

review showed that advertising for explicit-content labeled music recordings routinely appeared on popular teen television programming. All five major recording companies placed advertising for explicit content music on TV programs and magazines with substantial under-17 audiences. Furthermore, ads for explicit-content labeled music usually did not indicate that the recording was stickered with a parental advisory label.

So not only did they market to kids, they didn't warn the parents in the advertising that this was parental labeled material. In the advertising, they said they were not even going to point that out to the parents.

If you refer back to the original FTC report released last September, you will find 100 percent of the violent music they studied was target-marketed to kids—100 percent. Evidently the recording industry saw no reason to change.

Soon the Senate will turn its attention to consider the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, and how to provide the best education for all of America's children. I think for every Senator of both parties, ensuring that America's children get a world-class education is a top priority.

We also know one of the best measures of what a child learns is time on task; that is, children learn what they spend their time focusing on. That is significant because typically the American child spends more time each year watching television and movies, playing video games, listening to music, than he or she does in school. It makes no sense to assume that what a child sees, hears, and does in school will mold, shape, and enlighten his or her young mind but that what he sees, hears, and plays in terms of entertainment will have no impact whatsoever.

Many of the most popular songs, games, and movies actively glorify violence and glamorize brutality. There are video games which cast players as drug kingpins, with the game revolving around selling drugs and killing competitors. There are movies which glamorize murder, casting teen idols as dashing killers. And there are numerous songs which celebrate violence against women—all of which are marketed to children.

If being perceived is doing, we clearly have problems on our hands.

There is new evidence to suggest that exposing children to violent entertainment not only affects their emotional and behavioral development—their sensitivity to other's pain, their ability to empathize, and their perceptions of the world around them—but also their cognitive development. A professor in my alma mater of Kansas State has done ground-breaking research on the impact that exposure to violent entertainment has on children's brain activity. Dr. John Murray's studies have found that in terms of brain activity, kids who are exposed to violent entertainment have a similar experience to

those who are exposed to real-life trauma, and their brain responds in much the same fashion.

This research, while still in its rudimentary stages, has potentially profound implications for education. I would therefore like to announce my intention to introduce an amendment to ESEA which calls for increased research into the impact that exposing children to violent entertainment—violent music, and violent video games—has on their cognitive development and educational achievement. I hope and trust that the Senate will adopt this amendment.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to look at this interim study by the FCC and what has happened.

I also urge the recording industry to step up and actually do what they said they would do, which is not to market adult-rated material and parental advisory material directly to children. It is harming our kids. It is the wrong thing to do. I ask them sincerely to review what they are doing in their marketing campaigns and stop this practice. It is harmful.

I am hopeful when we have the followup study and the anniversary report to the FCC study this fall that the recording industry will actually step forward and do what is right.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. 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. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield myself up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire pertaining to the introduction of S. 759 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to address the Chamber. May I ask, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in a period of morning business for 3 hours, equally divided.

Mr. DODD. Is there a limitation on the amount of time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a 10-minute limitation.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to spend a couple of minutes, if I can,

talking about the possibility of us debating and passing a comprehensive bill on elementary and secondary education. My hope is, of course, that in the coming days this body will do what it should have done 2 years ago; that is, to pass legislation, as we are required to do only once every 5 or 6 years, on elementary and secondary education.

This morning across America 55 million children went to school. Fifty million went to school in a public school; 5 million went to school in a private or parochial school. We, as President Bush has said, bear a principal responsibility to the education of all our children, but a particular responsibility to children in our public schools, and even further, from a Federal standpoint, a particular obligation to the most disadvantaged children across America.

That has been our historic participation, to try to assist our communities, our States, and most particularly families in this country who suffer from various depravations, to see to it that their children have an equal opportunity to success. We have no obligation, in my view, to guarantee anybody success in America. But we do bear responsibility to try to provide an equal opportunity to achieving success. That is all really any of us can try to accomplish in our public responsibilities.

So the Elementary and Secondary Education Act historically over the years has been an effort by the Federal Government to assist and participate in the improvement of the quality of public education in the United States. For every dollar of education that is spent by our public sectors—State, local governments, and the Federal Government—out of every dollar that is spent, the Federal Government spends about 6 to 8 cents. And 93, 94 cents of the dollar spent on elementary and secondary education comes from local property taxes in most States. I do not know what Oklahoma does, but I know in Connecticut it is mostly a local property tax. The State also contributes, but primarily it is local property taxes. So the Federal Government's participation financially is rather small when you think of it. Out of a dollar spent, we contribute about 6 or 7 cents.

