

have a chance to recreate public education in our country. It needs to be recreated. It has fallen down in the last 25 years. It is time we brought it back up. It is time we do not take no for an answer. It is time we do not allow someone to say that some children just can't learn. Every child can learn. We just must make sure we fit that child's individual needs and every child will learn. The key is catching the child early enough that we can give the child the full chance to have a quality public education. If we find out in the ninth grade that the child is reading at the third grade level, 6 years will have been lost for that child's development. That is not fair. We can do better. That is what I hope we will do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to continue under the time on education, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. I suppose we are all hopeful the committee will soon come together with their proposal and have some agreement on the bill and bring it here.

As we think more and more about the education bill, and we begin to think what are the elements of a successful education for young people, of course we immediately begin to think, first of all, about families, about parents. That is the early responsibility. It is so interesting to watch in our communities, as we see the youngsters with parents who, when the children are very small, begin to help with reading, begin to give parental support. Then as they get to school, we can see their opportunities are much greater.

The other things, of course, that we talk about are the facilities, the teaching opportunities that are provided by the community. We begin to try to put all these things together. Then we begin to say what is the role of dollars? I think the average expenditure per child is maybe \$500. There are substantial differences in the costs of education throughout the country. Then we begin to measure reading performance against the amount of dollars that are spent. We see as dollars go up, reading capacity does not necessarily go up. So we say what is it that has to be done besides dollars?

We begin to think of the role of the Federal Government versus the role of the school board and the State, in terms of decisions about school buildings, for example. Traditionally, the building of school facilities has been a responsibility of local governments. Local governments make the decisions. Then we find ourselves looking at things that need to be done in that area and we see we need Federal money. When Federal money comes, along with it comes regulation. People say: Wait a minute, get the Federal Government out of our lives.

It is not an easy issue. Do we want to have the best education we can? Of

course, nobody argues with that. That is our goal and it should be. We start with preschool and go on to have the best kind of education we possibly can have for everyone. Not only is that good for everyone, the people themselves, but it is good for our society. We cannot really have successful democracy unless we have educated citizens.

That is what we are talking about. It sounds easy: we are going to support schools, we are going to do this, we are going to do that. Then we think it out and say: How do we best do this? How do we get accountability? Where should the money come from? How important is it as compared to teaching expertise, for example? What does that have to do with buildings, facilities, and these things?

It is an interesting topic. I hope we will get to it soon. The bill before us will cover almost all these things. It will have to do with accountability. It will have to do with financial capacity. It will have to do with choice. It will have to do with how the money is spent and who decides that. I look forward to that.

I think the arrangements have been for the Senator from West Virginia to begin now, so I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The Senator from West Virginia.

BUSH TAX CUT PROPOSAL AND THE PSEUDO-RECESSION OF 2001

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, last Friday, the Commerce Department reported that the U.S. economy grew at a rate of 2 percent during the first 3 months of this year, January 2001 to March 2001. That is twice the rate that forecasters were projecting. It doubles the pace of late last year, October 2000 to December 2000.

Saturday's Washington Post quoted economist Jim Glassman of J.P. Morgan Securities saying:

These are great numbers. They suggest that the economy is not nearly as weak as was feared and that we are not close to being in a recession.

This information stands in stark contrast to what the administration has been telling the American people in recent months. In presenting his budget and tax cut proposals to a joint session of Congress on February 28, President Bush declared:

the long economic expansion that began almost 10 years ago is faltering.

As recently as March, White House aides warned that \$1.6 trillion in tax cuts were needed to avert an impending recession.

Contrary to the administration's dire warnings, the economy has continued its unbroken 10-year expansion—the longest economic expansion in U.S. history. The Nation's unemployment rate is near historic lows at 4.3 percent. Consumer spending increased from a 2.8 percent rate in February to a 3.1 percent rate in March. Construction

spending remains strong, business infrastructure investment is rising, manufacturing activity is inching up, and factory inventories are falling.

Even the stock markets—and we have learned that the stock market is not the economy—but even the stock markets are rebounding from their recent lows. The Dow Jones increased from 9,500 in early March to almost 10,900 yesterday—10,898.34—a 15 percent increase. The Nasdaq increased from 1,619 in March to 2,168 yesterday—a 34 percent increase.

