

for Greece and others in the past. The cold war is over. Europe is rich. These countries have money. We should not just stick U.S. taxpayers with the total bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 76, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 106 Ex.]

YEAS—24

Ashcroft	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Harkin	Moynihan
Bond	Hutchinson	Murray
Bumpers	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Byrd	Johnson	Torricelli
Conrad	Kempthorne	Warner
Dorgan	Kohl	Wellstone
Feingold	Leahy	Wyden

NAYS—76

Abraham	Faircloth	Lugar
Akaka	Feinstein	Mack
Allard	Ford	McCain
Bennett	Frist	McConnell
Biden	Glenn	Mikulski
Bingaman	Gorton	Murkowski
Boxer	Gramm	Nickles
Breaux	Grams	Reed
Brownback	Grassley	Reid
Bryan	Gregg	Robb
Burns	Hagel	Roberts
Campbell	Hatch	Rockefeller
Chafee	Helms	Roth
Cleland	Hollings	Santorum
Coats	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Inouye	Shelby
Coverdell	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Craig	Kerrey	Snowe
D'Amato	Kerry	Specter
Daschle	Kyl	Stevens
DeWine	Landrieu	Thomas
Dodd	Lautenberg	Thompson
Domenici	Levin	Thurmond
Durbin	Lieberman	
Enzi	Lott	

The executive amendment (No. 2312) was rejected.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay it on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN, MR. JOHN PRESCOTT

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess for 2 minutes for the purpose of welcoming Deputy Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. John Prescott, to the floor.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent the privilege of the floor be granted to Sir Christopher Mayer, the British Ambassador to the United States.

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

RECESS

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:21 p.m., recessed until 3:23 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KEMPTHORNE).

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

The Senate continued with consideration of the treaty.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the expansion of NATO. And how appropriate that our friends, colleagues, and allies from the United Kingdom have joined us on the Senate floor just as they have joined us in battle and just as they have joined us in keeping the peace, and we welcome them with affection, admiration, and gratitude.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate has returned to consideration of the ratification of NATO enlargement. I hope we will now have an uninterrupted debate. NATO enlargement deserves the dignity of serious consideration of this matter and to take such time as the Senate deems necessary.

Mr. President, I 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 means that future generations might not have to fight and die in a European theater.

If NATO doesn't enlarge, the Iron Curtain remains permanent and the unnatural division of Europe will live on longer than the Communist empire did in the Soviet Union. NATO will remain, as President Havel has said, an alumni club for cold war victors. It will have little relevance to the realities of the 21st century.

Mr. President, as a Polish American, I know that the Polish people did not choose to live behind the Iron Curtain. They were forced there by the Yalta agreement and by Potsdam and because they and the Baltic States and the other captive nations were sold out by the West.

Many Members of the U.S. Senate have stood long for the freeing of the captive nations. Many of our colleagues have been strong supporters of Solidarity. I, as both a Congresswoman and then as a U.S. Senator, supported the Solidarity movement. I was a strong supporter of the Solidarity movement. I was with President Ronald Reagan in a wonderful evening he held at the White House where he hosted the Polish Ambassador to the United States who had defected when Poland had imposed martial law on its own people, there sitting with President Reagan and the Ambassador from Poland who chose to defect rather than uphold where the Polish Army had been forced to go against its own people.

We pledged that we would make Poland free. And now Poland is free, but we have to make sure that Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic are not only free but that they are secure. That is why my support is for the expansion of NATO. My support for NATO is not based on ethnic American politics nor is it even based on the past, but it is based on the future. What will the new world order look like?

I support NATO enlargement because it will make America and Europe more stable and secure. NATO enlargement means a future in which the newly independent countries will take their rightful place as a member of Western Europe. NATO played an important part in securing this freedom. It has been the most successful alliance in history. It is an alliance that helped us win the cold war. It deterred war between the superpowers and helped prevent confrontation between member states.

But if NATO is to survive, it must adapt to the needs of a 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. Each new member strengthened NATO and increased security in Europe. No expansion of NATO is easy. No expansion of NATO is done without thought. No expansion of NATO is ever without controversy. We can only reflect what the bitter debate must have been when we voted to include Germany because of their provocative role in World War I and World War II.

Today, we are facing difficult and different threats to security. We have civil wars, as in Bosnia; we have hot spots caused by ethnic and regional tensions, as in Kosovo; we have international crimes, drugs, and terrorism; and we have the spread of weapons of mass destruction. NATO must change in order to meet these new threats. Europe's new democracies will help us meet those challenges.

The countries of Central and Eastern Europe want to help us address these new threats. How many times has the Senate discussed burdensharing in Europe—and we want others to share the burden, not only in the financial cost, but of the risk to be borne in defending democracy. How often have we in the United States complained that European countries were not willing to pay their fair share for their own defense?

Now, we have countries that are asking to share the burden. They are asking to pledge their troops and equipment for a common defense. They are asking to share the burden of peacekeeping. In fact, they are doing it right now in Bosnia, where thousands of troops from Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic are helping to secure the peace. Hungary has made itself available, so it is our base camp to go into Bosnia. They have even committed to joining us and ending Iraq's