I am not going to debate this point right now, or discuss this point, but I happen to believe in the 21st century the Federal Government ought to be a better partner financially. I would like to see us become someday a one-third partner—the States one-third, the local government one-third, and the National Government one-third. What a wonderful relief it would be—and I saw the Presiding Officer nod affirmatively when I spoke of property taxes in Oklahoma, as is the case in Connecticut—what a great relief it would be, putting aside education issues, if we could say to people in Oklahoma and Connecticut: We are going to reduce your

local property taxes by a third—that is where most of it goes, to education—because your Federal Government is going to step up and be a far greater participant in recognizing the national benefits we all accumulate if the quality of public education in this country improves. So that is what brings us to this particular point.

There has been a lot of discussion about whether or not we have some agreements between the White House and the Senate on an Elementary and Secondary Education Act. There has been some progress. But we are light-years away from an agreement—light-years away from an agreement.

I do not say that with any glee. I had hoped after 2 or 3 weeks of discussions we would be a lot closer. But reports I have read in the newspaper and heard in the press and heard from the White House, heard from some quarters here, that we are on the brink of some agreement, is very far from the truth. I think it is a sad commentary, but it happens to be a fact. Let me tell you why.

First of all, we are asking schools to do some very dramatic things—testing, for one.

I am not terribly enthusiastic about testing as the only means of judging performance. Testing is really not a reform; it is a measurement of how well one does. That is all. As an educator in my State recently said: When children have a fever, taking their temperature three times an hour is not going to make them feel better; medicine will. Testing every year in and year out is inclined, in my view, to turn our schools into nothing more than test prep centers across America.

Who is going to pay for that unfunded mandate if we jam that down the throats of communities across the country? I am very concerned with this mandatory testing idea as the only way to judge how students are performing.

Many look to our schools as the source of the kids' problems when, in fact, in my view, the problems begin before the kids ever get to school. The problems too often are occurring at home. We do not want to look in the mirror and see what is happening in our own homes long before this child enters kindergarten or the first grade. We now blame child care centers. We blame the kindergarten teacher, the first, second, third, fourth, or fifth grade teacher because Johnny cannot read or Johnny is not performing well.

As I said, too often the problems occur long before a child reaches school age or enters a child care center. We need to be a bit more realistic about what we can expect by testing kids all the time, at some significant cost, as a mandate.

Accountability standards have been improved. I am willing to support some of those. These are the same account-

ability standards that have been developed, frankly, over the last few years. JEFF BINGAMAN, my colleague from New Mexico, has been the principal author of legislation to improve accountability standards that will get us closer to a better way of getting schools to live up to the obligations they bear for their students and families who send their children to these schools.

Today's children are part of the first generation that is being raised in a truly global world. Nothing we do this year or in the coming years is more important than how we go about providing for our children's education. If we succeed in this endeavor, our country's future will be very bright. If we do not succeed, it is going to be bleak.

With that in mind, I believe we have much work to do as we prepare to take up the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. If this debate turns out to be a feeding frenzy with literally dozens and dozens of amendments being proposed every 5 minutes, with Members having little knowledge of what they may do, we do not know what we are going to produce.

Since we only deal with this once every 5 or 6 years, we ought to take some time and pull this together and come forward with a bill that truly recognizes and reflects bipartisanship, that includes the ideas of people who spend a lot of time thinking about how to improve the quality of education in our country, rather than one that is a jump ball that could end up doing a lot more damage despite the press releases and pats on the back we give ourselves on how we judge whether or not we have lived up to our obligations.

The first issue we have to talk about candidly is the funding of these programs. If, as the President says, education is his top national priority—and I applaud him for that; this is what I call the hub of the wheel: education. If we get education right, then we increase dramatically the likelihood that every other issue will be dealt with intelligently, and we can build public support and come up with good answers.

