

If we take those two numbers and split the difference, if we add them up and divide them, we get \$386 million per year as an average estimate just to comply with this one single rule.

Taking a look at this rule, let's use our own pay ratio test. In 2014, the Bureau of Labor Statistics calculated that the annual mean wage was \$47,230. If we divide \$386 million, which is the cost of complying with the pay ratio rule, by \$47,230, which is the mean annual wage for workers, we get the number 8,172. This means that on average we could pay 8,172 people their full salary for the amount of money it takes to comply with the pay ratio rule. Remember, this is only one of 398 such rules found within Dodd-Frank, a number of which have not even been implemented yet.

The money they would use to do this has to come from somewhere to pay for the new compliance systems required to follow this rule, taking away much needed capital from businesses that could otherwise invest money growing their business and creating job opportunities. It is a waste of time, effort, and money.

The legislation I introduced yesterday simply strikes this rule in Dodd-Frank. It does nothing to change any other part of the law. Repealing the pay ratio rule would allow companies to find more productive uses for their time and money so they can invest in the future and create job opportunities.

I am committed to relieving Americans from this and other unnecessary and burdensome regulations during my time in the Senate. I encourage my colleagues to join me in this effort.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EVERY CHILD ACHIEVES ACT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on an amendment that has great significance for our country. It is about early learning. I will give you the formal name of the amendment so we have it for the record: Casey amendment No. 2152, the strong start for America's children amendment, which is an amendment to the Every Child Achieves Act that will establish a Federal-State partnership to provide access to high-quality and public pre-kindergarten education for low- and moderate-income families.

We have had a debate, especially over the last couple of days, about our commitment to basic education, so-called elementary and secondary education. As part of that, I think it is the time to finally, at long last, have a debate about early learning on the floor of the

U.S. Senate. It has been a long time since that has happened.

I thank the folks who have made it possible for us to get to this point to consider an amendment like this and to have this debate about the larger legislation but also about this amendment, in particular. Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY were leading the effort to consider the Every Child Achieves Act, but also, in particular, I again salute Senator MURRAY for her many years, as you might call it, laboring in the vineyards of early learning, as she has done on so many other issues—since the first stage, she has been in the Senate working on early learning. I thank Senator HIRONO for her work on this issue as well, in proposing legislation which has come together now after a lot of years of work by a number of us in the Senate. We are grateful for their contribution.

I also ask unanimous consent to add Senator BOOKER as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, what this comes down to is something very fundamental. The basic link between learning and earning—if children learn more now or learn more when they are very young, they are going to earn a lot more down the road. They are going to do better in school. They are going to succeed in progressing in school in a way we would hope, no matter where they live and no matter what their circumstances, if we make the commitment to those children. Because of that success and progress and learning, they will learn more down the road. We know a more developed education leads to great success in school and also leads to a better job down the road.

This isn't simply a commitment to a child. It certainly is that first and foremost, but it is also a commitment to our long-term economic future. If you want higher wages and you want better jobs and you want a growing economy and you want America not only to compete in a world economy but outcompete and have the best workforce, the best workers in the world, we have to make sure we have the best education system. That starts long before a child gets to first or second grade and even starts before they get to kindergarten. That is why I refer to this as pre-K or prekindergarten education. If they learn more now, they will learn more later. We have to make sure we bear that in mind.

As we debate the appropriate role of the Federal Government to ensure that all students in the Nation graduate from high school prepared for college and career, we cannot forget about this basic piece of the puzzle that begins before that child enters kindergarten.

In the short term, students enter kindergarten more prepared and ready for elementary school if we pass legislation like the amendment I am proposing. Some studies have even shown high-quality early learning can help double a child's cognitive development.

High quality and early learning can double a child's cognitive development.

In the long term, high-quality early learning—we want to emphasize “high quality.” I didn't say just any program or any kind of curriculum. We will talk more about that later. High-quality early learning contributes to, among other things, No. 1, a reduction in the need for special education; No. 2, lower juvenile justice rates; No. 3, improved health outcomes; No. 4, increased high school graduation and college matriculation rates; and, No. 5, increased self-sufficiency in productivity among families. These aren't just assertions. These are the results of many years of study.

