

will now be a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN, controlling 15 minutes; the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD, controlling 15 minutes; and the Senator from Maryland, Ms. MIKULSKI, controlling 5 minutes of the majority's time.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RUSSIA AND THE NEW START TREATY

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the challenges America faces in our relationship with Russia and their implications on the Senate's consideration of the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, known as START.

A number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have spoken about the treaty's impact on global nuclear non-proliferation. I would like to use my remarks today to highlight my concerns about the treaty in the broader context of: one, the Obama administration's "Reset Policy" towards Russia; and two, the new START treaty's impact on our allies in Eastern Europe and the Baltic states. I believe these concerns must be addressed by the administration before I can determine my support for the treaty.

Over the last decade I have been an ardent champion of NATO and have worked diligently to increase membership in the alliance. I have also been active in improving our public diplomacy in Eastern Europe through our expansion of the Visa Waiver Program at the request of our friends and allies in Central and Eastern Europe. That legislation which the President signed on Visa Waiver was supported by both our State Department and by our Department of Homeland Security.

In my remaining time in the Senate, I will continue to work to strengthen the Visa Waiver Program which has improved our image in the world and strengthened our borders through shared best practices and enhanced intelligence sharing with our partners and allies abroad.

My passion for foreign relations stems in large part from my upbringing as the grandson of Southeast European immigrants. As an undergraduate at Ohio University, my first research paper examined how the United States

sold out Central and Eastern Europe and the former Yugoslavia to the Soviets at the Yalta and Tehran conferences in 1943 and 1945. These states would become the "Captive Nations" suffering under the specter of Soviet domination, brutality, and oppression for nearly 50 years.

As a public official in Ohio, I remained a strong supporter of the Captive Nations. During my tenure as mayor of Cleveland, I joined my brothers and sisters in the Eastern European Diaspora to celebrate the independence days of the Captive Nations at City Hall. We flew their flags, sang their songs, and prayed that one day the people in those countries would know freedom.

We saw the Berlin Wall fall and the Iron Curtain torn in half thanks large in part to the leadership of Pope John Paul II, President Reagan, and President George H.W. Bush. But even with the end of the Cold War, I remain deeply concerned that darker forces in Russia are reemerging as a threat to democracy, human rights, and religious freedom, not just for the Russian people but for the citizens of the newly freed Captive Nations.

This concern in 1998 during my tenure as Governor of Ohio and Chair of the National Governor's Association prompted me to pursue an all-50 State resolution supporting NATO membership for the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland.

When I think about the importance of NATO and our commitment to the Captive Nations, I am inspired by President George W. Bush's speech on NATO expansion in Warsaw on June 15, 2001. President Bush stated: "We should not calculate how little we can get away with, but how much we can do to advance the cause of freedom." There was concern at that time because of the debate with Russia that we would back off and not support further expansion of NATO.

I worked diligently from my first day as a member of the Senate in 1999 to extend NATO membership to my brothers and sisters in the former Captive Nations. I knew NATO membership would provide these fledgling democracies safe harbor from the possible threat of new Russian expansionism. But I also knew the process of NATO expansion would enhance much more than security in Europe.

As I noted in a speech on the Senate floor on May 21, 2002, "While NATO is a collective security organization, formed to defend freedom and democracy in Europe, we cannot forget that common values form the foundation of the alliance." In other words, the foundation of the Alliance is based on common values.

Democracy, the rule of law, minority rights, these are among the values that form the hallmark of the NATO alliance.

One of my proudest moments as a Senator was when I joined President Bush, Secretary of State Colin Powell,

Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff GEN Richard Myers at the NATO Summit in Prague on November 21, 2002, when NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson officially announced the decision to invite Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia to become part of the Alliance. This was truly one of the most thrilling days of my tenure as a Senator.

Later that day, my wife Janet and I were happy to attend a dinner in honor of Czech President Vaclav Havel at the Prague Castle. Following that dinner, at 1:30 a.m. Prague time, I placed a call to Cleveland to talk with my brothers and sisters at home with ties to these NATO aspirant countries. They had gathered in the Lithuanian Hall at Our Lady of Perpetual Help to celebrate that day's historic events, and this was truly a capstone to years of effort.

It is because of my long history and work with the Captive Nations that I continue to worry about the uncertainties of our future relationship with Russia. I have traveled to 19 countries during my 21 trips to the region as a Senator. Presidents, prime ministers, and foreign ministers in Eastern Europe have told me time and time again it is comforting for them to know their relationship with NATO and the United States serves as a vital hedge against the threat of a future potentially expansionist Russia.