If, in a democratic society, our education system begins to crumble and fall apart, then our democratic institutions, in my view, begin to fall apart as well. Thomas Jefferson, 200 years ago, said that any nation that ever expects to be ignorant and free expects what never was and never possibly can be. If that was true at the outset of the 19th century, then it is even more profoundly true as we begin the 21st century.

Our children will not just be competing with each other—a child in Oklahoma competing with a child in Connecticut or a child in Louisiana competing with a child in New Hampshire—it will be a child in Oklahoma and a child in Connecticut competing with a child in Beijing, Moscow, South

Africa, Paris, Berlin, and Australia. That is the world in which they will have to be able to compete.

What we do this year with elementary and secondary education will be how we begin the 21st century, giving this generation the tools it must have to succeed as a generation and to also perpetuate the vision and dream that each generation has embraced over our more-than-200-year history.

Funding is important. I happen to believe if elementary and secondary education is the top priority, then it ought to be reflected in the funding. We know we need approximately \$14 billion to meet the 6 or 7 cents out of every dollar the U.S. Government contributes to elementary and secondary education.

What resources will we devote to title I, the most important title of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the primary mechanism through which the Federal Government provides resources to help low-income schools improve student achievement, resources to pay for more teachers, new computers, curricula, and other reforms?

According to a study published this year:

Whenever an inner city or poor rural school is found to be achieving outstanding results with its students by improving innovative strategies, these innovations are almost invariably funded by title I.

The President's budget provides for an additional \$42 billion for all education programs over 10 years. That is approximately \$4.2 billion a year out of a huge economy, and I will speak to that in a minute. At the same time, the President's budget includes a \$1.6 trillion tax cut over that same 10-year period.

Think about this. The President said: This is my top priority. He has only been in office about 100 days: This is my top priority. All during the campaign: This is my top priority; \$4.2 billion a year versus \$1.6 trillion. The numbers speak louder than the rhetoric—much louder.

By the way, under the President's tax proposal, approximately \$680 billion will go to people who earn more than \$300,000 a year. Those are not my numbers; those are the President's numbers: \$681 billion will be going to people who earn \$300,000 or more a year. That is where the tax cuts go. It appears the President considers tax cuts for people making over \$300,000 a year to be seven times more important than increased funding for education in America.

I do not agree with those priorities. I do not think the President does, or at least he says he does not. And I know the American public does not either. In fact, 3 weeks ago, this party on a bipartisan basis showed it does not agree with those priorities either. That is why we supported the amendment of Senator HARKIN from Iowa to decrease the tax cut by \$450 million and devote

that amount equally to education and debt reduction. That is why we supported the amendment of Senator BREAUX and Senator JEFFORDS to reduce the tax cut to provide funding for special education.

I suspect Connecticut is not different from Oklahoma, Minnesota, or Louisiana. When I go home every week and meet with the mayors or first-select people—forget about meeting with the superintendents of schools and the PTAs—I say: Tell me what you think are the top priorities. I am going back to Washington on Monday; what can I do to help?

The answer is: Special education. You guys promised 40 percent of the cost of this. You mandated it basically. You said: We will come up with 40 percent of the money for it. That was 25 years ago, and we have done about, at best, 11 percent. That money is not even included in the President's budget, although we force it down the throat of the administration.

Special education is critically important. Contrary to what some in the administration say: we as a nation cannot afford the increased funding for education, the Democrats are saying we can afford it if we really believe it is a top priority.

We are not talking about eliminating the tax cut. We are saying make a more modest tax cut and use some of those resources for making education the top priority that most people think it ought to be. I believe it is a priority to help children and communities by fully funding special education. I believe it should be a priority to provide children with afterschool programs to enrich their lives.

I have been willing to go along with the accountability standards. Some testing may be fine. We will work that out. But I have asked the administration: How about school construction funds? That is something I really care about and I think a lot of parents do, too.

Mr. President, 50 percent of our students this morning went to school in a building built prior to 1950. Think of that: 50 percent of our elementary and secondary kids walked into a building that was built prior to 1950.

How about some resources for new school construction, wired to compete in a global economy, to have access to the great libraries and institutions all over the world? A kid who walks into a falling-apart building is going to get a falling-apart education. That is not any great leap of logic; that is a fact.

How about some resources for new school construction? How about the White House saying: We will go along with you on that? I say: You want me to support some of your ideas that I think are questionable at best. How about supporting my ideas and those of us who advocate funds for school construction.

