

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 Orbán (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

same direction, whether it is a body moving through space in the physical world or whether it is a Government agency moving through regulations that always does things the same way. It keeps things going. It takes yesterday's answers and tries to force them on today's problems.

As I look at this bill overall, I do not see the boldness, the freshness, the challenge to do something different and try to break out of the old patterns that, frankly, were there when President Bush first submitted his education plan. We, in this body, have added so much baggage to that exciting first motion that it is hard to recognize the President's initiatives in this bill. They are buried under piles of money and piles of directions that are rooted in the status quo and in the past.

So I decided that the bill is going to pass, regardless of what I try to do. But if I can draw a little bit of attention to the fact that the bill is not, in fact, as bold, as innovative, and as hopeful as it started out to be by casting a negative vote, then that would justify casting a negative vote.

I don't expect very many people will listen to what I have to say, and I don't expect very many people will pay attention to the vote I have cast. But I remember when I first came here as a young Senator, someone said to me, Cast your vote with this in mind—how will you feel as you drive home thinking about it after the debate is over?

I decided that as I drove home thinking about this one that I would drive home feeling better having cast the protest vote than I would if I had gone along with the large majority of my colleagues.

I don't mean to suggest that anyone who voted for this bill was not voting out of complete, sincere dedication to the idea that this is something good. I don't mean to question the motives of anybody else. I simply want to explain my own. This bill has grown too expensive. This bill has grown into too much Federal control. And the end result, in terms of timidity and support for the status quo, is simply not worth those first two. That is why I opposed the bill.

I hope the product that comes back to us from conference will be better and that I will then be in a position to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

226TH BIRTHDAY OF THE ARMY

Mr. HAGEL. Madam President, I rise today to wish the United States Army happy birthday. It was 226 years ago today, in 1775, that the Continental Army of the United States was formed. The United States Army has had a monumental impact on our country.

Millions of men and women over the past 226 years have served in the senior branch of our military forces. The Army is interwoven into the culture of America. Those who have had the great

privilege of serving our country in the U.S. Army understand that.

Last week, I was in Crawford, Nebraska. I am helping with the renovation of the historic barracks at the old Ft. Robinson in western Nebraska.

Ft. Robinson was home to the U.S. Army's "Buffalo Soldiers"—the heroic black soldiers who fought as part of the U.S. Army after the Civil War into the early 20th Century.

The 9th Cavalry Buffalo Soldiers called Ft. Robinson home from 1885 to 1898. And the 10th Cavalry Buffalo Soldiers were stationed at Ft. Robinson from 1902 to 1907.

It is also interesting to note that Nebraska was home to the 25th Cavalry Buffalo Soldiers who were stationed at Ft. Niobrara, in the north central part of Nebraska, from 1902 to 1907.

The Buffalo Soldiers made up about twelve percent of the U.S. Army at the turn of the Century and they served our country valiantly and with great distinction.

Eighteen Buffalo Soldiers earned the Medal of Honor, our Nation's highest award, fighting on the Western frontier. Five more earned the Medal of Honor for service during the Spanish American War.

"Duty, honor, country" is the motto of the U.S. Army. It is America. Every generation of Americans who have served in the U.S. Army—from the Continental Army to the Buffalo Soldiers to today's fighting men and women—have been shaped by this motto.

It has molded lives in ways that are hard to explain, just as the Army has touched our national life and history and made the world more secure, prosperous, and a better place for all mankind.

On this 226th birthday of the U.S. Army, as a proud U.S. Army veteran, I say happy birthday to the Army veterans of our country. We recognize and thank those who served and whose examples inspired those of us who have had the opportunity to serve in the U.S. Army.

It is the Army that has laid the foundation for all of this nation's distinguished branches of service and helped build a greater, stronger America.

Mr. President, on this, the 226th birthday of the Army, I say Happy Birthday and, in the great rich tradition of the U.S. Army, I proudly proclaim my annual Senate floor "HOOAH!"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

THE 226th ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. ARMY

Mr. DODD. I commend my dear friend from Nebraska for his remarks celebrating the 226th anniversary of the Army. I am glad I was present on the floor to hear the annual "Hooah" from a wonderful former sergeant who served with great distinction during the Vietnam conflict. He is a wonderful

Member of this body and a great friend to the veterans of America.

I served in the Army. I was a week-end warrior. I defended the shores of Connecticut from outside aggression over the years. But, I am deeply proud to have worn the uniform of the Army while rising to the rank of E4. I am even more proud of my friend for his wonderful service and for what he has done in public life after his service. I join him in wishing happy birthday to our friends in the U.S. Army.

Mr. HAGEL. Madam President, if I may respond to my friend from Connecticut, it is common knowledge that E4s run the Army, so I salute him with a big "Hooah."

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I want to spend some time talking about the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which we passed just a few minutes ago.

First, I commend my friend and colleague from Massachusetts, the chairman of the committee, for his continuing leadership in the area of education. Senator KENNEDY has been a tireless champion of children and families and is now into his fifth decade here in the Senate. He has no equal when it comes to his passion for serving those in need, and demonstrated that passion once again during his management of this bill over the past 6 or 7 weeks.

I also want to join with those who have commended our colleague, Senator JEFFORDS of Vermont. Senator JEFFORDS is the former chairman of this committee. We were elected to Congress together more than a quarter century ago. He has been a wonderful friend and fellow New Englander and in large part is responsible for the outlines of the bill just adopted by a substantial vote. In his quiet way, JIM JEFFORDS made a very profound and strong imprint on this legislation.

Although much attention has been focused on political events over the last few weeks associated with our colleague from Vermont, that should not overshadow his substantive commitment to the quality of education in this country, and this reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is one of the finest examples of his efforts over the years. So I commend him for his work.

I thank my friend from New Hampshire, Senator GREGG, who is a tremendously bright and articulate Member of this body. We have our differences, but there is no more engaging Member, no one with whom I more enjoy debating a subject. He is knowledgeable and deeply committed to these issues. He has very strong views, but is a very fair individual, and he did a very fine job here on the floor. Other members, also have been very involved in this legislation, such as Senator FRIST of Tennessee, who cares deeply about these issues;