Yet now there is much talk from this administration about resetting the U.S. bilateral relationship with Russia. Moscow seeks to regain its global stature and be respected as a peer in the international community. I do not blame them.

President Obama's May 2010 National Security Strategy states: "We seek to build a stable, substantive, multidimensional relationship with Russia, based on mutual interests. The United States has an interest in a strong, peaceful, and prosperous Russia that respects international norms." I agree with the administration. There is nothing inherently wrong with this approach.

There are indeed key areas where the United States and Russia share common cause and concern:

1. Russia is a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council and will continue to be essential towards any effective multilateral pressure on Iran to give up its nuclear program.

2. Russia continues to have leverage on the North Korean regime and has stated a nuclear-free Korean peninsula is in the interest of both our nations.

Russia continues to have leverage on the North Korean regime and has stated a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula is in the interest of both our nations.

- No. 3, we are partners in the International Space Station, relying on the Russians. Until the August 2008 invasion of Georgia, our government and U.S. industry were working hard on a nuclear cooperation agreement with

Russia similar to the one we entered into with India. In fact, I worked on that with Senator LUGAR. I thought that was a good idea. With the world economy as it is today, the worst thing we can do is break off communication and revert back to our Cold War positions. President Obama's trip to Moscow last year and President Medvedev's reciprocal trip to Washington in June were opportunities to further engage Russia and determine where we have a symbiotic relationship and what we can accomplish together for the good of the international community.

However, I believe our reset policy with Russia should not establish a relationship with Moscow at the expense of the former Captive Nations. We simply do not know how our relationship with Russia will transpire during the years to come. Will Russia fully embrace a democratic government, free markets, and the rule of law or will Russia seek to reestablish its influence over the former Soviet Union whose collapse then-President and now-Prime Minister Vladimir Putin described in 2005 as "the greatest geopolitical catastrophe" of the 20th century? This is what Putin had to say about the dissolution of the Soviet Union, a pretty striking comment coming from the former President and now Prime Minister.

This brings us to the topic of the new START treaty, which the Senate may consider in the coming weeks. America's grand strategy toward Russia must be realistic. It must be agile. As I have said, it must take into account the interests of our NATO allies. I am deeply concerned the new START treaty may once again undermine the confidence of our friends and allies in Central and Eastern Europe. Let me be absolutely clear: I do not ideologically oppose the administration's non-proliferation agenda. The President's stated goal of a world without nuclear weapons is noble, but I believe the Senate's consideration of the new START treaty must be considered through a wider lens that includes the treaty's implications for our friends and allies in the former captive nations.

Let's talk about what is going on right now. First, I am concerned about the uncertainties surrounding a Russia that could revert back to a country seeking to expand its influence on the Baltic States and Eastern Europe. President Medvedev's February 2010 National Military Doctrine of the Russian Federation, released 2 months before the conclusion of the new START treaty in April of this year, explicitly labels NATO expansion as a national threat to Russia's existence and reaffirms Russia's right to use nuclear weapons if the country's existence is threatened. I am sure such statements, combined with Russia's 2008 invasion of Georgia, send shivers down the spines of our brothers and sisters in Central and Eastern Europe, even if they don't say so publicly.

The concerns of our captive nation brothers and sisters regarding Russia

are not abstract. They are rooted in blood and tears and in a history of abandonment. My hometown of Cleveland, OH, was once the city with the world's second largest population of Hungarians after Budapest. I remember vividly the stories my Hungarian brothers and sisters told me about the Hungarian revolution of 1956. Encouraged by the implicit promise of intervention from the United States and the United Nations, hundreds of thousands of Hungarians protested against the People's Republic of Hungary in support of economic reform and an end to political oppression. Those protests spread throughout Hungary. The government was overthrown. But Moscow sought to maintain its control over the captive nations, took advantage of America's inaction on the rebellion, invaded Hungary, crushed the revolution and established a new authoritative government. Over 2,500 Hungarians were killed in the conflict, and 200,000 Hungarians fled as refugees to the West. Hungary would suffer under the oppression of the Soviet Union for nearly another half century. Of course, there was a similar episode in Czechoslovakia during the Prague spring of 1968.

The former captive nations have accomplished so much as free market democracies and members of the NATO alliance. Our friends and allies must have absolute confidence negotiations toward the new START treaty did not include side agreements or informal understandings regarding any Russian sphere of influence in those Captive Nations. Moreover, I remain deeply concerned, even in the absence of agreements of understanding, that the former Captive Nations may once again wonder: Will the West abandon us again? Will agreement with Russia once again be placed above the interests and concern of our allies? Will we forget what happened after Yalta and Tehran? We cannot let this happen again.