Smaller class sizes: This should not take more than 5 minutes of debate. If a teacher is in a classroom and has more than 20 kids they are not teaching; all they are doing is managing chaos in most instances. The teacher cannot teach; the kids cannot learn. That is not a leap of logic; that is a fact. Every parent knows it; every teacher knows it. We do not need to do any studies; what we need is some resources to help poor communities across the country and others to come up with some resources so they can reduce class size and attract good people to the teaching profession.

We talk about the administration that says we want to test teachers every year or every 2 years. I wonder, if I said we are going to test all lawyers every 2 years or test all doctors every 2 years—how about testing every Senator for 2 years? What other profession do we mandate at the Federal level we are going to require testing every year?

If the administration tries to write that into the bill, I will not vote for it under any circumstance. That is punitive. It doesn't accomplish anything. It only creates great divisions within this country. It isolated the teaching profession.

There are ways of determining whether or not teachers are doing a good job. A lot of the States are doing a good job in making those evaluations. Test the new ones coming in and decide whether or not they can teach at all and use some of the creative methods developed to determine whether or not teachers are up to the job. This rush to test everybody, every year, is not a model of form.

We have asked for \$14 billion, an increase of the elementary and secondary education authorization. I don't think that is too much. I don't think it is too much to demand in the context of a \$1.6 trillion tax cut. I know many colleagues on both sides of the aisle agree with me. That is why I will offer an amendment with Senator COLLINS of Maine to authorize full funding for title I grants to schools over the next 10 years. Congress must go on record in making that, not a tax cut for the wealthy, a top national priority. That is why this education bill must include class size reduction funds. No one questions that smaller class sizes and better teachers result in better student achievement. That is why this education bill must include school construction funds.

According to the GAO, the problem of inadequate, unsafe school facilities is a \$112 million problem. The average school student goes to a school built around the 1950s. There are issues far from being resolved. They are not being discussed in these negotiations. Come out to the floor, offer your amendment, and see what happens. You accept all of our provisions and we will have a jump ball over yours.

What happened to bipartisanship? How many times did I hear we would work things out? It is 50/50 here, almost 50/50 in the House. I heard the President say over and over again: I want to work in a bipartisan fashion. Bipartisanship means you take my ideas and we will see what happens to yours? That may be enough for some people; it is not enough for me.

This bill will not be voted on again for 5 or 6 years. For many, this may be the last time we get to express how public education at the elementary and secondary schools across the country ought to be dealt with.

We took 2 weeks on campaign finance reform. We took 2 weeks last year to name the Ronald Reagan National Airport. We can take a few weeks to try to get this right. The American people expect nothing less. I remember the days, not that many years ago, when an elementary and secondary education bill passed this Chamber by votes of 92-6, 96-4. Today we ought to try to achieve the same results and to truly work to include these provisions which are necessary.

Democrats support real increases in proven programs. Yet the President, who says education is his top priority, would provide inadequate increases, \$4.2 billion each year over the next 10 years, in a budget where he advocates a \$1.6 trillion tax cut.

We can do better than that. I know our colleagues agree with that conclusion. That is why this education bill must include construction funds, include class size reforms.

We have to speak with a clear voice and build consensus. We are not there yet. In my view, we ought to be. But we are a long way from achieving the kind of consensus that those who have been out there suggest we are on the brink of; we are not. We may have to take some time before this is resolved.

I intend to be heard on these matters. I don't want to see a bill come up which will turn into a mess out here that allows these ideas to go down the drain and the President claiming a bipartisan achievement because a few Democrats go along with something that isn't adequately funded, doesn't provide for the true reforms that are needed, and we end up doing some real damage to kids, and then build a consensus that our public schools have failed for this country and you have to walk away from it. That is my fear of what will happen down the road and we will look back to these days and rue the fact we didn't try to come together with a truly compromised bill that reflected the attitudes of all people in this Chamber and particularly the values and aspirations of the people we represent.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I rise to add my voice to my distinguished colleague

from Connecticut and to thank him for his outstanding leadership. Senator DODD and my staff have been enthusiastically involved in this particular debate. As a member of the committee, he has been a tremendous voice for education reform. I acknowledge the work Senator DODD has done with many of our colleagues on this issue and to say how much I agree with all of the points he has raised. I will join with him in as many hours as it takes through this week and the next week to try to bring some of these points home to our constituents and to the country at large.

