my fervent wish that the suffering endured by all the Afghan people and international workers be quickly relieved.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S DECISION OF VIEQUES BOMBING RUNS

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, last week, the administration made headlines when it said it would stop the bombing in Vieques.

But is that really true? Let's look at the fine print.

First, the administration did not commit to stopping the bombing immediately and permanently, as so many of us have called for. In fact, the bombing runs continue this week.

Second, the administration said it would stop the bombing by May 1, 2003. But is that really something new? Let's look at the date by which the bombing would stop under the current agreement and existing law, which provides for an end to the bombing if the people vote for it. The current agreement and existing law call for an end to the bombing by May 1, 2003—the very same date.

In other words, the administration is saying nothing more than what current law mandates if the people of Vieques vote to stop the bombing.

If that is all the administration announced—that the bombing would stop by the same date provided for under current law—then this flurry of attention would be little more than an overblown story about this President's desire to abide by the letter and spirit of the agreement entered into between the Federal Government and the representatives of the people of Vieques and Puerto Rico.

But that is not all the administration announced. It also announced that it wanted to stop the November referendum. The devil is in the details, they say. Well, this is one powerful devil of an idea that has not received the scrutiny it deserves.

For what the administration is really attempting to do is to undermine the intent of the law and subvert the will of the people of Vieques.

The administration says that a referendum is unnecessary, because it already plans to end the bombing by 2003. I say a referendum is more important than ever, because without an electoral mandate to require an end to the bombing, any administration expression of intent is nothing more than that: an expression of intent. Not a legal requirement. And ''intentions'' can change at a moment's notice.

I wholeheartedly support all efforts to find a viable alternative site to train our naval forces. We need such training, to protect our national interest and to protect our troops. And we must work hard to find places and ways to provide such a vital element of our defense.

As I have said before, the people of Puerto Rico are great patriots; its sons and daughters volunteer for our Nation's armed forces at one of the highest rates in our country.

Thousands of Puerto Ricans have lost their lives in service of their country during all the wars of the 20th century. We need the good training to protect all our troops, many of whom are Puerto Rican.

So this is not a matter in which the people of Vieques or Puerto Rico should be pitted against the interests of national security. We are all Americans. We are all on the same team and we want the same thing: the best trained armed forces in the world.

And so, I agree with President Bush when he says the ''Navy will find another place to practice.'' I agree with Secretary Powell when he says, ''Let's find alternative ways of making sure that our troops are ready . . . using technology, using simulators and also finding a place to conduct live fire.''

But here's the bottom line: Under current law, if the people of Vieques vote in November to end the bombing by May 1, 2003, the bombing must end by that date. Pure and simple. However, under the administration's plan, there will be no referendum. And therefore, there will be no mandate and no requirement to end the bombing by 2003. Only a policy to do so. And that policy could be altered by the President anytime between now and 2003.

In fact, Secretary Rumsfeld has already said that the Navy might stay on Vieques for another, and I quote, ''two, three, four years'' until it can arrange ''the training that's needed in other ways.'' Defense Department officials were also quick to point out that while the President said that the Navy would find another place to practice within ''a reasonable period of time'' he never defined ''reasonable.''

Secretary England said he wanted to ''have us control our destiny,'' meaning the Navy, as opposed to allowing what he called ''this level of emotion'' distract ''our attention from the real issue.''

In other words, the will of the people of Vieques is an ''emotion'' that must be put aside, and the people of Vieques should not control their destiny—the Navy should.

I believe that is the wrong way to deal with this very important issue. I believe we should work toward a solution to this problem without circumventing the law of the land, without abrogating an agreement, without obviating the will of the American citizens of Vieques.

I will stand up against any effort to shut down the referendum in Vieques. Let the votes be cast. Let them be counted. And let the voice of the people be heard and respected.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred June 2, 1999 in West Palm Beach, FL. Two teenagers admitted they beat a homosexual man to death last year, alleging the attack was provoked when the 118-pound victim called one of the young men ''beautiful.''

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

THE DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT OF 2001

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 355, a bill requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the contributions to our nation of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Commemorative Coin Act of 2001, S. 355, was introduced by Senator MARY LANDRIEU on February 15.

As we approach the 40th anniversary of Dr. king's ''I have a dream'' speech, we remember that Dr. King was a man larger than life who had an extraordinary impact not only on the civil rights movement, but also on the history of America. He was living proof that non-violence can change the world.

In the last session of Congress, this measure was introduced in both the House and Senate, but no action was taken on the floor. My constituents, however, concerned themselves with the issues and the Borough Council of Fair Lawn, NJ, passed Resolution 315–2000 urging that the measure be adopted and the commemorative coins be authorized for the year 2003.

David L. Ganz, the Mayor of the Borough of Fair Lawn is a former member of the Citizens Commemorative Coin Advisory Committee, a long-time advocate of using commemorative coins properly, and an avid coin collector. In an article appearing in COINage magazine, a monthly trade publication, in the July 2001 issue, Mr. Ganz argues that ''the accomplishments of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. transcend the work of presidents and academicians and cut across cultural lines. His life's work ultimately affected the fabric of American society . . . worthy of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1904 . . . [and leading to] social justice for a whole class of citizens and a generation of Americans.''

This is a remarkable opportunity to honor a remarkable man, and I urge the Banking Committee, and ultimately this body, to promptly enact

this legislation into law and authorize this distinctive tribute to a distinctive American.

BETTER EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ACT

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, if there is one thing that the Senate can agree on wholeheartedly, it is that we, as a Nation, need to invest in our children's educational future. There is no other issue that hits closer to home for America's families.