Second, the former Captive Nations are also closely watching Russia's military activities. Last September—and nobody made a big deal out of it—Russia undertook Operation West, a military exercise involving 13,000 troops simulating an air, sea, and nuclear attack on Poland. Not much said about it. These war games, which took place during the 70th anniversary of Polish independence, were the largest Russian military exercises since the end of the Cold War. If we look at the Russian military's recent activity, one cannot help but understand our allies' concern Moscow may be reverting to the past. I hope President Obama will meet with leaders from the former Captive Nations this weekend during the NATO summit in Lisbon. The President should provide these leaders public reassurance that the United States remains committed to article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which states that an attack on any member of NATO shall be considered to be an attack on all.

One of the best ways to alleviate the anxiety about the Russian military amongst our Captive Nation allies is for this administration to pursue negotiations with Russia toward its compliance with the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, the CFE. The Senate's potential consideration of a new START cannot be disconnected from Russia's prior track record on treaty compliance. Russia decided in 2007 to suspend its compliance with the CFE treaty, a treaty signed by 22 countries that placed balanced limits on the deployment of troops and conventional weapons in Europe. This unilateral decision by Moscow should serve as a reminder to Senate colleagues about Moscow's commitments to its international obligations. Russia's compliance with the CFE treaty is essential to sustained security and stability in Central and Eastern Europe. Again, complying with it would send a very great signal to the people worried about Russia's direction.

Our friends in Central and Eastern Europe are worried about the uncertainty surrounding a Russia that appears at times to be reverting back to an authoritative state seeking to weaponize its oil and natural gas resources as a means to expand its influence on Europe and the West. Russia has the largest reserves of natural gas and the eighth largest oil reserves. Moscow turned off the tap to Europe in the recent past. They could do it again. We should also be concerned about Moscow using its control of oil and natural gas to pit members of NATO against each other. I know when I was at the German Marshall Fund Brussels forum this year and last, I spoke with our friends in the EU and encouraged them that rather than unilaterally negotiating with Russia in terms of natural gas, they should all come together and negotiate as a team so they wouldn't be pit against the other. Unfortunately, most of them ignored that.

Finally, I am deeply troubled that the Obama administration has decoupled Russia's human rights record from America's bilateral relationship with Russia. The United States and Russia are both signatories of the 1975 Helsinki Declaration, which clearly states that:

Participating States will respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

In recent years, we have seen anything but a respect for human rights in Russia. Prime Minister Putin stated during a recent interview with the *Kommersant* newspaper that pro-democracy demonstrators in Russia assembling without prior permission "will be hit on the head with batons. That's all there is to it."

The actions of the Russian Government speak louder than words. We have seen protests canceled, newspapers closed, activists detained and abused.

Yet we have seen little effort by this administration to engage in a sustained dialog with Moscow on its human rights record and commitments under the Helsinki Declaration. We did more about human rights violations 20 years ago in Russia than we are doing today. It is like we have tape over our mouth.

As David Kramer of the German Marshall Fund of the United States notes in a Washington Post opinion on September 20:

The human rights situation in Russia is bad and likely to get more worse as [Russia's] March 2012 presidential election nears. Those in power will do anything to stay in power . . . Enough already with U.S. expressions of "regret" about the deteriorating situation inside Russia—it's time to call it like it is: Condemn what's happening there and consider consequences for continued human rights abuses.

I believe the Obama administration's inaction and reluctance to confront Russia on its human rights record sends a dangerous signal to Moscow that there are little or no consequences for bad behavior. At a minimum, such coddling of bad behavior by the West only serves to embolden Moscow as to our resolve to hold Russia to account on its international obligations, a distressing thought as we consider the new START in the Senate.

I have fought all my life to secure freedom for my brothers and sisters in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Yugoslavia. Once they received their freedom, I championed—and continue to champion—their membership in NATO and the EU. I am working with Senator SHAHEEN right now in the former Yugoslavia to see how many of those countries we can get into the European Union and how many we can get into the NATO alliance. I will be darned, at this stage in my life, to do anything that would jeopardize their security and economic prosperity. I have seen too many opportunities for the region slip away during my lifetime. I will not let it happen again.

Political expediency should never be an excuse to rush to judgment on public policy, let alone our national security. Treaties supersede all laws and acts of Congress. The Senate's advice-and-consent duties on treaties are among our most solemn constitutional duties. I cannot, in good conscience, determine my support for this treaty until the administration assures me that our reset policy with Russia is a policy that enhances rather than diminishes the national security of our friends and allies throughout Europe.