I thank the Senator again for continuing to keep Senators focused on not only the increases in investments that we need in education but the targets of those investments to reach the children who need the most help, whether in Connecticut, Louisiana, Oklahoma, or other States, for whom we are fighting. I thank the Senator for that.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleague, and I admire her work. She has been at these issues for a long number of years both in her home in Louisiana before she arrived in the Senate and as a Member of this body.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Let me follow up by making a few points. The President is right about one thing. That is, simply throwing more money at the problems facing our educational system in America will do little to create the type of reform necessary to move America forward in the new global economy.

However, conversely what is true, passing new mandates and new accountability and new standards and new goals for our students and our teachers and our communities, without that important and strategic and significant new investment in education, is a hollow and an empty promise.

I call attention to a wonderful ad that caught my attention a couple of weeks ago. It was put out by the Business Leader Council. We do a lot of talking in this Chamber about budgets, taxes, futures trading, commodities trading, and economic issues.

With my compliments to the Business Roundtable, this is the ad they ran. It said under the picture of the bright-eyed optimistic and hopeful children:

Our Nation's classrooms are America's true futures market, where a commitment today will yield individual and national prosperity tomorrow.

Let me repeat that:

Our Nation's classrooms are America's true futures market, where a commitment today—

Not next year, not 5 years from now, but a commitment today—
will yield individual and national prosperity tomorrow.

I hope my colleagues can see the faces of these children. What jumped out at me from the picture is the hope-

fulness in these children's eyes. They look like children in every classroom in Louisiana, with smiles on their faces, with hands in the air, anxious to answer questions presented by their teachers, with hope and optimism for the future.

The debate we will have in this Chamber and with our colleagues in the House will determine whether these children walk away with supplies or whether they walk away with heads hung, shoulders stooped down, opportunities taken from them because we have made the wrong decisions on this floor.

That is what this debate is about. This budget is not just about numbers. It is not just about hard, cold facts. It is not just about statistics. It is about hearts, minds, souls, and opportunities for our children and for our families and for this country. I am afraid if we don't come to terms and make the best decisions we can, and good decisions this week, these children and millions and millions like them, and their parents, are going to be sorely disappointed.

Let me try to explain. One of the major debates we are preparing for is what kind of investment in education should we be making. The President has recommended what might seem to be a lot of money. When we talk about billions and hundreds of millions of dollars, those are large figures and people's eyes tend to glaze over because that sounds like a lot of money. We are debating an underlying bill, a reauthorization of elementary and secondary education, that is going to fundamentally change the way the Federal Government helps local and State government.

We are saying, instead of just sending you money and crossing our fingers and hoping for results, we are now going to tie the resources in a real and meaningful way. When we give you these moneys, we are going to expect real performance, real excellence, and there are going to be real consequences for failure. Schools may have to be reconstructed, reorganized; principals and teachers may need to be removed and we may need to have a new leadership team come in. Students are to be tested not once every few years but every year. Teachers are going to be held to higher standards because we believe in excellence. We do not want to leave any child behind, and we want to make sure that, whether you are in a poor rural area or a poor urban area or in a wealthy urban area or wealthy rural area, that you have a chance, as a child, to get an excellent education.

We are also going to give local officials more flexibility. We are not going to micromanage from Washington any longer. We are not going to specifically mandate that you have to cross every t and dot every i. We are going to be less focused on compliance and more focused on performance.

I agree with the President that all of those things are important and that we should change the way Washington funds our elementary and secondary education system. But doing that and yet not providing the money at a high level for our schools to be able to do that is an empty, hollow promise to our children and an unfunded mandate of gigantic proportions to our local governments and to our States.

It would not be right. It is not what the American people want. It is not what we should do. That is what this debate is about. Yes, we want reform, but we must have the significant, historic, huge investments necessary to make those reforms work.

Let me say to those who might say money doesn't matter—yes, it does. Testing costs money. Improving teacher quality costs money. Fixing leaky roofs costs money. Buying textbooks and computers and training teachers and students costs money. You cannot just wish it. We can be more efficient. We can spend our money more wisely. But in this year, in 2001, as we begin this new century, it has to be a combination of new reforms and new investments.