In the midst of the Great Depression of 1932, which I lived through, President Franklin Roosevelt cautioned that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself. In the midst of the pseudo-recession of 2001, the only thing that the Bush administration has to fear is stirring up public doubt.

This administration has been walking a fine line between promoting the President's tax cut proposal on the one hand and alarming consumers and investors. The Bush administration has touted the President's tax cut plan as a possible "second wind for economic growth," so that bad economic news becomes good news for the tax cut.

That is the tune the administration plays.

The problem is that, in attacking an illusory problem through the bogus cure of massive tax cuts, this Administration creates two very real problems. It threatens our debt repayment efforts and cuts back on our ability to address a backlog of infrastructure needs.

Let's consider, for a moment, our national debt. The Congressional Budget Office projects that the national debt will increase from its current levels of \$5.7 trillion to \$6.7 trillion in FY 2011. The President's budget would set aside \$2 trillion to retire the national debt over the next ten years, but that number is based on two highly unlikely assumptions: (1) that \$5.6 trillion in budget surpluses will materialize in spite of CBO warnings that they might not, and (2) that discretionary spending should be limited to the unrealistically low numbers proposed by the President.

If the massive-permanent tax cuts are enacted, our debt retirement efforts may be compromised and that could significantly disrupt the financial markets, resulting in higher interest rates and slower economic growth.

An equally important concern is whether these tax cuts will allow us to adequately address this country's failing infrastructure. Roads, bridges, airport runways, mass transit systems, water and sewer systems, and energy delivery systems—we could go on and on—are vitally important to support thriving businesses. They enhance productivity. They provide jobs. They are basic to a strong economy.

Yet, according to the American Society of Civil Engineers, ASCE, one-third of the nation's major roads are in poor or mediocre condition, costing American drivers an estimated \$5.8 billion a year.

The latest ASCE survey revealed that 29 percent of the nation's bridges are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Airport capacity has increased only 1 percent in the past 10 years. No wonder airport congestion delayed nearly 50,000 flights in one month alone last year.

Due to aging, outdated facilities, and severe overcrowding, 75 percent of our nation's school buildings are inadequate to meet the needs of school children—to meet the needs of America's schoolchildren, tomorrow's citizens, and tomorrow's leaders.

The nation's 54,000 drinking water systems face an annual shortfall of \$11 billion to comply with federal water regulations.

Some of the nation's 16,000 wastewater systems are 100 years old. More than one-third of U.S. surface waters do not meet water quality standards.

These statistics show the infrastructure needs of a third-world nation, not the world's last remaining super power.

Furthermore, these statistics only reflect the gap between federal funding and our nation's physical infrastructure needs. What about our human infrastructure needs?

The Senate voted last month to set aside \$225 billion in tax cuts to finance investments in education.

The Senate also declared its intent to set aside \$300 billion for a prescription drug benefit—twice the amount allotted in the President's budget.

Medicare is estimated to have 45 million beneficiaries in 2015 (11 million more than 2000), yet the program will not have the resources to finance benefits after 2016, 15 years from now.

Let me say that again. This should be of interest to everybody in this country.

Medicare is estimated to have 45 million beneficiaries in 2015; yet the program will not have the resources to finance benefits after 2016.

Likewise, the Social Security program provides a financial safety net for our Nation's seniors; yet it will not be able to rely on payroll tax revenues after 2016.

Let me say that again, talking about the Social Security program.

I can remember when we didn't have any Social Security program in this country. I can remember when Franklin Delano Roosevelt and a Democratic Congress provided the Social Security program in the country.

Before that time, when people became too old to work, they either stood at the gates of their children with their hats in their hands hoping that their children would take them in, or, otherwise it was over the hill to the poorhouse. I can remember that.

All through the years, the workpeople of America, the people who have labored and earned their bread by the sweat of their brow, paid into that Social Security program as did their employers, and looked forward to the time when they could retire in dignity,

and not have to sit on the porch of the old county poor farm, and not have to call upon their children, who were already struggling, to take them in.

