costs, the changing role of the alliance, the EU, or intra-alliance disputes. Past rounds of enlargement have gone forward with little or no conditions attached.

There is something to be said for knowing this historical precedent as it demonstrates the nonpartisan U.S. commitment to NATO, the European security, and to being a reliable partner, setting the kind of example we want our allies to follow on this and many other matters.

Imagine our reaction if the parliament of one of our allies were to attach conditions to NATO enlargement that we would find unacceptable—for example, restricting use of NATO designated forces in strikes against Iraq.

To the extent conditions are attached, they must be of a nature so as not to impede or slow down the ratification of NATO enlargement, here or in other Allied capitals. There are many complicated issues at stake in European security that demand our attention, but these issues cannot and should not be solved through hurried words in the resolution of ratification.

We risk doing more harm than good by mandating simplified solutions to problems where there is need for more thoughtful consideration and where there is no consensus within this body or among our country's foremost experts. This applies in particular to questions about NATO's ''new missions'' and the alliance's strategic concept. Clearly, we need to pay close attention to NATO's growing out-of-area role and its greater emphasis on peacekeeping and crisis management.

In today's world, no longer dominated by an East-West divide in Europe, these new directions of NATO make sense. Rather than seeking to use a resolution of ratification to restrict development of these concepts in NATO, we simply need to continue to do our job in the Senate of exercising oversight to ensure that NATO's evolving strategic concept remains consistent with our treaty commitments and that the United States does not commit to foreign military engagements that do not have sufficient support in the Senate and among the American public.

I do not see the logic in a mandated pause before future rounds of enlargement. It is scarcely necessary, given there will be a de facto pause as the alliance absorbs the first round of new members. The United States always maintains a veto at NATO, and the Senate always has the right of advice and consent. All a pause would do is needlessly tie our own hands and those of a future President in the event a qualified country that could make a real contribution to NATO wanted to join. Even worse, it would eliminate the incentive other Europeans have to spend now the resources necessary to prepare for NATO membership in the future. A mandated pause buys us nothing we do not already have, yet has real down sides.

Burdensharing is an issue of constant concern and debate with our allies. It is a long-term struggle for this country to ensure that we bear only a reasonable and fair share of the costs of our common security through NATO. Enlargement itself already implies a small reduction in the U.S. share of NATO's common expenses, although the total dollar amount will go up as NATO takes on new costs associated with enlargement. But seeking to use the resolution of ratification to mandate further reductions in our share of NATO expenses that have not been consented to by our allies is simply another way to try to scuttle enlargement.

I also fail to see the logic of tying NATO enlargement to decisions by the European Union about its enlargement. Security is an issue in its own right, independent of economics, and we need to fill the security vacuum in Central Europe, bind these countries to the West, and guarantee a stable environment in Europe regardless of the state of European Union enlargement.

Moreover, the European Union is dragging its feet on enlargement. We should not allow this foot-dragging to delay our taking action to enhance security in Europe. The U.S. is not a member of the EU and has almost no influence over its membership decisions. There is no reason for the U.S. to abdicate to the EU the decisions about which countries we will end up defending through NATO and when.

Finally, the EU is negotiating with six candidates for future EU expansion. Three of these countries are the same as the three NATO invitees, but the others include countries such as Cyprus and Estonia for whom near-term NATO membership would be problematic.

In my view, the resolution of ratification, as currently drafted, addresses most of the concerns that Senators have raised in a responsible and thoughtful manner. It does not impose any unacceptable conditions. It calls for a reaffirmation from the administration on a few key points—the primacy of the North Atlantic Council vis-a-vis the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council; the maintenance of collective defense, not collective security and out-of-area missions, as the core mission of NATO; and the requirement to keep the costs of enlargement under control and shared equitably among the allies. These are sound policy positions soundly formulated. Neither the administration nor our allies should have any difficulty supporting them.

Mr. President, there is no reason to delay bringing this issue to a vote. This issue has received more attention in the Senate and in public discussion than most other foreign policy issues in recent memory. The proliferation of op-eds, articles, studies, think-tank papers, and conference proceedings is astonishing.

