

We also thank the professional staff of Senator KENNEDY, led by Danica and other members of their staff.

Mr. KENNEDY. I express my thanks now, and I will do so at the conclusion and hope they understand we appreciate this.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GREGG. If the Senator will suspend, on behalf of Senator WARNER, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw his previously submitted amendment No. 792.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, this will be the last vote of the week. There will be no session tomorrow. We begin again on Monday. There will be no votes on Monday. For the information of all Senators, the first vote will occur sometime on Tuesday, but we will be in session on Monday.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. 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. Under the previous order, the bill will be read the third time.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), is absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 192 Leg.]

#### YEAS—91

Akaka	Domenici	McConnell
Allard	Dorgan	Mikulski
Allen	Durbin	Miller
Baucus	Edwards	Murkowski
Bayh	Ensign	Murray
Biden	Enzi	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Fitzgerald	Reed
Boxer	Frist	Reid
Breaux	Graham	Roberts
Brownback	Gramm	Rockefeller
Bunning	Grassley	Santorum
Burns	Gregg	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hagel	Schumer
Campbell	Harkin	Sessions
Cantwell	Hatch	Shelby
Carnahan	Hutchinson	Smith (NH)
Carper	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
Chafee	Jeffords	Snowe
Cleland	Johnson	Specter
Clinton	Kennedy	Stabenow
Cochran	Kerry	Stevens
Collins	Kohl	Thomas
Conrad	Landrieu	Thompson
Corzine	Leahy	Thurmond
Craig	Levin	Torricelli
Crapo	Lieberman	Warner
Daschle	Lincoln	Wellstone
Dayton	Lott	Wyden
DeWine	Lugar	
Dodd	McCain	

#### NAYS—8

Bennett	Hollings	Nickles
Feingold	Inhofe	Voinovich
Helms	Kyl	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The bill (H.R. 1), as amended, was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. KENNEDY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the clerk to make technical and conforming changes to any previously agreed to amendments with respect to the ESEA bill.

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 441, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Lugar amendment No. 441 be further modified with the technical change that I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The modification is as follows:

On page 265, line 25 strike "identified" and all that follows through "Secretary" on line 1 of page 266, and insert "nationally available".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, before we turn to morning business, there is one thing I would like to say. I have been on the floor during the entire 8 weeks of this debate on the education bill. A great deal of that time—about 6 of the weeks—I spent with Senator JEFFORDS as a manager of this bill. I just want to make sure everyone understands his contribution to this piece of legislation.

He was chairman of this committee. His substitute is what we accepted. In the kind of glow of having finished this legislation—we are all happy to finish a major piece of legislation; the President should be happy—I just want to make sure everyone understands the great contribution to this piece of legislation made by the junior Senator from the State of Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I join my friend and colleague, Senator REID, in paying tribute to JIM JEFFORDS at the time of the completion of this legislation. As the Senator rightfully pointed out, Senator JEFFORDS was really the architect of the development of the core aspects of this legislation and presided over a very extensive markup. He was able to bring the committee to a unanimous vote of support for that legislation even though there

were a good many differences that were expressed. It does not surprise any of us who are on that committee because he has been a leader in the area of education over his entire career in the Senate as well as in the House of Representatives.

There are many features in this legislation that have been included of which he was really the architect many years ago. So I think all of us who are mindful of the progress that has been made join in paying tribute to Senator JEFFORDS for his remarkable leadership. I think this body will continue to benefit from his continued involvement. We certainly depend upon it, and I know America's children depend upon it as well.

I thank Senator JEFFORDS for all of his good work.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP TO EUROPE

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I am pleased to address the Senate to applaud the leadership being shown by President Bush during his visit with leaders in Europe. I like the straightforward and forceful way he is expressing his views on international security issues, especially on the subject of missile defenses.

In March, the President dispatched senior administration officials around the world to discuss with leaders of other nations the plans he was considering to deploy defenses against ballistic missiles. The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and high-level administration teams have worked hard to ensure that our friends and allies understand why the United States intends to deploy these new defensive systems.

This week European leaders are hearing directly from the President his personal views on this issue. At his first stop in Madrid, President Bush said that the task of explaining missile defense "starts with explaining to Russia and our European friends and allies that Russia is not the enemy of the United States, that the attitude of mutually assured destruction is a relic of the Cold War, and that we must address the new threats of the 21st century if we're to have a peaceful continent and a peaceful world."

The Prime Minister of Spain, Mr. Aznar, responded to President Bush's remarks by saying:

[I]t is very important for President Bush to have decided to share that initiative with

its allies, to discuss it with them, to establish a framework of cooperation with his allies with regard to this initiative and, as he announced, to also establish a framework for discussions, cooperation, and a new relationship with Russia.

The Prime Minister also said:

What I am surprised by is the fact that there are people who, from the start, disqualified his initiative and, in that way, they are also disqualifying the deterrence that has existed so far and probably they would also disqualify any other kind of initiative. But what we're dealing with here is an attempt to provide greater security for everyone. And from that point of view, that initiative to share and discuss and dialog and reach common ground with the President of the United States is something that I greatly appreciate.

Today the news reports indicate that many other European leaders agree with the sentiments expressed by the Prime Minister of Spain. The most conspicuous exceptions have been France and Germany.

I commend President Bush for his effort to modernize our defenses against terrorism and ballistic missiles. Internationally, we remain vulnerable to these threats. We can no longer intentionally choose to accept that on behalf of our citizens. Nor can peace-loving people anywhere in the world tolerate the continued intentional vulnerability that this policy ensures.

President Bush realizes this and is doing what is necessary to remedy the situation. He is making it clear that he will unilaterally reduce our stockpile of nuclear weapons to the lowest level, compatible with the need to keep the peace. And he is consulting with our allies and others in an effort to explore new agreements that will further protect our common security interests.

