

were securing our national independence, promoting the spread of self-determination and democracy, or defeating Soviet communism.

But the post-cold-war period is a new day for America as well as the world. In my view, we need not, and certainly will not, renounce our ideals, but in this new era, those ideals must be grounded in a policy which realistically gauges what price Americans can or should pay in support of our global role.

We have to ask the Dover, DE test: How many body bags do we want to see coming home? We have to ask what price we are going to pay for our military. We cannot continue to downsize our American military by a third and increase our commitments abroad by 300 percent, whether or not our commitments abroad are actually sustainable over a period of time.

Last, I am struck by the words of the conservative editor of the *National Interest*, Owen Harries:

I advocate restraint because every dominant power in the last four centuries that has not practiced it—that has been excessively intrusive and demanding—has ultimately been confronted by a hostile coalition of other powers. Americans may believe that their country, being exceptional, need have no worries in this respect. I do not agree. It is not what Americans think of the United States but what others think of it that will decide the matter.

Mr. President, I appreciate the indulgence of the Senate for our discussion here, and I thank my colleague for his tremendous insight and his marvelous research into the challenges we face in America's global role today. I look forward to continuing this discussion and this dialog in the coming weeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, in closing, I again thank my colleague for undertaking this effort. As usual, his remarks have been on point. They have provided focus. They have been very thought provoking.

I would like to recount a personal experience. Last spring, Senator STEVENS led a Senate delegation to the Balkans, to Macedonia. Obviously, we didn't go into Kosovo at that particular time. Along with other Senators, we visited the Albanian refugees and the various refugee camps. This one was Brazda.

Standing in the cold and in the mud amidst a circle of refugees, there came an old man with a stocking cap. It was pulled over his head. He was recounting, through his interpreter, his tale of human misery. He had refused to join his wife and family in fleeing their home. He didn't want to leave home. He urged them to leave the home because of his worry about their safety.

Two sons had fled to the mountains. He did not know, since he fled at the last moment, where his family was. He was wearing the shoes of a long-time friend who was killed in the violence.

His home was burned. His savings and life's wherewithal were destroyed. And with tears in his eyes he grabbed me by the lapels and he said: "I believe in God, I believe in America, and I believe in you." That face will always be with me.

Yet today, we see the continuing ethnic violence so prevalent in that part of the world. The Senator from Georgia mentioned Samuel P. Huntington's book, "The Clash of Civilizations: The Remaking of the World Order." The central theme of that book is that culture and cultural identities, which we see so prevalent in the Balkans and in other places around the globe, which at the broadest level are civilization identities, are shaping the patterns of cohesion, disintegration, and conflicts in the post-cold-war world.

We should focus on that. I recommend his book to every Senator. It should be required reading. He has five corollaries to his main point which will help us shape our future foreign and defense policy:

One, in the post-cold war world, for the first time in history, global politics has become multipolar, multi-civilizational; Westernization is not producing a universal civilization—a shock, perhaps, to many who call themselves decisionmakers in regard to Western civilization.

Two, the balance of power among civilizations is shifting. The West is declining in relative influence. Asian civilizations are expanding their economic, military, and political strength. The Nations of Islam are exploding demographically, with destabilizing consequences for Muslim countries and their neighbors, and nonwestern civilizations generally are reaffirming the value of their own cultures.

Three, a civilization-based world order is emerging. Societies sharing cultural affinities tend to really cooperate with each other. Efforts to shift societies from one civilization to another are unsuccessful. And countries group themselves around the lead or core states of their civilization. The West's universalist pretensions increasingly bring it into conflict with other civilizations.

Finally, the survival of the West depends on Americans reaffirming their Western identity and westerners accepting their civilization as unique but not universal, and uniting to renew and preserve it against challenges from nonwestern societies. Avoidance of global war of civilizations depends on world leaders accepting and cooperating to maintain the multi-civilizational character of global politics.

Simply put, Samuel Huntington says, leaders in Western nations, Members of the Senate, the President of the United States and his Cabinet, maybe we ought to concentrate on strengthening and preserving our values where they

are cherished, they have been nourished, and they work well, instead of trying to impose them on countries where they are not welcome. If we do that, we will take a giant step in trying to set appropriate priorities in regard to our vital national security interests.

I thank the Senator from Georgia. We have concluded our remarks. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AFFORDABLE EDUCATION ACT OF 1999—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will continue with the consideration of S. 1134.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, as I indicated earlier today, I will attempt again now to see if we can work out an agreement as to how to proceed on the education savings account issue. I am prepared to continue working to try to work something out. I think it is perfectly legitimate—in fact, essential—that Senators be able to express themselves on education matters as a whole and specifically as it relates to this bill.

I think education amendments or education-related tax amendments that relate to this bill are very much in order. I support that all the way. But if it goes beyond that, then you get off into all kinds of other issues, and we will have an opportunity for that before this year is over. We have a long way to go. But I hope we can get serious consideration, good debate and amendments, on this education savings account bill and then move forward to other issues.

I am continuing to be hopeful that we can get an agreement to proceed on the Export Administration Act which does have bipartisan support. But we are working with the key members of the Armed Services Committee, the Governmental Affairs Committee, and the Intelligence Committee to make sure legitimate concerns are addressed about national security, intelligence, and how the concurrence process works between Commerce and State and Defense. We still are hopeful we can get an agreement worked out for that.