Over the past several years, the Senate has on 14 separate occasions, through unanimous consent resolutions, voice votes, rollcall votes, on things such as the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act, repeatedly given a strong endorsement to NATO enlargement. We even urged the administration to include one more country in the enlargement talks that was ultimately invited at Madrid.

Several Senate committees have held hearings on NATO enlargement. The Foreign Relations Committee has held numerous hearings and published 552 pages of testimony about the issue. This level of attention has been the most extensive of any previous enlargement of NATO. Ratification of Spain's membership was done by a voice vote. To say that there has not been enough debate is to say that no amount of debate will ever be enough.

The complaints that there has not been sufficient debate—often coupled with a request to postpone such debate—instead seem like an effort by opponents of enlargement to scuttle the issue because they know a majority in the Senate has considered the issue and is prepared to vote in favor.

The issues before us are clear and well defined. For the moral, strategic, and practical reasons I have outlined, the most important thing the Senate can do now is to offer an overwhelming, positive ''yes'' vote on the enlargement of NATO— without crippling amendments—to bring these countries back into the Western fold forever. I urge my colleagues to support the current resolution of ratification with no further amendments.

Mr. President, I thank the majority leader. I thank his staff and others who have contributed enormously to this effort. I want to thank Senator BIDEN and I want to thank Senator HELMS for their efforts. Without their work, we probably would not have gotten this issue to the floor. The majority leader has committed on this issue, and I appreciate his leadership.

But I also cannot help but recall, Mr. President, our former majority leader, Bob Dole, whose op-ed piece appeared in the Washington Times today. I will not take the time in the Senate to read the whole thing, but Senator Dole sums up where he says—and I quote—

> This is no time to postpone or delay action. It is time to act so that other NATO member countries can move ahead with ratification knowing the United States is leading the way.

Senator Dole, throughout his long and illustrious career here, always believed that the United States should lead the way. With our vote in favor of enlargement of NATO, the United States will again, in the words of Bob Dole, lead the way.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. CON. RES. 85

Mr. MCCAIN. As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Con. Res. 85, submitted earlier today by Senator NICKLES and others. I further ask unanimous consent

that no amendments be in order to the resolution or preamble. I further ask unanimous consent that total debate time be limited to 60 minutes, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with 10 minutes of the time allotted to the Democratic leader being under the control of Senator BIDEN. I finally ask unanimous consent that following the expiration or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to a vote on the adoption of the resolution, with no intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

CALLING FOR AN END TO THE VIOLENT REPRESSION OF THE PEOPLE OF KOSOVO

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution on Kosovo be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 85) calling for an end to the violent repression of the people of Kosovo.

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, the United States in concert with its allies must act immediately to prevent a resumption of the brutal repression of ethnic Albanians in Kosovo and to get real—not sham—negotiations started.

The past two weeks have seen appalling massacres of innocent ethnic Albanians in Kosovo by heavily armed Serbian paramilitary forces. Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic's black-suited thugs used artillery, armored personnel carriers, heavy caliber machine guns, and even helicopter gunships to carry out their gruesome work.

The pretext for their violence was an ambush of Serbian policy by the secretive Kosovo Liberation Army, which left four policemen dead. But we know that Milosevic had been planning military action in Kosovo for months. He was just waiting for an excuse to issue the final orders.

Not only were supposed members of the Kosovo Liberation Army murdered, but scores of innocent civilians, including women and children, were killed.

There is strong circumstantial evidence indicating that many victims were tortured before being put to death. Demands by Kosovo Albanians for outside forensic investigations before their kin were buried were cruelly denied by the Serbs, who dumped the corpses into mass graves.

Next, the world witnessed the spectacle of survivors exhuming the bodies of their loved ones in order to give them dignified, Muslim burials.

Mr. President, this behavior is worthy of the Dark Ages, not the end of the twentieth century.

Having ordered these massacres and ghoulish follow-up, Milosevic, true to form, attempted to con world opinion.

He sent a delegation to Pristina and offered to talk with the Kosovo Albanians ''without preconditions''—except for the little detail that the Albanians would have to negotiate within the framework of the Republic of Serbia.

In other words, the Kosovo Albanians would have to give up their only bargaining chip at the outset, namely their demand for independence. Some deal.