Let me share some interesting poll numbers that came out because people might say: Senator, you feel this way, but does anybody else feel this way? Senator DODD feels this way, but does anyone else?

This is a Washington Post poll issued today. The question was very basic. It says, Is the Federal Government spending too much, about right, or too little for education? Mr. President, 60 percent of the public says we are spending too little; 60 percent of Americans are saying we are spending too little at the Federal level for education. Only about 24 percent say "about right" and 8 percent say "too much." So 60 percent of Americans.

When we talk about at the State level, Is your State government spending enough on education? Mr. President, 61 percent say the State governments are spending too little on education. At the local level you can see that number drops fairly significantly because we are paying a greater portion at the local level.

This chart indicates to me that at the State level, but particularly at the Federal level, people across the board—and I think this was across regions and economic income levels—suggest our current investment level is not sufficient to meet the challenges.

Let me also share with you, from the same poll, a question: Which is more important to you, holding down the size of government, providing needed services, or both?

Mr. President, 31 percent said "holding down the size of government," 62 percent, "providing needed services." Does that mean the American public

supports sort of a runaway government? Obviously not. But do they support a government that has efficient programs and effective programs and also makes investments in areas that matter to them—education being one of them? Absolutely.

Let me show you the second chart that shows what their priorities are. This is what the American people said in the same poll. If given the chance, how would you spend your money and what are some of your most important concerns? Education is at the top of the chart, 47 percent. The next closest is 34 percent, Social Security and Medicare, making sure the resources are there to provide for Social Security and strengthen it, and provide, hopefully, for reforms in the Medicare system, and an expansion for prescription drugs. Health care is important also, at 29 percent.

I want to focus on this area—education. The President, when he was running for President, said it over and over again: Let's not leave any child behind. I agree with him. Many, many people in this Chamber, both on the Republican and Democratic side, do. But that is just a slogan unless it is backed up with real dollars that actually move children forward, that give them hope, that fulfill a promise for life to help them develop their skills and their abilities.

Again the Business Roundtable said:

Our Nation's classrooms are America's true futures market—where a commitment today will yield individual and national prosperity tomorrow.

Let me share, for the record, a specific example from one of Louisiana's industries, Avondale Industries. It is one of the largest employers in Louisiana, an industry that I certainly try to help and support, that is building some of the finest ships for our commercial shippers as well as our national defense. It does a magnificent job, let me add. They are now part of the Northrop Grumman Corporation, which is one of the five remaining facilities left in this whole country capable of building large combat vessels.

My staff called them and asked them if they could send us some applications for jobs that they might periodically put out to try to hire some of the individuals necessary for this work. These positions range from electrical engineer to data entry clerk. But the one requirement that comes through in all of these applications is that a high school diploma is necessary. What that translates to is really an 11th or 12th grade proficiency in math. Many of these jobs are related to calculations, to making analytical decisions based on plans and graphs, as you can imagine.

Right now in our Nation, according to the latest data, only 30 percent of our eighth graders are functioning at the proficient level in math. Here is an

industry in my State that could employ thousands of individuals, that puts out applications daily for a variety of different jobs. The minimum requirement is a high school education. Part of that is functioning just at the proficient level—not outstanding, not the top 1 percent in the Nation, just at the proficiency level for math.

I have to stand here as a Senator and look these industry people in the eye and tell them that we can only create a school system that can, at best, give them 30 percent of the eighth graders who can fill out the application. This is not going to work. It is not going to work for Louisiana. It is not going to work for Connecticut. It is not going to work for New York. It is simply not going to work. And a budget that does not fund more science teachers, more math teachers, makes a real investment to give those kids an opportunity, is not going to help them, their families, or Avondale.

I know the last administration asked me—it was a hard vote and I did it—to vote for 50,000 H-1B visas to bring in people from outside this Nation to fill jobs because we were not able to find people in America to take these jobs. I cast that vote, but I will tell you I thought about that vote, because when I cast that vote it allowed high-tech industries and some industries such as Louisiana's shipbuilders to be able to hire people from other nations.

