treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from the great State of Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I wish to speak on NATO enlargement and wish to consume such time as necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this is a truly historic occasion. Today the Senate begins debate on the ratification of NATO enlargement. By ratifying this treaty, we are building an undivided, peaceful, and democratic Europe for the new millennium. I stand here to support NATO enlargement because it will make Europe more stable and America more secure. It means that the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe will share the burden of European security.

It also means that future generations of Americans might not have to fight nor die for Europe. America has fought and won three wars in Europe: World War I, when an assassination in Yugoslavia led to years of bloodshed; World War II, the bloodiest war in history when thousands of Americans left factories and farms to fight on the battlefields of Europe; and we won the cold war, when Soviet expansionism forced us to prepare to defend Western Europe when the captive nations of Eastern Europe were forced behind the Iron Curtain.

If NATO does not enlarge, the Iron Curtain will remain permanent and the unnatural division of Europe will live on longer than the Soviet empire did. As a Polish American, I and members of my family have been waiting years for this debate to occur. I know that the Polish people did not choose to live behind the Iron Curtain. They were forced there by the Yalta agreement, by Potsdam, and because they and the Baltic States and the other captive nations were sold out by the free world.

My great grandmother had three pictures on her mantlepiece: One of Pope Pius XII, because we were Catholic and are Catholic, and that was her Pope; my uncle Joe, who was on the Baltimore City Police Department, and we were so proud of what he had achieved; and the other picture, of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, because of what he had done for working people.

But after Yalta and Potsdam, my great grandmother turned the Roosevelt picture face down on her mantel and she let it stay there until the day she died because of what happened at Yalta and Potsdam. That is why many of us cannot forget the history of that region, the placing of a nation and the

other nations, the captive nations, involuntarily under the servitude and boot heel of then the evil empire.

But my support for NATO enlargement is not based on nostalgia, nor is it based on the past; it is based on the future, and it is support as an American. I support NATO enlargement because I believe that it will make America and Europe more stable and more secure. NATO enlargement means a future in which the newly free and democratic countries will take their rightful places as members of Europe. NATO played an important role in securing this freedom. It has been the most successful defense alliance in world history. It is an alliance that helped us win the cold war. It deterred war between the superpowers, and it has helped prevent confrontation between member states.

But if NATO is to survive, it must adapt to meet the needs of the post-cold-war world or it will become irrelevant.

NATO has evolved since it was created in 1949. We have enlarged NATO on three different occasions, and each new member strengthened NATO and increased security in Europe.

Today, we are facing very different threats to security and stability in Europe. We have civil wars, as in Bosnia; we have hot spots caused by ethnic and regional tensions, as in Kosovo; we have international crime, drugs, and terrorism; and we have the very real threat of the spread of weapons of mass destruction. NATO must meet the needs of these new threats, and I believe it will do so by changing and expanding. Europe's new democracies will help us meet these challenges.

The countries of Central and Eastern Europe want to help us address these new threats. How many times have we in the Senate discussed burdensharing in Europe? How often have we complained that European countries were not willing to pay their fair share for the European defense?

Now we have countries that are asking to share the burden. They are asking to pledge their troops and equipment for the common defense. They are asking to share the burden of peacekeeping. In fact, they are doing it right now in Bosnia, where there are thousands of troops from Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. Mr. President, Hungary is a base camp for our troops which enables them to be in Bosnia. These new nations have even committed to joining us in Iraq to help us deal with ending Iraq's chemical and biological weapons program, which is more than some of our allies.

These countries are not asking for a handout; they are asking for a handshake, a handshake to welcome them into NATO. They are not asking for our protection; they are asking to be full partners in the new Europe and in the new world order. By transforming these countries into free-market democracies, they have earned this right. These new democracies will contribute