Moreover, the Belgrade Bully rubbed salt in the wounds of the community whom his storm troopers had just massacred by declaring that he would negotiate with the ''Albanian minority,'' meaning a minority in Serbia, not the ninety percent majority they hold in Kosovo.

No, Mr. President, this was not a serious offer of negotiations. It was vintage Milosevic ''bait and switch.'' Rather than beginning the necessary quiet dialogue, he cynically tried to make a public splash, while continuing to repress.

Once again, the civilized world is faced with a deadly serious challenge.

There is a real possibility that if Milosevic in his Greater Serbian haze tries to ''ethnically cleanse'' Kosovo of its ethnic Albanian population, the violence could spread into a full-scale Balkan War, cutting short the recent progress we have made in Bosnia and fracturing NATO. The cynical side of me tells me part of why he moved when he did was because of Bosnia.

Mr. President, I hope this time we will act without having to have 4 years of convulsions like we had on Bosnia, even though it is a very different circumstance in terms of what is at stake. It is not different in terms of the brutality and the atrocities that have occurred. It is time to act. The bipartisan resolution I am cosponsoring is just a beginning. I believe the United States should immediately reimpose all financial sanctions against Serbia, except for democratic assistance. We should insist that Milosevic lift the repressive martial law in Kosovo and withdraw his storm troopers. The United States must actively facilitate immediate good faith negotiations between Belgrade and Kosovo without preconditions as called for by the contact group to which we belong.

If Milosevic does not unconditionally come to the negotiating table by next week, we should freeze Yugoslavian assets abroad, attempting to exempt assets in Montenegro whose new reformist President has been cooperative in a number of ways. Milosevic and his Serbian colleagues should understand that if the atrocities resume, and if he does not protect lives, human rights, and the autonomy of the people of Kosovo, the pressure from the United States, and hopefully others, will escalate.

I believe the President is right when he suggests that no option should be ruled out. Milosevic is a thug. He is the President of a country but he is a thug. He should be indicted as a war criminal. He should be tried at The Hague. I reiterate what I told him to his face 4 years ago in his office when he asked me what I thought of him. He is a war criminal. He looked at me as if we were having a civilized discussion and said, ''And what do you think of me,'' and I repeat publicly what I said to him privately. I said, ''I think you are a war criminal and should be tried as such.'' Unfortunately, I have never been more correct than I was then. This guy is a thug. We should make no bones about who he is.

Mr. President, I hope that the concurrent resolution for which we have 1 hour of debate here, the concurrent resolution that is introduced by Mr. NICKLES, Mr. DODD, myself, Mr. HELMS, Mr. LIEBERMAN and others, I hope we pass it, and pass it swiftly.

I see my friend from Connecticut. I yield the floor to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleague from Delaware for yielding.

While we are on this resolution introduced by Senator NICKLES and I and the distinguished Senator from Delaware, my colleague from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, and others, let me commend the Senator for the very fine way in which he is managing the effort dealing with NATO expansion. I know in a sense we are interrupting that debate to consider this resolution.

Mr. President, I am very pleased to be a principal sponsor, along with our colleague from Oklahoma and others, of this resolution. I think it is appropriate, in light of events we have all seen in our newspapers and television stations, events that have occurred in Kosovo in the last couple of weeks, to speak, to be heard. I think it is appropriate.

In this body we are oftentimes asked, what do these resolutions mean? What value do they have? People write resolutions with a lot of language, and here are calling for sanctions or expressing outrage over behavior, and it seems just like a lot of words.

I remember, Mr. President, very vividly one of my first days in the Congress of the United States and I had a chance to meet with some refuseniks from the Soviet Union. They were courageously trying to achieve religious freedom for themselves and democracy in the Soviet Union, a very repressive regime. I remember raising the question to a couple of these people, does this have any real value when we speak out with resolutions, and people were wearing bracelets and so forth with the names of refuseniks. And there were those who questioned the wisdom of it, ''Wasn't it more sort of a lot of rhetoric without having much influence?'' I will never forget the response of these people. They said, ''You have no idea how closely the world watches what you say in America. When you speak our names on the floor of the U.S. Senate, when you talk about us, you give