For now, I renew my request and ask unanimous consent that all amendments be relevant to the subject matter of education or related to education taxes on the education savings account bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have been able to consider every piece of legislation so far this year in this session of Congress under unanimous consent agreements.

This is the first amendable vehicle that Members have had to try to amend this year. There is no attempt by the minority to filibuster, to delay this bill in any manner. Members on our side simply want the bill considered in the regular order, open to amendment.

Like the majority leader, I had the good fortune of serving in the House of Representatives. I loved my job in the House of Representatives, but there we worked under different rules. We had a Rules Committee. Before any bill came to the House floor—in fact, the majority leader served on the Rules Committee—there had to be a rule on that bill as to how long the debate would take, how many amendments would be offered, and how long for each amendment. Those are not the rules that have governed the Senate for 200-plus years, and they should not be the rules that govern the Senate today.

We have clearly heard what the majority leader said today, that other things we may want to bring up will be scheduled at a later time. But we are not part of that scheduling process. There are issues we believe are necessary now in this country to be the subject of legislation. The only way we can do that is through the amendment process. We believe the minority should be entitled to offer amendments of their choosing. There is no germaneness requirement, nor is there any necessity that there be a rules committee such as in the House of Representatives. Just because a Member's amendment may not be relevant does not mean it is not important and it is not something about which we should be able to talk.

I say to the majority leader, we object. I would hope he would reconsider and allow this matter to proceed in the regular order so amendments can be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I do truly regret this objection. But as I have indicated before, we will keep working to see if we can find a way to get an agreement to proceed.

I say to my colleagues, and to the American people, what is a more important issue than education? In most polls, the people indicate the issue they really are concerned about the most—or certainly in the top three—is education. Also, the indications across the board have been that people support the idea of having an opportunity to save for their children's education, not

only for higher education but in some respects even more importantly K through the 12th grade. This would allow parents to set aside up to \$2,000 per year per child of their own money for their own children's education needs.

I emphasize, what we are trying to work out does not restrict amendments on education, or education tax issues. Senators who have ideas about education—local control of education, or other ways we can help the children's education—boy, I can think of a lot of amendments that would be applicable here.

What I do not think we should do in an education debate is get into a whole raft of other important issues—maybe foreign trade issues, maybe just foreign policy issues, maybe trade amendments, maybe defense amendments, gun amendments—a whole myriad of amendments that Senators could come up with that they would want to put on this bill, perhaps because it is the first bill.

Under Senate rules, Senators will have the opportunity to offer whatever amendments they may be working on as we go through the year. It is just that I think sometimes we get into a position where we start offering the same amendments over and over again. What I am trying to do is get a process to get us to focus on education, have a good debate, have amendments, and when that is over, pass this legislation that, again, has bipartisan support.

There is broad support for the education savings account idea. But I will continue to work with Senators on both sides of the aisle. I think I am offering a reasonable request. I hope we can get something worked out between now and next Tuesday as to how to proceed.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. However, in order to be prepared to try to get an indication of where Senators are—are Senators for savings education accounts or not?—I do send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 124, S. 1134, The Affordable Education Act of 1999:

Trent Lott, William V. Roth, Jr., Paul Coverdell, Slade Gorton, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Rod Grams, Pete Domenici, Gordon Smith, Conrad R. Burns, Don Nickles, Mike Crapo, Sam Brownback, Frank H. Murkowski, Rick Santorum, Judd Gregg, Tim Hutchinson.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this cloture vote then will occur on Tuesday, unless we get something worked out

where we could vitiate that agreement, as we did 3 weeks ago on the bankruptcy reform legislation. We had a cloture motion, we saw good faith on both sides, we got an agreement worked out, and we vitiated that vote.

In the meantime, I ask unanimous consent the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived and the cloture vote occur at 2:15 on Tuesday.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, would the leader consider having that vote at 2:30 instead of at 2:15? We have a request for that.

Mr. LOTT. I amend my request to put it at 2:30 on Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I say sincerely to the majority leader and to the majority that we should be given the opportunity to go forward on this bill. We are very anxious to move forward. We believe there is a lot to be done in education. We certainly want to do that, but we want to proceed under the regular rules of the Senate. That does not seem to be asking too much. We are not going to object to the waiver of the quorum and those kinds of things, but I will say, if we are not able to work something out before Tuesday at 2:30, I will recommend to all Democratic Senators, all the minority, that we vote against invoking cloture on this issue. That would be too bad.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in light of the agreement, there will be no further votes today. We do have a number of Senators who have requested time during morning business, and I will have a unanimous consent on that momentarily.

The Senate will be in session on Monday debating this very important issue, education, and education for our children at the 4th-grade level, the 8th-grade level, and the 10th-grade level, and the merits of being able to save a little of your own money for your own children's education. I find it hard to believe that every Democrat is going to walk down and vote against going forward on education savings accounts—I think that is going to be hard to explain—because they want to offer an unrelated, nongermane amendment. But if the Democrats are prepared to do that, then we will just have to deal with that. The next rollcall vote, however, will occur then at 2:30 on Tuesday.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the period for morning business be extended until 5 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions in the following order: Senator GRASSLEY for 20 minutes; Senator