I will turn to the first chart for today. No. 1, high-quality early learning means children can earn as much as 25 percent more as adults. This is where early learning has a direct and substantial correlation to higher wages down the road. No. 2, early learning leads to healthier and more productive lives. There is no question about that. Some of the best research on this has been done lately and should be part of the discussion. No. 3, high-quality early learning also leads to children who are less likely to commit a crime. All the data shows that over many years now. No. 4, high-quality early learning means children are more likely to graduate from high school.

We need to get that number up across the country. We hope that will lead to more young people finishing high school and getting higher education, but that doesn't always mean a 4-year degree. It might mean a 2-year degree. It might mean a community college. It might mean a technical school. They can't get to a community or technical school or any kind of higher education unless they graduate from high school. We want to make sure we have programs that do that. Kids learn more now and earn more later. That is the first reason to do this. It has a positive impact on that child and a substantially positive impact on the economy.

The other way to look at this is what would happen in the absence of this kind of commitment, which we don't have right now as a nation. I think it is a strategic imperative that we have a commitment to early learning. But what happens if we don't? We can spend upward of \$40,000 per inmate on incarceration, thousands of dollars on drug treatment and special education. Whatever the challenge is, those problems become worse the longer we don't make this commitment. That is one option.

The other option is to spend a fraction of that \$40,000 on high-quality preschool and give children the good and smart start they need in life. It is that old adage: An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

We often have the best testimony from folks in our home State. I want to read one of those pieces of testimony. This is a letter I received. I will not read the whole letter. I want to refer to

a couple of individuals from Pennsylvania. Heather is from Southwestern Pennsylvania, and she wrote to us talking about her child. She is talking about the fact that her daughter is enrolled in a high-quality pre-K program. These are positive testimonials about the impact on the child and on the family. Heather, from southwestern Pennsylvania, wrote to us and told us that her daughter is enrolled in a high-quality pre-K program. These letters are positive testimonials that describe the impact this program has on a child and family.

Heather says in pertinent part:

My daughter has blossomed since starting the PA Pre-K Counts program . . . she loves it!! She sings us songs she learns daily and has made lots of friends daily she tells us how much she loves her school and her teachers!

It goes on from there.

Another letter from Dorie D., also from the southwestern corner of our State, out near Pittsburgh, says:

Our daughter has blossomed since starting the PA Pre-K Counts program. Having this program available to us has helped us see how our child learns best.

She goes on to say:

She is just so much more animated and open to learning now.

We get letters like these all the time about the positive impact of early learning. This is testimony from people who are directly affected by it.

One way to look at this is from the testimony of families. Another way to look at it is from the data. One of the best authorities is Dr. James Heckman, the Nobel Prize-winning economist who estimates that the return on high-quality early learning is as high as \$10 for every \$1 we invest. Another study of the Perry Preschool Project in Michigan showed a return of \$17 for every \$1 spent. So when you spend a buck on early learning, you get 17 bucks in return. This study has been on the record for many years, and unfortunately some elected officials haven't taken it to heart.

The data of return on investment is overwhelming and indisputable. So if we want to measure this in terms of dollars, there is all of the evidence in the world. I think the evidence and the testimony from parents is even more persuasive, but if we want to do a dollar comparison, there it is—17 bucks returned on 1 buck of investment in early learning.

The same research found that children who participated in high-quality early learning earned approximately 25 percent more per year than those who did not.

So study after study looking at full-day learning programs across the country have found a positive impact on the future earnings of participants, and in some cases the benefit just from increased wages could be as high as 3.5 percent per year. So this does have a direct correlation to wages. My strong start amendment would help more than 3 million American children have that

opportunity for high-quality early learning, and it would give them access to those kinds of programs.

My home State of Pennsylvania has made strides in this direction at the State level. That is the good news. The bad news is that they have not made anywhere near the strides we need to make. We are nowhere near 50 percent of our children in these kinds of programs. So because of that, because of that void or that deficit, the number for Pennsylvania in terms of benefits is high. It is estimated that 93,930 children in the State of Pennsylvania could benefit from this amendment being enacted into law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the document entitled "Five-Year Estimates of Federal Allotments and the Number of Children Served By Casey Strong Start Amendment" be printed in the RECORD.