Moreover, I must receive the strongest assurances that this policy does not once again amount to the United States leaving our brothers and sisters in the former Captive Nations alone against undue pressures from Russia.

When I finally cash out, I want to know these countries we forgot at the end of the Second World War, where millions of people were sent to the gulag, will never be forgotten again.

I think this President has an obligation to look at this treaty beyond just

the nonproliferation side. He has an obligation to look at it as part of resetting our relationship with Russia, and we ought to get some things cleared up before we go ahead and sign this treaty.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO BILL BARTLEMAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a legendary Kentucky newspaperman who, after 39 years, is retiring, and the Commonwealth will certainly be the poorer for it. I am going to miss my old friend, Bill Bartleman of the Paducah Sun, as his service in the fourth estate ends this month.

Bill's first day at the Paducah Sun was January 7, 1972, when the Murray State University graduate was hired as both a reporter and a photographer. In the four decades since, he has covered Senators and Governors, local lawmakers and the Kentuckians whose names you may not know but who, in his words, "make life happen."

He has interviewed a President of the United States, and he has ridden a hot air balloon over the Ohio River. He has become Kentucky's longest running legislative reporter. He has led quite a life of accomplishment, and I wish him well in the next stage of his career.

I first met Bill when he covered my initial race for the Senate in 1984, and he has covered every one of my races since that time. For my last election campaign in 2008, Bill moderated a debate between me and my opponent that was broadcast on C-SPAN. So the whole Nation had a chance to see Bill hard at work. He was fair, honest, and professional, as always.

After 39 years, it would be easy for some reporters to make the mistake of thinking they are the story—but not Bill. This veteran journalist has words of wisdom for young reporters. This is what Bill had to say:

Remember the responsibility of what you do.

He went on to say:

Bill Bartleman isn't important, but what he covers is important. You need to represent the public and report what happens fairly. You can't send people tainted water, and you can't send tainted news.

Those words are well said. Those of us in public life will always have a close relationship with members of the press. Sometimes it is a bit challenging and sometimes it is frustrating. Sometimes the politician and the reporter do not always see eye to eye. I cannot say Bill Bartleman and I agree on everything. But I can say that Bill Bartleman will always have my respect.

For 39 years, Kentuckians have benefited from his incisive political coverage. As he moves on to a position with Mid-Continent University in Mayfield, KY, I know I speak for many Kentuckians when I say: Thank you, Bill. Thank you, Bill, for your dedicated service. You certainly will be missed.

Bill's own newspaper, the Paducah Sun, recently published an excellent article about his life and career, and I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Paducah Sun, Oct. 24, 2010]

AFTER 39 YEARS, BARTLEMAN TO RETIRE
FROM SUN

Kentucky's longest-running legislative reporter plans to retire from The Paducah Sun in November.

Bill Bartleman, 61, will retire from the Sun after 35 years of covering government and politics, and nearly 39 years total working for the newspaper.

"I have thoroughly enjoyed my career as a reporter for The Paducah Sun and have mixed emotions about retiring," Bartleman said.

"The profession has provided me with opportunities to experience things and see things that others don't get to see and feel. Most gratifying are the memories of the people I've met and having the opportunity to work for people who care."

The Pennsylvania native graduated from Murray State University in December 1971. Bartleman served his first day at the Sun on Jan. 7, 1972, after being hired as a dual reporter and photographer with the majority of his duties in photography.

He took over the paper's government and politics beat in 1975 and covered, in person, every session of legislature in Frankfort from 1976-2007 while using the Web, phone interviews and less frequent Frankfort visits for coverage in the past three years.

A frequent commentator for more than 30 years on Kentucky Educational Television's "Comment on Kentucky," Bartleman also served as a panelist for KET political debates for governor, U.S. senator and other offices.

In 2008, he moderated a U.S. Senate candidate debate between Sen. Mitch McConnell and Bruce Lunsford, which was broadcast on C-SPAN, the national cable affairs network.

Bartleman said he will become an administrator at Mid-Continent University in Mayfield on Dec. 1.

"I learned early in my career that The Paducah Sun has had a rich tradition and responsibility of reporting news thoroughly, fairly and accurately," Bartleman said. "It is a tradition handed down by Ed Paxton, Sr. I've always viewed myself as one of his caretakers to help carry on that tradition and responsibility. It is time for me to pass on my caretaker role to someone else and meet a new and exciting challenge."

PRIORITIES DURING LAMEDUCK SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, both Republicans and Democrats in the Senate held many meetings this week to assess the priorities of our respective conferences.

I am extremely proud of the clarity my Republican colleagues have used to express what our priorities must be and