I go home and drive through neighborhoods, walk through communities, sit and talk to young people who have been left out because we have not provided them the kind of education they need. They have to step aside and watch someone from another country walk past their door, fill out the application, and take the job that they could have had if we had had a school system that could have given them the education necessary for the job.

That is a tough thing for a Senator to have to do because I do not represent any other country; I represent the United States, and I represent Louisiana. I represent cities and communities where there are thousands of people who cannot pass 11th grade math because we will not put the resources and the money where they need to be to give them the chance. Are they willing? Yes. But we have not done what we need to do.

So my message to the President and to my colleagues is, let's do it while we can. Perhaps when we were running terrible deficits and running up large, large bills, you could say: Look, we would love to do it but we simply can't afford it. We are running huge deficits. We can't keep spending money we don't have. Money doesn't grow on trees. We can't tax people any more. So I am all for that and when we have to cut back, let's do it.

But now that we have a historic and significant surplus, now I am listening

to people say: We have the surplus; we have the money; it is sitting there in the bank, but we don't want to spend it on these children. We don't want to spend it on them. They are not our future. We want to give a huge tax cut, and we don't want to make any investments in education.

I am not talking about the same kind of investments for the same mediocre results. We can't keep doing it 3 or 4 or 5 percent a year, which is what the President is recommending, and think we are going to get a 50-percent increase in results. It doesn't work that way.

We have to make an extraordinary commitment now and put our money where our mouth is to reach the children that we need to reach through our schools. Yes, reform our schools with strong accountability standards matched with a true investment and targeted to the kids who need it the most.

We do a great job sometimes in Washington inventing new programs, and everything sounds great. And every year we invent about five, six, or seven more programs. We need to get back to the basics and fund through elementary and secondary education a significant amount, if not tripling the amount of money, for title I—flexible grants that go to places in Louisiana, New York, Connecticut, Alabama, New Mexico, or where the communities can't raise the tax dollars because they are relatively poor or have a limited capacity.

The Federal Government can honestly stand up and say, whether you are little girls in Oregon or you were born into a poor, rural area or a poor urban area, it doesn't matter because we have a system at the Federal level that ensures, because of the way we fund education, that the school you go to will help you pass and exceed that proficiency in math so that you can get a job and we don't have to import someone from another country to take the job while you collect welfare or while you have to live on food stamps or while you tell your children they cannot ever live in a home of their own because you can't bring home a paycheck enough for you to be able to live in a home of your own.

I am not going to say that as a Senator because the money is in the bank. The question is, Are we going to write the check for the kids who need it or to our schools, or are we going to squander the surplus and not make the investments that we need?

I will come to the floor every single day this week and next week, as long as it takes, because I know as a Senator from Louisiana, particularly, my State's future rests in large measure on how our schools can function so that every child in every part of our State can get the quality education that in some small way perhaps will make up for what they do not always get in their homes.

I don't know what kind of miracle schools can achieve. I know schools can't do it without the parents. I know there is a limit to what schools can contribute to a child if they are not getting that support at home. But I am tired of making excuses and hearing excuses such as this kid can't learn because this child only has one parent or this child can't learn because this child is poor or this child can't learn because this child is a special education student.

I am here to tell you that every child can learn, but it takes a good system and good investments from the Federal Government, the State government, and the local government working in partnership with parents.

I am about fed up with the excuses because I want to support trade and globalization, and I want our businesses to have the workers they need. I have to fight for children to have the opportunity. I urge our President to please work with us. Work with the Democrats. We don't want to waste money. We want to make a significant investment in education, coupled with accountability, new standards and exciting possibilities for our Nation. I most certainly want to work with him. I believe we can make a real difference in Louisiana and Texas and many places throughout our Nation.

In conclusion, I refer to the vision of Lyndon Baines Johnson when we created the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—a vision that would make the dream of a quality education a reality for all children regardless of their race, their socioeconomic status, or their gender. This is what America is about. It is about opportunities.

In many ways, while education begins at home, it is most certainly enhanced at the school level. We are shortchanging ourselves, shortchanging our children, and shortchanging our future to do anything less.

I will end saying, again, I am going to be down here every day until we complete this debate, urging my colleagues to push hard for a significant investment and targeting that investment to the schools and communities that need the most help, and also helping all of our districts to achieve success in educational excellence.