What do we see happening?

We see that the Social Security program provides the financial safety net for our Nation's seniors, yet it will not be able to rely on payroll tax revenues after 2016 just 15 years from now. Unless we plan now for this eventuality, where will the revenue come from to ensure that these retirement benefits are paid if the surpluses don't materialize?

Federal dollars also support high-technology research which, in turn, is transferred to the private sector to help domestic businesses compete more efficiently in the international market place.

Where will the money come from to finance these human infrastructure needs—if the kitty is blown—if the kitty is blown on tax cuts?

The reality of this year's budget process is that if the Senate decides to approve 10-year tax cuts as large as \$1.6 trillion, or even \$1.35 trillion or \$1.2 trillion, it is likely to do so at the expense of everything else that we owe to the American people.

You, the people as I am looking right into your eyes through that electronic camera behind the Presiding Officer's chair. It is you. Yes, it is your money, but it is also your Social Security program, it is your Medicare program. Whether you are young or whether you are old, it is going to affect you, the American people.

The administration is fond of saying that these projected surpluses are the people's money. And they are. Yes, it is the people's money. But what the American people expect for their tax dollars—modern and safe roads—safe roads on which they can take their children to the childcare center, on which they can go to church, on which they can go to school, on which they can go to the bank, on which they can go to the grocery store, on which they can go to work—safe roads, modern roads, clean drinking water, adequate health care, reliable retirement benefits, access to higher education, and better public schools.

The President's budget does not even allow for what the Congressional Budget Office says is necessary to maintain current services in such key areas as transportation, agriculture, and energy—we have an energy problem in this country, don't we?—and certainly does not provide what is necessary to address the backlog of infrastructure needs in education, health care, and a whole host of other areas.

Consider the following: Highways, bridges and transit: The President proposes to divert—yes, you heard me exactly; divert—\$430 million of TEA-21 funding in FY 2002 from highway construction to other transportation programs.

Schools: The President proposes to terminate the \$1.2 billion school construction program. How about that?

Drinking Water/Wastewater: The President proposes to reduce funding for EPA clean and safe drinking water by \$463 million and grant and loan levels for the rural water/wastewater by \$100 million.

I traveled around the world in 1955, 46 years ago. In most of the countries where I traveled, we did not find clean drinking water. We were told not to turn on the faucet, not to drink the tap water: Don't drink it. Boil it in advance. Oh, I saw many of the beautiful sights of the world—the Taj Mahal, the pyramids of Egypt, Angkor Wat in Cambodia—but the most beautiful sight I saw, after that 66 days of traveling around the world, were the two little lights, the two little red lights in the top of the Washington Monument when I flew back into National Airport at the end of that journey. And what a joy it was just to be able to go to the spigot in the kitchen and turn on the water and get a glass of fresh, clean, safe drinking water.

There are millions of people in this country today who cannot go to the water faucet and turn it on and get safe drinking water—right in this country. One does not have to go to Kandahar, one does not have to go to Afghanistan or to Pakistan or to Vietnam or to Korea in order to experience what I am talking about. Just go to West Virginia. There are some places in West Virginia where the people do not have safe, clean drinking water.

What about dams and navigable waterways?

The President proposes to reduce funding for the Corps of Engineers from \$4.5 billion to \$3.9 billion. The President proposes no new starts despite a backlog of \$38 billion of authorized but unfunded projects.

Hazardous waste disposal, what about that? Despite a \$13.6 billion backlog for cleaning up toxic sites on the national priority list, the administration proposes to freeze Superfund at the FY 2001 level. Freeze it. Do not increase it. Leave it at the 2001 level.

Instead of addressing the Nation's infrastructure needs, this administration chooses to devote its resources to a so-called fiscal stimulus, even though the economy seems to be correcting itself without one.

The President has said that the economic engine is beginning to sputter, and that tax cuts are needed to accelerate the economy. What good does it do to rev up the economic engine if the roads are in such a state of disrepair that they cannot be traveled? Even the fastest, most expensive, most shiny, glossy car in the world cannot travel over bridges that are dangerous, falling apart, and roads filled with potholes.