But, even as we recognize the importance of education, we must realize that close to home is where education works best in America, and simply spending more and more Federal dollars on more and more Federal ''one size fits all'' education directives will not, by itself, make our education system perform better.

S. 1, the Better Education for Students and Teachers Act, that the Senate passed last Thursday contains several provisions that I favor.

The bill contains a modest pilot ''Straight A's'' provision that will help us build on the Education Flexibility Partnership Act that I worked to help pass in the 106th Congress to allow States to consolidate Federal education programs to meet State and local needs.

It also contains an amendment that I sponsored, that will provide loan forgiveness to Head Start teachers in effort to encourage teachers to go into early childhood education.

Further, S. 1 expands local flexibility and control by block-granting funds, consolidating some programs, and includes another amendment that I sponsored to allow local districts to spend Title II funds, if they desire, on pupil services personnel.

However, taken as a whole, S. 1 is fiscally irresponsible and violates my deeply held principles of federalism.

Over the course of my 35 years of public service to the people of Ohio, I have developed a passion for the issue of federalism—that is, assigning the appropriate role of the Federal Government in relation to State and local government.

Our forefathers outlined this relationship in the 10th Amendment:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.

Education is one such responsibility, and it has only been in the last 35 years that the Federal government has had much of a role to play in education policy, albeit a small one.

As my colleagues know, the Federal Government currently provides approximately 7 percent of all money spent on education in America, while 93 percent of the money is provided at the state and local level.

In my view, S. 1 not only violates that principle of federalism and the proper role of the Federal Government in education, it violates a principle long-held in this country; and that is, local control of our schools. I am concerned that this bill will put us on a fast-track towards thoroughly federalizing education.

As it has been said before on the floor of the Senate, one size does not fit all when it comes to education. Different districts have different requirements, with the needs of rural areas differing from the needs of our cities. And that has been the guiding force in American education for over 200 years.

But some of my colleagues think the Congress is the national school board. Well, we are not the national school board here in this Congress!

With the expansion of education programs that the Federal Government would undertake in this bill, I have a genuine concern that in ten or fifteen years, Washington will be dictating what is happening in every schoolhouse across the nation.

Indeed, in spite of the limited expenditure of Federal funds for education, this bill stipulates that every school district in America will test their students from grades 3 through 8.

This testing will occur regardless of how well students are performing in their particular school districts, and despite the fact that most of our states have mechanisms already in place that test students' educational performances.

For instance, just last week in my state of Ohio, Governor Taft signed into law a bill to revamp the State's testing program.

Governors, legislators, school boards, parents and most of all, teachers, all understand how onerous additional federally mandated testing provisions truly are.

I can assure you that there are many teachers in Ohio who are going to be saying, ''here we go again.''

In addition, there are other provisions in this legislation that usurp the authority of states and local school districts in their ability to make decisions that will affect their students.

For example, S. 1 lays out specific steps that states and school districts must take to address failing schools.

Also under S. 1, the Federal Government would be able to tell States that its teachers in low-income schools must meet certain Federal qualification and certification requirements.

Further, the Federal Government would be able to continue to tell school districts how to spend funds in a number of areas including: reading; teacher development; technology; and programs for students with limited English language skills, instead of providing States and local school districts with full flexibility to spend funds on their own identified priorities.

Besides violating a long-held principle regarding State and local control over schools, the bill's fatal flaw is that it increases authorized and appropriated spending for education by more than 62 percent over last year's budget, and it demolishes the budget resolution that Congress recently passed.

According to the Senate Budget Committee, ESEA spending totaled $17.6 billion in fiscal year 2001. That same year, we spent over $6.3 billion on special education. That's a total of $23.9 billion of Federal funds for kindergarten through grade 12. It also represents a 21 percent increase over fiscal year 2000.

S. 1 as reported authorized $27.7 billion for ESEA alone for fiscal year 2002. Since the beginning of the debate on the floor of the Senate until its passage on June 14th, a period of some 7 weeks, the Senate added an additional $11.1 billion in education spending for fiscal year 2002.

That's a total of $38.8 billion and, as I said earlier, a 62 percent increase in just one year!

Over the life of the bill, these amendments add $211 billion to ESEA for a total of $416 billion. That is an increase of 101 percent over seven years.

When you consider that the House and Senate agreed to a budget resolution that included a modest increase in Federal spending over last year's budget of approximately 5 percent, it's obvious that if we are to fund ESEA with a 62 percent increase, many legitimate functions that are the true responsibility of the federal government will not be met. Otherwise, we will not be able to live within the parameters of the FY 2002 budget resolution.

I am concerned that a number of my colleagues may have voted for many of the amendments to S. 1, as well as the final version of the bill—even with its expensive price tag—believing that the Appropriations Committee will not fully-fund each and every authorized program.

In my view, we should only vote to authorize what we are actually willing to appropriate.

That's because, I am very sure that there will be tremendous pressure on the appropriators to fully-fund the programs included in this bill. And, at 62 percent over last year's level, the programs in S. 1 just cost too much money for this Congress to spend.

In fact, I am concerned that the level of spending in this bill will put us back on the path towards a repeat of last year's ''budget busting'' appropriations cycle; a cycle that saw the Congress spend 14.3 percent more in non-defense discretionary spending than the year before.

That is why over the last few weeks, I have been working with my friend from Kentucky, Senator BUNNING, to get the signatures of our Senate colleagues on a letter to President Bush to show him that we are willing to support him in his efforts to instill fiscal discipline in the appropriations process.

In addition, our letter is meant to put Congress on notice that excessive spending will not be tolerated.

Although President Bush has indicated that he will not hesitate to use his veto pen on spending bills, Senator BUNNING and I felt he needed a ''Backbone 34''—a contingent of at least 34