

should. Of course we all want the best education available for our children, and to improve the state of American education and schools for all children.

It's in the best interest of our kids and of our country. It would be nice to think that we could solve the problems of education by spending more and more money. Unfortunately, that doesn't work. The United States is the world leader in national spending per student. Yet our test scores show that our system is failing our children.

Test results released last year show that American high school seniors score far below their peers from other countries in math and science. We're at rock bottom. It's going to take more time and effort to solve these problems—and the most important work will be done by those in the best position to do so: parents, teachers, and local administrators. We must give them the freedom they need to accomplish the job. This freedom comes with the authority to make decisions based on a variety of specific needs. I will continue to support measures like the Ed-Flex legislation and the Dollars to the Classroom Act, that return money and control—from Washington—to parents, teachers, and local school districts. After all, they know best how to spend education dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I know that education has a lot to do with what happens in these cases, and the failure of our educational system in some regards is certainly a contributing factor. As we get into the drop-out protection aspects of the bill and also the Safe and Drug Free Schools Act, I think you will learn some startling things.

I remember not long ago here we had a speaker who told about the amoral generation we are raising in gangs across the country leading to these kind of problems. I think it is incredibly important that when we do take up, which only occurs once every 5 years, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we have to examine what happens and why we have these problems. I look forward to working with my friend to design hearings which should be productive to our society.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the conference report on H.R. 800.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, we cannot yield the remainder of the time until we have the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum on his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I have checked with the minority, and I yield back all remaining time.

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

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is absent due to surgery.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) would vote "aye."

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 89 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Abraham	Enzi	Lott
Akaka	Feingold	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	McCain
Baucus	Frist	McConnell
Bayh	Gorton	Mikulski
Bennett	Graham	Murkowski
Biden	Gramm	Murray
Bingaman	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Reed
Boxer	Gregg	Reid
Breaux	Hagel	Robb
Brownback	Harkin	Roberts
Bryan	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bunning	Helms	Roth
Burns	Hollings	Santorum
Byrd	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Campbell	Hutchison	Schumer
Chafee	Inhofe	Sessions
Cleland	Inouye	Shelby
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Collins	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kennedy	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerrey	Specter
Craig	Kerry	Stevens
Crapo	Kohl	Thomas
Daschle	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Landrieu	Thurmond
Dodd	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Domenici	Leahy	Voinovich
Dorgan	Levin	Warner
Durbin	Lieberman	Wyden
Edwards	Lincoln	

NAYS—1

Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Moynihn

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I will briefly speak to thank the staffs on both sides. They worked so hard on this bill. When we went to the conference with the House, there were many things that had to be worked out and they worked extremely fast and very competently to allow us to have this bill passed and on to the President as soon as possible.

I especially thank all of the staff who worked on this bill: Meredith Medley

and Lori Meyer with Senator FRIST, Danica Petroshius with Senator KENNEDY, Suzanne Day with Senator DODD, Denzel McGuire and Townsend Lange with Senator GREGG, and Lindsay Rosenberg with Senator WYDEN. I also thank Susan Hattan and Sherry Kaiman with my staff.

I thank all the Members for their excellent cooperation on this bill, which will do a lot to help our local schools in particular to be able to better face the problems they encounter.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask the Senate recess for no longer than 10 minutes and at the end of that recess period the senior Senator from West Virginia be recognized.

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

Thereupon, at 4:16 p.m., the Senate recessed until 4:25 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SESSIONS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from West Virginia is to be recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina for such time as he may require to introduce some guests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair and certainly thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for whom I have the greatest admiration.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON TAIWAN

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, today we have in this Chamber a distinguished group of parliamentarians from the Republic of China on Taiwan. I invite Senators who have not already done so to come over and say a quick hello to our visitors.

RECESS

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 3 minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:26 p.m., recessed until 4:30 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SESSIONS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Thank you, Mr. President.

NATO: THE NEXT GENERATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this weekend, the 19 member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

will gather in Washington to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the establishment of NATO. Some may see the juxtaposition of this summit against the images of NATO airstrikes over Yugoslavia as being ironic. I see it differently. I see it as prophetic.

The world has changed in the past 50 years, but as the events in Kosovo so graphically illustrate, the world has grown no less dangerous. NATO, likewise, has undergone significant changes over the years but remains no less important to the security of Europe. The key challenge facing NATO today is the dramatic change in the nature of the threat. The cold war is history; the Soviet Union is defunct; the Berlin Wall is just a pile of rubble. Forces massed along the borders have given way to flash points dotted around the globe. The tense but symmetrical standoff in Europe between the East and the West has been exchanged for the capriciousness of terrorists and tyrants.

Just as the nature of the threat has evolved, so must the structure and mission of NATO metamorphose if it is to remain relevant into the 21st century.

In 1949, when the alliance was formed, the Soviet Union and its satellites posed the only credible threat to Western security. It was the chilly dawn of the cold war era, and NATO was precision-tuned to meet the cold war challenge. In the ensuing decades, as NATO expanded from the original 12 to 16 member nations, the alliance grew in strength and stature to guard Western Europe against the formidable forces of the Warsaw Pact nations.