And one does not have to travel very far to see potholes. Just drive around in the Nation's Capital. Potholes—one sees on television the pictures of automobiles hitting those potholes and then having to go to the nearest garage to have the axle replaced. The tires are blown. Right here, in the city of potholes, Washington, DC. One does not

have to go to Mud, WV, or to Duck, WV, or to Sophia, WV. Just go to Washington, DC. The potholes are there.

Most people expect to get something for the taxes they pay. They expect clean, safe water. The taxpayers expect to see, modern highways, and transportation systems. They expect to see food free of toxics, a sound education system, decent health care, and safe streets and neighborhoods. The frustration comes when the taxpayers don't see their tax dollars working for them. We tell them their tax dollars are collected to buy these things that will improve their lives.

When we don't deliver, we break faith with our promise and we undermine the trust of the taxpayers. I say the people don't want their money back, they want their money's worth. We hear this refrain being sung. I can hear it now wafting its way in the refreshing air of May from the White House at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue: The people want their money back. No, I say; the people want their money's worth.

If I go to the grocery store with my wife Erma to buy food for the weekend, I don't want the grocery man to smile at me and say: I won't fill up your shopping cart but I will give you your money back. I don't want my money back; I want my money's worth.

When I hire a contractor to fix my roof if it is leaking, I don't want him to tell me he won't do the job but he will give me my money back. I want to be dry. I don't want the rain to come into my modest cottage. I don't want my money back; I want my money's worth.

If I take my old Chevrolet to a mechanic because it won't run, I don't want to be told that the car can't be fixed but I will get my money back. I don't want my money back. I want my money's worth. Fix my car. That is what the American people want. They want us to get the most from the taxes we collect. They want us to plan ahead and invest in our country. They want us to exercise stewardship in their best interest. They don't want us to creep up to them with our head down and with a long face and say to them: Here, you gave us this tax money. I hid it in a napkin. Here is your money back. No. That is like the unfaithful steward in the Biblical proverb.

The American people want to get the most from the taxes we collect. They want us to plan ahead and to invest in our country. They want us to do the basics that feed the economy, to allow for future growth and anticipate future change. We fail them if we don't do these things. We have failed them if we say: Here, just take your money back. The people can't repair highways. They can't build sewers and clean up water systems. They can't build new airports. They can't inspect the food supply. Government exists to take care of things that people cannot do on their own.

It also exists to make intelligent choices about future trends and to an-

ticipate needs. How can we do that if we squander our ability to make investments for the future because of huge tax cuts, huge tax give-backs now, based on projections which may not be real?

The Associated Press is reporting today that President Bush has struck a deal with the Republican leadership on a so-called budget deal. Further, I understand that the House and Senate Budget Committee chairmen are rushing to file the budget resolution conference report this evening. This is another example, if it is true, of the President and the Republican leadership disregarding the President's promise to bring bipartisanship back to Washington.

The House and Senate took up the budget resolution without a detailed President's budget. For the first time in its history, the Senate Budget Committee did not mark up the budget resolution. And now we hear we will have a budget resolution conference report that was produced without the involvement of the ranking members of the House and Senate Budget Committees, also without any input by the ranking members of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees.

So what is in this conference report? We do not have the report, but according to the press reports, it contains \$1.35 trillion for tax cuts over 11 years and it limits discretionary spending to a 5-percent increase for fiscal year 2002.

Where is the bipartisanship? I am not in on such a deal. I am the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. Where is the bipartisanship? The Administration puts on a big show, having invited everybody down to the White House. Where is the bipartisanship in this budget conference report, if what we are reading in the press is true?

I am also told that it contains budget process provisions, such as a defense firewall, that were in neither the House nor Senate resolutions.

What will be the effect of a 5-percent increase for discretionary programs? That is what I hear: Discretionary will be 5 percent.

At best, this level provides only enough of an increase for nondefense programs to maintain last year's funding levels, adjusted for inflation. This level will leave no resources for increases that we all know are necessary for education, for infrastructure, for research and development, and for promoting our energy independence. What about Social Security or Medicare?