He acknowledges that everyone, not even our closest allies, will agree with us on everything, but President Bush holds out hope for new understandings. He said at one news conference:

I don't think we are going to have to move unilaterally, but people know I am intent on moving forward.

The President is doing the right thing and setting the right tone in providing this kind of leadership at this particular time. It is a very important step in achieving a higher level of security for all the world, not just for the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of quotations from those supporting U.S. missile defense plans be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### QUOTES SUPPORTIVE OF U.S. MISSILE DEFENSE PLANS

Australia—Foreign Minister Downer (June 1, 2001): "We've said to the Americans that we are understanding of their concerns about the proliferation of missile systems . . . if a rogue state were to fire a missile at the United States, would an appropriate response be for the United States to destroy all of the people in that country? And I think, understandably, the Americans are saying that may be a slight over-reaction. And if

that is all that their current deterrence arrangements provide for, then I think it's understandable that they should want to look for more sophisticated and more effective, and at the end of the day, more humane ways of dealing with these problems."

Czech Republic—President Havel (June 13, 2001): ". . . the new world we are entering cannot be based on mutually assured destruction. An increasingly important role should be played by defense systems. We are a defensive alliance."

Hungary—Prime Minister Orban (May 29, 2001): "The logic of the Cold War, mutual deterrence, would not give a reply to the problems of the future. It is important that North America and Europe should work jointly on solutions demanded by the new realities."

Italy—Prime Minister Berlusconi (June 13, 2001): "We agree that it is necessary for a new, innovative approach in our policies towards these new threats."

Defense Minister Martino (June 11, 2001): "[Missile defense] would not be directed against the Russian Federation today; the aim is to protect us from unpredictable moves by other countries. It is in the interests of peace, of all of us."

Japan—Prime Minister Koizumi (June 7, 2001): "This is very significant research because it might render totally meaningless the possession of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles."

Poland—President Kwasniewski (June 13, 2001): "[The U.S. missile defense plan is a] 'visionary, courageous, and logical idea.'"

Defense Minister Komorowski (May 27, 2001): "Poland has looked upon U.S. declarations on the necessity of establishing a missile defense system with understanding from the very start. We . . . see the modification of the project to provide for a 'protective shield' for European allies as a step in the right direction. This can only enhance defense capabilities but also strengthen the unity of NATO. The territory of Poland and the Polish defense system may become a key element of an allied missile defense structure."

Secretary of the National Security Council Siwiec (May 18, 2001): "The ABM Treaty . . . stands in the way of building a new security system. The debate on the missile shield is not unlike protests of steam engine users against the inventors of rocket engines . . ."

Romania—Defense Minister Pascu (June 12, 2001): Romania understands the U.S. desire for protection from missile attack and would have 'no objection at all' even if the U.S. proceeded unilaterally. Regarding those in Europe that dismiss the threat of missile attack, Pascu said "It is a real danger. To some, it is not because they don't want it [missile defense] done."

Slovakia—Prime Minister Mikulas (June 8, 2001): "We have always perceived the United States as the protector of democratic principles in the world and we understand the alliance (NATO) as a defense community. So we consider the missile defense project to be a new means of collective defense . . . a security umbrella for this democratic society and therefore in general we support this project."

Spain—Defense Minister Trillo (May 23, 2001): "The [U.S.] missile initiative . . . is neither an aggressive initiative—it is a defensive one—nor a nuclear escalation, but rather, on the contrary, a means of deterrence of the buildup of nuclear weaponry."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### VOTE ON ESEA AUTHORIZATION

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, the vote we just had recorded only

eight votes in the "nay" column, and one of those eight was mine. I don't usually find myself that isolated. I thought on this occasion that it would be appropriate for me to explain why I voted against this bill.

I am not sure what I would have done had my vote been decisive, because I recognize that we need to pass an elementary and secondary education bill. We need to move forward on an issue that President Bush has correctly identified as our No. 1 domestic priority. Nonetheless, I was troubled enough by the bill that I voted against it and wanted to make my reasons clear in the hope they might influence the conferees.

I have three reasons for voting against this bill. The first one is money. The cost of this bill is twice what it was when the bill hit the floor to begin with. We added money here; we added money there. We had a drunken sailor's attitude toward this situation: Education is wonderful; let's throw money at it.

I am troubled by that kind of view with respect to how we should legislate around here. It struck me as being a bit out of control.

Secondly, as I heard more and more from the people in Utah who will have to live under this bill, they kept saying to me, This feels an awful lot like a Federal straitjacket. This feels an awful lot like Federal control. This feels an awful lot like we are losing the power to run our own schools. I find that troubling as well. As some of my colleagues have said, I didn't run for the federal school board; I ran for the U.S. Senate.

Many of the decisions that were made with respect to this bill were decisions that were made on the assumption that Washington knows better than the local school boards, and that assumption troubles me.

It is because of the third reason, as I looked at the bill as a whole, that I decided to vote against it. I am passionate enough in my commitment to education that I could swallow the idea of more money. Frankly, if we were getting the right results, I could look the other way and say, Well, since we are getting the right results, I can tolerate increased Federal control.

But this bill is not a step forward in education. This bill is overwhelmingly timid. It has almost no significant new initiatives in it. It is simply funding the status quo to the maximum. The more I look at education, the more I think we need to break out of the status quo. We need to try new things. But any time a suggestion was made that we try something new, even on a pilot basis in a very limited sense in just a few places, it was swatted down.

People talk about Government as if inertia at rest is the problem, that nothing ever gets done. It is my experience that it is inertia of motion that is the problem with Government. It is not just the law of physics. A body in motion tends to stay in motion and in the