

would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred on September 28, 2001. A 47-year-old Mexican immigrant was beaten in his home by two men who believed him to be of Arab descent. After following the man home, the pair chased him to his front door, broke in after him, and physically assaulted him in front of his wife and child. According to the pair, the assault was revenge for the September 11, 2001 bombing tragedy.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

NATO PROTOCOLS OF ACCESSION

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I would like to speak about the historic vote last week in this Chamber to recommend the ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's Protocols of Accession. I add my belated support to the protocols which serve to broaden the world's greatest alliance and, in the process, strengthen it to confront the new dangers of this new century.

It is said that the poppies in the fields of Europe are red with the blood of millions of Europeans and Americans who gave their lives so that millions more could live in peace. Such is the legacy of the 20th century. And from that same period, that same struggle, emerged the most successful strategic alliance the world has ever known—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

For nearly half a century, that alliance manned the ramparts of a Europe that was divided and was still, truly, at war with itself. The fact that the war was a cold one, was itself cold comfort to the countless thousands trapped behind what came to be known as the 'iron curtain.'

When framed against the circumstances of NATO's birth and the fact that for so long the alliance's purpose was to keep the peace in a divided continent, the event that we gathered for last week was truly awesome indeed. Last week, we welcomed many of the nations of Europe once held captive by Communism into the partnership of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The vote gave us the opportunity to affirm the place that NATO holds in the constellation of American security. Our fate is bound up with Europe's—to deny this is to overlook the lessons of history and the signposts of the future. Within Europe we find many of our closest and our oldest allies. For over 50 years, we have drawn strength from

NATO, and for over 50 years we have, through NATO, worked hard for the security of our partners. We cannot, will not, must not stop now.

Let us not forget, in times of crisis NATO has worked for American security as well. In the wake of September 11, 2001, the alliance invoked Article V of its charter for the first time in its history, calling the attack on one member an attack on all. European aircraft helped secure the skies over the eastern seaboard of the United States. Our NATO partners and our partnerships with them continue to be crucial to our Nation's security: the challenges we face as a nation are formidable—terrorism, tyrants, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction among them—and we cannot, we must not, face them alone.

But the world has changed, and so, too, must the alliance. The issues raised by Senators LEVIN and WARNER address some critical questions. As the number of alliance members increases, the ability of the council to act quickly may become harder and harder to realize. That is especially true because every NATO action requires unanimous consent. In addition, we must acknowledge the possibility that with 26 alliance members, the chances that one of them may someday cease to uphold the basic values that the treaty organization is based on also becomes—mathematically speaking, at least—more likely. The amendments request that the North Atlantic Council study how to deal with both eventualities, and I believe these requests to study are both appropriate and timely.

However, while I support these amendments, I am mindful of NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson's recent warnings that developing procedures to suspend members or changing the decisionmaking apparatus of the alliance would be ill-advised at this juncture. Lord Robertson has navigated the Alliance through some perilous waters during his tenure at the helm of NATO, and I see no reason to distrust his counsel now.

The expansion of NATO makes clear that, despite the claims of alarmists, this great alliance is not stumbling into irrelevance. We have had differences with some of our partners, and we will continue to. But with our commitment, the alliance can once again prove its resilience. It can once again demonstrate that common values between nations are the strongest bonds of all. We must not forget that enemies of America are also enemies of NATO, and they see the democratic diversity of our nations as a weakness. They think they can divide us. They are wrong. In our diversity, we find a wellspring of great strength. Standing in the Chamber today speaking for Senate approval of these protocols, I am reminded of the words of the Great Seal of the United States: *e pluribus unum*: "from many, one." I welcome our new European allies into the alliance structure; they will add their

strength to ours, and their addition will make us all more secure.

There are those in this country and in Europe who question the value of strong trans-Atlantic ties; they cite recent disagreements between some European nations and our own government as a rationale for the United States to stride alone into whatever fate holds in store for us all. By way of rejoinder, I offer President John F. Kennedy's words in 1962, when he urged his fellow Americans to "think intercontinentally." President Kennedy continued, "acting on our own, by ourselves, we cannot establish justice throughout the world; we cannot insure its domestic tranquility, nor provide for its common defense, or promote its general welfare, or secure the blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. But joined with other free nations, we can do all this and more. We can assist the developing nations to throw off the yoke of poverty. . . . We can mount a deterrent powerful enough to deter any aggression. And ultimately we can help to achieve a world of law and free choice, banishing the world of war and coercion." President Kennedy called for a trans-Atlantic partnership based on common values and concerns, one that looked outward as well as inward, one that would "serve as a nucleus for the eventual union of all free men—those who are now free and those who are vowing that some day they will be free."

The truth in President Kennedy's words in 1963 has not diminished in 40 years. Although we may disagree with our partners and brothers in peace, our paths have not diverged, and our concerns are tied together still. I applaud my colleagues for their overwhelming vote for the ratification of the Protocols of Ascension that which, once ratified by all 19 NATO members, will allow these 7 nations, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia, to become parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, and full members of the treaty organization.

CUBA TRAVEL

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to speak to the issue of the Freedom to Travel to Cuba Act of 2003, S. 950, introduced by the junior Senator from Wyoming. I am cosponsoring this bill because I do not think the United States Government should tell its citizens where they can and cannot travel. I also think greater people-to-people contacts with societies living under dictatorial regimes can help encourage the spread of democratic ideas. It is for these reasons that I support S. 950.

Lifting our ban on travel to Cuba is not a gift to Fidel Castro, and it should not be interpreted as an endorsement of his regime or as a sign of diminished commitment to improving human rights conditions for the Cuban people. The recent harsh prison sentences meted out to dozens of peaceful political dissenters in Cuba, and the execution of three men involved in a ferry