The increases being debated on the floor for elementary and secondary education this week could not be funded, to say nothing of other education programs such as Pell grants. During debate on the budget resolution in the Senate over twenty amendments were adopted to add discretionary spending. Almost half of those amendments were offered by Republicans. Where are we going to get the money to pay for increases for veterans' medical care, the

Wellstone and Bond amendment, or for fossil fuel programs, or for the National Science Foundation, the Bond and Mikulski amendment, for food safety, the Clinton amendment, for conservation funding, the Murkowski amendment, for energy research, the Reid amendment, or for law enforcement, the Leahy amendment? The President proposes to cut State and local law enforcement by over \$1 billion. Where will the money come from to restore those cuts? Where will the money come from to add funds for health centers, the Bond amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD. And what about our Nation's infrastructure? Where will we get the money to restore the cuts proposed for clean water and safe drinking water, for the Corps of Engineers, and for school construction?

Very often in this country, there seems to be nothing on our radar screen except the immediate, the here and now. We think no further than next week, next year or the next election. Where are we if our leaders fashion fiscal policy on such things, on such bases? Where are we as a Nation if the most vision we can muster is a colossal tax cut for the wealthy that may jeopardize such basics as our ability to ensure a clean water supply to all of our citizens? It is a hollow vision. It is a vision that appeals to greed. It is a vision that fails to ask us to pull together as Americans for the good of the whole country. It is a vision that sets up a patchwork quilt of a nation, with areas of prosperity next to areas of poverty. It is a vision that makes a hollow joke out of the word "bipartisanship." It is a "fold your hands," "you do it" vision, based on an ideology and an experiment that failed in the 1980's. Most people in West Virginia won't benefit from this tax cut, but they will suffer from the continued lack of investment in the basics. They are not by themselves. West Virginians won't be suffering alone. There will be others like them in every State of the Union. They don't want their money back. I am talking about my constituents. They don't want their money back; they want their money's worth.

I implore this administration to take off the dark sunglasses and think about that word "bipartisanship" and lift its nose from the ideological bible of the tax cut religion. Let me say that again. I implore this administration to lift its nose from the ideological bible of the tax cut religion. There is much more to keeping faith with the American people than tax give-backs for the better off.

Building a strong Nation does not just mean building another weapons system. Building a strong Nation means giving our people the basics, the education, the health, the opportunity

to compete in an increasingly global economy. It means providing the roads, transportation, water and sewer facilities which support a thriving economy and allow the people to follow their dreams.

This morning's newspapers reported that the Republican leadership had reached a tentative deal on the overall amount of tax cuts that can be passed by the Senate. I noted that no deal has yet been reached with regard to discretionary spending, although a consensus seems to be consolidating around a 5-percent figure. That is not bipartisanship. Where was I? Where were the ranking members? Where were the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Appropriations Committee in this deal? Where is the ranking member of the Senate Budget Committee in this deal? Does the White House call this bipartisanship?

I hope the Senators will give due recognition to the real threats facing this country—the declining state of our infrastructure and our national debt—and not chase will-o'-the-wisp, pseudo-recessions, and money-back guarantees that cannot deliver the goods.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

BETTER EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we have had a lot of conversation on the floor in the last week about education, and given that education is the No. 1 issue before us and the one that, according to the polls, is the No. 1 issue on the minds of most Americans, I think that is appropriate. So I am going to join in that conversation and make some comments on education tonight. I trust I will have an opportunity to make some comments on education a little later on as the debate proceeds.

Members of this body have heard me before talk about my experience as far as education is concerned. It was the educational issue that got me back into public life. I was enjoying a career as a businessman at a relatively prosperous organization. I was the chief executive officer, so I got to make a lot of decisions. For example, I got to choose what kind of health care I had. None of the other employees got to do that, the way the health care system works in America, but I did because I was the chief executive.

I got a phone call from the chair of the Utah State Board of Education asking if I would serve as a member of the strategic planning commission for that body, and I agreed. Then she called back a little later and said, "We want you to chair." I said, "Well, all right." So I became chairman of that planning commission and immersed myself in issues of education.