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

FIVE-YEAR ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL ALLOTMENTS AND THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED BY CASEY STRONG START AMENDMENT

(funding in dollars)

State	Federal Allotment \$	Estimated Children Served
Alabama	429,922,966	51,804
Alaska	130,998,000	15,643
Arizona	656,508,117	80,170
Arkansas	315,518,722	34,630
California	3,139,171,848	356,816
Colorado	366,496,715	43,250
Connecticut	199,660,755	21,673
Delaware	130,998,000	15,789
District of Columbia	130,998,000	12,666
Florida	1,440,455,110	161,553
Georgia	917,616,106	101,756
Hawaii	130,998,000	16,099
Idaho	153,654,734	18,800
Illinois	961,484,302	108,064
Indiana	530,095,397	65,147
Iowa	241,549,933	26,707
Kansas	259,275,568	30,942
Kentucky	411,598,742	47,475
Louisiana	455,185,965	52,223
Maine	130,998,000	15,427
Maryland	361,451,446	40,378
Massachusetts	268,510,976	30,552
Michigan	704,261,046	82,020
Minnesota	341,519,863	41,581
Mississippi	341,868,957	42,015
Missouri	448,967,945	54,565
Montana	130,998,000	16,099
Nebraska	147,742,118	17,666
Nevada	252,190,201	30,808
New Hampshire	130,998,000	16,099
New Jersey	448,992,376	42,744
New Mexico	227,159,310	27,175
New York	1,234,026,608	137,136
North Carolina	872,086,515	101,598
North Dakota	130,998,000	16,099
Ohio	976,595,679	118,760
Oklahoma	323,544,733	34,739
Oregon	292,466,846	33,472
Pennsylvania	817,003,895	93,930
Puerto Rico	453,536,785	55,738
Rhode Island	130,998,000	16,035
South Carolina	514,947,370	61,478
South Dakota	130,998,000	16,099
Tennessee	585,849,305	68,313
Texas	2,670,071,687	299,902
Utah	283,952,191	34,897
Vermont	130,998,000	15,224
Virginia	461,782,685	53,967
Washington	511,392,470	60,180
West Virginia	150,649,562	15,676
Wisconsin	455,857,852	50,212
Wyoming	130,998,000	16,099
Total	26,199,600,001	3,017,891

Notes: Table prepared by the Congressional Research Service. Estimates were developed using assumptions and some may not be subject to change. Estimates of children served assume the cost of serving each child would be \$9,000 per child in every state.

Mr. CASEY. That is a list of the dollar amounts that States would receive under this. They have to choose to participate, but if they did, they would have not just the dollars for it but the

children served. So my amendment would benefit 3 million children across the country and almost 94,000 children in Pennsylvania. In Ohio, 118,760 children would benefit from this program. Even a very large State that might not have the investment we would hope, a State such as Texas, has 299,902 children—let's just round it off and call it 300,000—who would benefit.

This chart shows the number of children who would benefit, and I believe it is long overdue that we made this commitment to our children.

The State would have to match, and that is why I mentioned it at the beginning. This is a Federal and State partnership. And we know if that happens, the full-day preschool would be available for 4-year-olds—that is the age category we are focused on—from families earning 200 percent below the Federal poverty level. So if it is a family of four, 200 percent is a little less than \$49,000 of family income.

Earlier, I mentioned quality. We don't want to just have programs set up around the country—a Federal and State partnership and have a program. That would be nice, but it won't advance the goal of the best possible learning. We want high-quality programs. So we insist that the programs be ones that have teachers with high qualifications who are paid comparably to K-through-12 teachers. We would also insist that there be rigorous health and safety standards for these programs, such as small class sizes and low child-to-staff ratios, and instruction that is evidence-based and developmentally appropriate. We don't want to have just any curriculum; we want to have the best curriculum that is based on evidence that it works and also evidence-based comprehensive services for children.

This amendment acknowledges that high-quality pre-K programs should be inclusive of services for children with disabilities as well and recognizes the need for increased funding to specifically serve these children in early childhood.

There are other aspects of the program I do not have time to discuss right now, but I wanted to address an issue some people have brought to my attention. This program is a new commitment by the United States of America, and even folks who say this is a really good idea ask: How do you pay for it?

Well, we have a pay-for. There is a change to the Tax Code, which I think a lot of folks would support because of what we have seen over the last couple of years. To pay for this, we would put limits on the ability of American companies to invert and move their tax domicile overseas to reduce their tax liability. That is a long way of saying we would make it more difficult for companies to engage in this so-called inversion strategy which allows them, through a loophole, to pay less taxes because they move operations into a smaller company that is foreign owned.