Conflict in Korea and Vietnam, turbulence in the Middle East, the growing influence of China—none of the cataclysmic events of the second half of the 20th century deterred NATO from its focus on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. And, in the end, NATO's intensity and single-mindedness paid off handsomely, with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the subsequent collapse of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact.

Through the years, NATO has adjusted its strategy and its mission to meet changing circumstances, but never has the challenge been as great or as far reaching as it is today. Where once NATO contended with the shifting fortunes of a cold war enemy massed along a single front, today the alliance is confronted with brush fires in its backyard, the threat of terrorism from geographically remote nations and organizations, and the proliferation of nuclear weapons in virtually every direction.

To meet this shifting political and military landscape, NATO has expanded on its primary focus of defending its members against the threat of attack by reaching out to its former foes to promote European stability and security. Only last month, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic were welcomed into the alliance. And nine other nations are clamoring for membership.

It is in this context that the 19 members of the alliance will gather in Washington to mark the anniversary of NATO and to discuss the future of the alliance. And it is in this context that the conflict in Kosovo can serve as a useful template for many of the challenges that the alliance is likely to face in the early years of the 21st century.

The lessons learned in Kosovo, preliminary though they may be at this point, should be brought to the summit table. The lessons that are still to come, as NATO prosecutes the attack on Yugoslavia, must be accommodated in any future strategy.

Several specific issues arising from the Kosovo conflict deserve careful consideration by the members of the alliance. And these include the following:

First, NATO should discuss the wisdom of establishing a more robust forward operating presence in Europe beyond alliance headquarters. Given their history, the Balkans are a logical choice. The time and logistical constraints built into ferrying people and equipment from the United States, Britain, France and elsewhere to the front are formidable. The result is a potentially serious disconnect in the ability of commanders in the field to respond rapidly and effectively to changing circumstances. One example of the problems this remote staging has caused is the agonizing wait for the U.S. Apache helicopters to arrive in theater—a delay that has cost NATO in terms of tactical flexibility and has given the Serbs in Kosovo a lethal window of opportunity to carry forward their ethnic cleansing activities.

Second, and in conjunction with a more aggressive NATO forward operating presence, the allies must accelerate their efforts to field common systems and increase interoperability. This does not mean that the United States should become an open-ended pipeline for the transfer of technology to our NATO allies, but there are basic military tools that should be available to, and designated for, NATO operations.

Third, the Kosovo operation should be the genesis for a top-to-bottom review of the NATO decisionmaking process. While the system seems to be working reasonably well considering that it is a conflict being fought by committee, there is no doubt in my mind that decisionmaking must be streamlined. It is, for example, far too cumbersome to give each of the member nations veto power over the list of military targets. It may be well for NATO to consider establishing subgroups of responsibility defined operationally and perhaps even geographically. At all costs, NATO should not blunder into the decisionmaking no-man's-land that has paralyzed the effectiveness of the United Nations.

And finally, NATO should continue to engage Russia as a vital partner in its quest for stability and security, and

redouble its efforts to bring other former Soviet bloc nations into the alliance once they have met NATO membership criteria. This is the time to reach out, not to pull back. NATO's sphere of interest and influence no longer spans just the Atlantic Ocean; it spans a vast and complex territory never contemplated in 1949. In this new operating arena, a broader but still solid base will mean a stronger, more vigorous alliance.

We would be foolhardy to believe that Kosovo is an anomaly, just as we would be foolhardy to believe that Kosovo will be the only model of future conflict. The threats that face the NATO alliance at the beginning of the 21st century are many and varied, and they will doubtless proliferate in the coming years. The threat of nuclear attack from rogue nations, the possibility of so-called "loose nukes" falling into the hands of terrorists, the danger of chemical or biological warfare, the prospect of cyber-attack, the reality of increasing ethnic tensions amid shifting resources and contested borders—these are some of the threats that the United States and its NATO allies face in the coming years. And these are just the threats we can predict today. Who knows, ten years or twenty years from now, what perils the world will face and what shape our defenses will have to take. But as the conflict in Kosovo so sharply indicates, we must be prepared for the unexpected, even the unimaginable. If NATO has the staying power to celebrate its centennial fifty years from now, it will be in a world that few of us can image today.

NATO has served a worthy purpose since its inception in 1949. Its role in the future security and stability, not only of Europe, but also of the United States as well as far-flung corners of the world, is equally essential. And so I salute NATO on its 50th anniversary, and I urge its representatives to weigh carefully the future goals and mission of the alliance. NATO is at a crossroads: it can remain a force for security and stability in the world, or it can become just another relic of the cold war. For the sake of us all, I hope that NATO charts a course of action that will steer it safely through the turbulence of today and into the 21st century.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GUIDANCE FOR THE DESIGNATION OF EMERGENCIES AS A PART OF THE BUDGET PROCESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.