It was a wonderful experience. The most distressing part of it is that hap-

pened over 10 years ago, and as I sit here in this Chamber and listen to the debate on education, it hits me that nothing has changed. The issues that were prominent 10, 15 years ago are still the issues we are dealing with, and that is very depressing.

I go back to a comment that was made to me by one of the employees of the Utah State Board of Education when we were talking about changes that needed to be made. He said to me, "Bob, don't be so hard on us. We are changing. We are changing a little bit all the time. It is just that we are not changing as fast as you want us to change. Some of the things you are asking us to do, it will take us 15 years to do."

I stopped and pointed out to him that 15 years is longer than it takes a child entering school in kindergarten to graduate from high school. I said, "In other words, you are saying if we come to the conclusion that this is the right thing to do, no one currently in Utah schools will get the benefit of that. A whole 15-year cycle could go by and somebody could enter kindergarten and graduate from high school without getting the benefit of something we decide now has to be done."

The depressing thing is that conversation took place close to 15 years ago and we are still having the same debates around here.

I have put up a chart, which the Senator from Maine, SUSAN COLLINS, has used. I want to refer to it again because we need to reinforce a fundamental truth. The source for the chart is the National Center For Education Statistics, in the Digest of Education Statistics. The red line is expenditures on education in 1999 dollars. So these are constant dollars adjusted for inflation. Back in 1971, this is where they were, and now you see the line goes up. This is where they are today. It is roughly double the dollar amount. Here are the reading scores; it is absolutely flat. The yellow line is the fourth grade; it is absolutely flat. The eighth grade is also absolutely flat. The 12th grade is absolutely flat.

We keep spending more and more money on education and keep getting exactly the same results. The former Senator from New York, Mr. Moynihan, once made a comment while looking at a chart that was even more distressing than this, where the expenditures per pupil were going up and reading scores were going down, and with his sense of humor and sense of irony he said, "Maybe we can postulate that spending more money on education causes education to get worse, because that is the trend line. The more we spend, the worse things are."

Well, this chart indicates, at least, that the more we spend, the more things stay the same. If we are satisfied with what we are getting in education right now, then all we should do is leave things exactly as they are but spend more money on them. We will get exactly the same results we have

been getting for the last 20 years. We will spend more money and we won't get anything any better.

Unfortunately, as I listen to speeches in this Chamber, particularly the speeches from those who are disappointed with President Bush's proposal, I discover that there is an interesting attitude in Washington: If a program is good, Washington says spend more money on it. If a program is bad, Washington says spend more money on it. They don't seem to differentiate between one situation and the other because they have a one-size-fits-all solution, which is to spend more money. It makes us feel good to spend more money. It makes us feel good to be able to go home to town meetings and say, as I have said—I fall into the same category when somebody starts attacking me on education—I have voted to increase the budget on education every time since I have been in the Senate. That kind of shuts them up. They can't attack Senator BENNETT for being anti-education if he promises to keep spending more money on education. They never ask me the fundamental question: What have you done to change the system so that it gets better?

What have you done to change the system so that the reading scores start to go up? Well, that is a little harder. It is much easier to say, well, I voted to spend more money, and send me to Washington and I will vote to spend more money.

President Bush wants to spend more money on education. A lot of people say, boy, that is unusual for a Republican. The Democrat reaction is, we want to spend even more money than President Bush wants to spend, and we are back in the same Washington trap, which is, if it is a good program, spend more money on it; if it is a bad program, fix it by spending more money on it.

We need to get away from that. We need to break out of that syndrome and say: Let's not spend more money; let's spend smarter money; let's begin to demand a return on our investment; let's begin to say this is not good enough and we are not going to give you more money until we can be convinced that the money we are spending is producing better results.

That brings me smack into the issue that has been discussed today, which is fully funding title I.

That is a great political hot button: we must fully fund title I. That is why it is not working. That is why we are not getting the effectiveness. We have only funded it to this level, and we should be funding it to that level.

That is a great way to put off this decision. That is a great way to continue doing what we have been doing without facing the fundamental question, which is, Why has title I not been effective? Is there a possibility there is a reason other than the fact that we have not been spending enough money on it?

Oh, that is very hard to discuss in Washington because, as I say, the all-