I believe we should make it more difficult for companies to do that. If they want to do that—I don't like when they do that, and not many people like it—we should at least make it a little more difficult. If we make it more difficult for companies to do what we hope they wouldn't, that will actually lead to a savings in revenue.

It would make a lot of sense for American companies that believe they should move overseas to help us pay for early learning. I think that makes all the sense in the world if we are committed to early learning and if we are committed to making sure we can pay for the program. The amendment itself is paid for by dealing with this loophole or dealing with part of an advantage companies have.

This amendment is supported by nearly 40 national organizations, from unions, to parent education and early learning groups, disability advocacy groups, and civil rights groups.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full list of endorsing organizations printed in the RECORD.

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

List of Organizations Endorsing Casey Amendment #2152 to S. 1177—The Strong Start for America's Children Amendment

1. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees
2. American Federation of Teachers
3. American Federation of School Administrators
4. Bazelon Center
5. Child Care Aware America
6. Center for American Progress Action Fund
7. Center for the Collaborative Classroom
8. Children's Defense Fund
9. Center for Law and Social Policy
10. Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning
11. Common Sense Kids Action
12. Easter Seals
13. Education Law Center
14. First Five Year's Fund
15. First Focus Campaign for Children
16. Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights
17. Learning Disabilities Association of America
18. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
19. National Association for the Education of Young Children
20. National Association of Councils on Developmental Disabilities
21. National Association of Elementary School Principals
22. National Association of School Psychologists
23. National Association of State Directors of Special Education
24. National Black Child Development Institute
25. National Center for Families Learning
26. National Council of La Raza
27. National Urban League
28. National Women's Law Center
29. National Education Association
30. Nemours Children's Health System
31. Parents as Teachers
32. School Social Work Association of America
33. Service Employee International Union
34. Teach For America
35. Teaching Strategies

36. The Committee for Children
37. The National Down Syndrome Congress
38. Tourette Association of America
39. Zero to Three

Mr. CASEY. Just a couple of more points, and I will move on.

Even with these recent gains, according to one of the national groups that track this data, the National Institute of Early Education and Research, NIEER, shows that only 4 in 10 American 4-year-olds are enrolled in public pre-K and fewer than 2 in 10 3-year-olds. Let's just focus on the 4-year-olds. Four in ten 4-year-olds are in these kinds of programs.

I don't know how we can compete and have the best workforce in the world and develop the highest skill level in the world for our future if we don't make a commitment to early learning. I don't know how else we can get there over time if we are going to continue to talk a good game about early learning. And to listen to the testimony of parents, CEOs, and business owners who come to us year after year, in addition to talking to us about taxation and other issues—they say: Please, please make an investment in early learning. Some of the biggest companies in Pennsylvania and some of the biggest companies in the world have come to us and said that. Whether it is a CEO or a parent or an educator, they all believe we have to finally, at long last, make a commitment to early learning as a nation because it is a strategic economic imperative.

Even in Pennsylvania, where I mentioned before that we made some strides over basically the last decade or 15 years, we rank 10th in the amount of State resources invested. That is kind of good news but not enough. Pennsylvania is still only able to serve less than 10 percent of all 3- and 4-year-olds in State funding for early learning.

I think that at the same time we can make the academic arguments—the arguments by parents and educators and CEOs—we also know that the national data and polling show it is something the American people support as well. The American people understand the vital importance of increasing investment in early learning.

A national poll conducted last year by the bipartisan team at Public Opinion Strategies and Hart Research showed that 64 percent of Americans believe we should be doing more to ensure that children start kindergarten ready to do their best.

Here is another way to summarize it. This chart shows voters who say we should be doing more to ensure that children start kindergarten ready to do their best, and virtually no one else says we should do less. Those who say we should do more to ensure our children start kindergarten ready to learn and ready to do their best—64 percent. Twenty-seven percent say we should do enough. We have to persuade some of those folks in green. Only 4 percent say we should do less. I don't know who those folks are. I hope I can meet them

and talk to them. But the overwhelming majority of Americans say we need to do more to give children the opportunity to be prepared to learn and therefore to have a strong start in their education and down the road to literally earn more when they are working.

This support runs across all parties—55 percent of Republicans, 63 percent of Independents, and 73 percent of Democrats.

