

of legislation, should be brought to the floor of the Senate as soon as possible. The later that it is brought to the floor of the Senate, the less likely it is that Congress will get its work done on the tobacco bill. I ask the majority leader, bring the tobacco bill to the floor of the U.S. Senate, and let's get it done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). Under the previous order, the hour of 10 a.m. having arrived, the Senator from Indiana, Mr. COATS, is recognized to speak for up to 45 minutes.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. COATS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. BROWNBACK pertaining to the introduction of S. 1994 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the privilege order, the Senate will now go into executive session to resume consideration of Executive Calendar No. 16, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Treaty Document No. 105-36, Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on Accession of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

The Senate resumed consideration of the treaty.

Pending:

Kyl amendment No. 2310, to establish principles of policy of the United States toward the Strategic Concept of NATO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 10:45 having arrived, the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN, is recognized to offer an amendment on which there shall be 2 hours of debate equally divided.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

EXECUTIVE AMENDMENT NO. 2312

(Purpose: To limit any United States subsidy of the national expenses of Poland, Hungary, or the Czech Republic in meeting its NATO commitments)

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] proposes an executive amendment numbered 2312.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

In section 3(2)(A), strike "and" at the end of clause (ii).

In section 3(2)(A), strike "(iii)" and insert "(iv)".

In section 3(2)(A), insert after clause (ii) the following:

(iii) any future United States subsidy of the national expenses of Poland, Hungary, or the Czech Republic to meet its NATO commitments, including the assistance described in subparagraph (C), may not exceed 25 percent of all assistance provided to that country by all NATO members.

At the end of section 3(2), insert the following new subparagraph:

(C) ADDITIONAL UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE DESCRIBED.—The assistance referred to in subparagraph (A)(iii) includes—

(i) Foreign Military Financing under the Arms Export Control Act;

(ii) transfers of excess defense articles under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(iii) Emergency Drawdowns;

(iv) no-cost leases of United States equipment;

(v) the subsidy cost of loan guarantees and other contingent liabilities under subchapter VI of chapter 148 of title 10, United States Code; and

(vi) international military education and training under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I will yield myself such time as I may consume for opening comments and then reserve some time for others on the amendment.

Mr. President, we are, as the Senate and the country now know, debating the issue of whether or not the Senate will advise and consent to the President's signature on a proposal to bring three more nations into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

While I was not present yesterday in this Chamber, I did watch some of the debate that unfolded yesterday, and I think the debate is taking a good course of action. The debate yesterday was a good debate. I hope that the debate today will continue along those lines. In other words, what I mean by that is not just people giving a speech and then walking off the floor but where we can actually engage one another in asking and answering questions about the implications of the NATO treaty.

So I hope that will be the course of action during the Senate's responsibility to advise and consent here.

Mr. President, I want to make some extended remarks about the whole picture of NATO expansion, but I will just talk very briefly right now about the amendment I sent to the desk.

Basically, I think one of the most important issues facing us on NATO expansion is what it is going to cost, what it will cost the taxpayers of this country. So what I have sent to the desk is an amendment that will hopefully clear this up a little bit and provide for an accurate accounting of all of the expenses incident to the expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. And I will have more to say about that a little bit later.

Concerns about the extension of our military obligations—and let's again be frank about this; NATO is a military alliance—have been voiced by Senators and interest groups, academics across the political spectrum, and when the voices expressing caution include Republicans and Democrats and progressives and conservatives, libertarians and others, such a diverse opposition may be a sign that we ought to really act very deliberately and deliberately on this issue. So I am glad the debate has finally begun, and as I said, I am delighted with the course of action in the debate.

At the outset, I hope the Senate would not simply rubber stamp this bill that we have before us. We have a constitutional responsibility to both advise and consent on treaties. This is a responsibility that is taken seriously by every Senator and ought to be, as you know, under our Constitution a treaty overrides the Constitution. So anytime we advise and consent on a treaty, we are advising and consenting on a document that basically overrides much of our Constitution. So we have to be very careful about this.

There are important issues to consider in NATO expansion—burdensharing, command and coordination, responses to real and perceived threats, even the basic questions of mission and scope of the organization itself. They are not simple questions that lend themselves to a simple, sound bite debate. These questions and their answers will shape for better or worse our defense and foreign policy options for decades to come.

There is no doubt that NATO has been one of the greatest military alliance success stories in our Nation's history. And, again, at the outset we have to ask the question. Here is an organization founded in 1949 shortly after the end of the Second World War—the Second World War in this century—when 12 countries signed the North Atlantic treaty to establish the military alliance known as NATO.

Now, let's face it. The reason for NATO was the Soviet Union. The reason for being in that alliance, and also to preserve the nations of Europe together, was to preclude any possibility of cross-border excursions by European countries. The treaty had as its goal "to unite their efforts for collective defense and the preservation of peace and security in Europe."

Four nations have been added. Spain, the most recent, joined in 1982. So, again, it has been a success. It has kept the peace in Europe for nearly 50 years, both by deterring aggression by the Warsaw Pact and by encouraging cooperation between its members.

I must say, due to the commitment of its members and the leadership of the United States, NATO has largely fulfilled the reason for its very birth—the demise of the Soviet Union. So we have to, I think, at the outset, say, if something was born because of the Soviet Union and it has succeeded, what,