I yield any remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, before my colleague from Louisiana leaves the floor, I thank her so much for saying what the issue before us really is. We all agree that we need to make children our No. 1 priority. We all agree that there are things in our schools that need to be improved, and we need to, frankly, underscore the things that are working. We don't want to leave any child behind. That is President Bush's comment.

When we get the chance to have an education bill brought here with our friends, Senator KENNEDY, Senator JEFFORDS, and others, we want to make sure it is not just an empty promise. I think she has fleshed this out. I thank her very much.

In California, we test every year. It is not a big deal. We have that reform in place. But if you test them and find they are failing and you don't have anything in place to help them after school or during school to give them the smaller class sizes, to give them a facility that feels good, looks good, and is safe for them, they are not going to improve.

When this education bill comes up, I predict that the Senate will take that Bush bill and change it dramatically in terms of the resources we put behind the rhetoric. There are two R's. Usually they say there are three R's. But there is rhetoric here, then there is requirement. Those are the two R's. The rhetoric is fine. Let's get the requirements in there so that we can meet the needs of our children. There is a third R—results. That is what we want to do.

How much time do I have? Is there a limit on time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are 10 minutes per speaker, and the Democrats have 40 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. I would like to know when I have 1 minute remaining of my 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will notify the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I have been amazed at the first 100 days of the Bush administration in relation to the environment issue. When I say the environment, I don't just throw that word out. I am talking about air, I am talking about water, I am talking about drinking water, I am talking about parks, and I am talking about cleaning up Superfund sites and brownfield sites. The fact is, we have a situation on our hands that is going to be very dangerous for our people.

Why do I say that? I say that for a couple of reasons. First of all, we see rollbacks on very important issues. We have all heard about the President backing off the pledge he made in the campaign to deal with CO₂ emissions which cause major problems in air quality. We know he has backed off that.

We saw him evaluate a number of rules that were put in place under the Clinton administration. The one that I cannot get over—there are a number; I don't have time to get into them—is the one dealing with arsenic. We know a few things about arsenic. It is unsafe at any level. We know for a fact that at the current level of arsenic that is al-

lowed in our drinking water, if you drink out of that water supply, 1 out of 100 people will get cancer—not may get cancer, not might get cancer, but will get cancer. We know this to be the case.

Yet this administration, in violation of the law, in my opinion—that will be tested in the courts—reversed the Clinton administration rule on arsenic to reduce the parts per billion that would be allowable, where the Clinton administration had gone from 50 parts per billion to 10 and he put us back at 50 parts per billion.

Let me list some of the countries that have a standard of 50 parts per billion. I will give you an idea of the countries that allow 50 parts per billion of arsenic: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia, China, Egypt, India, and Indonesia. That is an example.

Let me list some of the countries that have the 10 parts per billion: European Union, Japan, and Jordan.

I have to say that we owe our people safe drinking water. If we owe them nothing else, we can argue a lot of things, but the Federal Government needs to make sure that our people are safe.

What we have is a rollback on a number of fronts. I am just talking about the arsenic one today. There are others. I will save them for another day. But in addition to this, in order to pay for his tax cut to the wealthiest people who do not need it, those over \$300,000 and \$400,000 a year, those over \$1 million, \$2 million, or \$1 billion a year, in order to pay for that tax cut, some of those people are going to get back a million dollars a year. This President has cut back environmental enforcement.

Let's take a look at the key cuts that he has put in his budget. The Environmental Protection Agency, a \$500 million cut; the Interior Department, a \$400 million cut. The clean energy and nuclear contamination cleanup—you have DICK CHENEY out there saying we need more nuclear power. He has not even figured out a way to clean up the nuclear waste we have. They have cut \$700 million, and they want more nuclear power, which is dangerous. There is a conservation program in the Agriculture Department. They cut that \$300 million. So we see a total of \$1.9 billion in cuts to pay for a tax cut that favors the top 1 percent, leaving out 99 percent of the people.

What does that really mean? What does it mean when you cut environmental enforcement? Let me get into that. It is very serious. What happens is, we are going to see fewer inspectors out in the field and fewer technical exports on the ground. We are going to see that the Federal Government will no longer be able to be a watchdog for some of the most serious threats to public health and the environment.

I want to give examples because people have seen the movie "Erin