When asked about a similar proposal to the one in my amendment, 7 in 10 Americans, including 67 percent of Republicans, support it. So it has overwhelming support.

I will end with the words of the folks who know the benefit of these programs already—some of the parents who wrote to us. There are two more letters I will cite.

The next testimonial is from Beth. She is from Washington County, PA. She expresses gratitude for the Pennsylvania pre-K program. She says:

My daughter has learned so much. Before the start of PA Pre-K Counts, she couldn't write any of her letters or even recognize them. She has improved so much since the first day of class. It has given her socialization with other kids her age.

She goes on to tell how much that means to her family and how much that means to her daughter.

Finally, Megan, who is from the other end of the State, southeastern Pennsylvania in Montgomery County, says in part that her son “came into this program shy and with very little verbal communication. He now talks nonstop and loves learning!”

I have only read brief excerpts from letters we have received.

Here is the point: If a child enters a program and by the end of that is curious about learning, that is a huge success. If a child enters a program not knowing her letters and by the end of that she is learning and achieving, that is something we can all be positive about.

The first letter I read talked about the way one mother's child was singing songs that she learns daily. Whatever it is, whether it is singing or learning letters or reading, these children are learning because of a good program. It didn't just happen by accident. It happened because they are in a high-quality program. It happened because in some communities they made the decision to invest in the future of that child and the future of our economy.

So let's take a step with this amendment to allow children to learn more now so they can earn more later and help us move into the future in a very positive direction for our children, for our families, and for our economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in strong support of an amendment to this underlying bill that addresses resource equity in our Nation's schools. I am proud to have

worked across party lines to join my colleagues in supporting this bipartisan amendment, particularly to have worked with Senators KIRK, REED of Rhode Island, and BROWN on this measure. It is an improvement to the long-overdue reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that we have been debating over the course of this week.

The Every Child Achieves Act importantly focuses on ensuring that those students most in need have access to a high-quality education. It continues to ensure that title I funds flow to school districts where Federal support can make the greatest impact and the most difference. It requires States to report key information that will help us identify disparities such as per-pupil expenditures, school discipline, and teacher and educator quality. But I believe we must further strengthen those reporting requirements in order to fully ensure that the range of critical school resources—from quality teachers, to rigorous course work, to well-conditioned and equipped school facilities—is being equitably distributed among school districts in a given State. And we must require States to demonstrate how they will act to address disparities among schools.

Despite the advances we have seen since President Johnson signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act into law 50 years ago, significant gaps in achievement and opportunity still exist. The U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights recently published data from a comprehensive survey of schools across the Nation that illustrated the magnitude of the problem. For example, the report describes how Black, Latino, American Indian, and Native Alaskan students and English learners attend schools with higher concentrations of inexperienced teachers.

Furthermore, nationwide, one in five high schools lacks a school counselor, and between 10 and 25 percent of high schools across the Nation do not offer more than one of the core courses in the typical sequence of high school math and science.

In my home State of Wisconsin, higher poverty and higher minority school districts remain more likely to have inexperienced teachers. The Department of Education has data that shows that, for example, in Milwaukee, where there are the most high-poverty and high-minority schools in our State, 8 percent of teachers are in their first year of teaching and 19 percent of teachers lack State certification. The State average is 5.6 percent for first-year teachers and 0.3 percent for those who lack certification.

As with the Nation, achievement gaps follow these disparities. According to data from the National Center for Education Statistics, there are startling differences in student proficiency and graduation rates both in Wisconsin and nationally. For example, the average math proficiency in low-per-

forming schools in my home State is 12 percent. The average in all other schools in the State is 51 percent. That is a huge gap; it is a 40-percent gap. There is also a 37-percent gap for reading and language arts proficiency and a 31-percent gap in graduation rates.

We cannot close those achievement gaps if we do not provide all students with equal access to core educational resources. That is why I am pleased to join Senators KIRK, REED, and BROWN in offering this opportunity dashboard of core resources amendment. This amendment requires each State to report what key educational resources are currently available in districts with the highest concentrations of minority students and students in poverty. Then it requires them to develop a plan to address the disparities that are shown to exist. It gives States flexibility to develop those plans and lay out a timetable with annual benchmarks for taking action, and it protects a parent's right to know about the critical educational resources that are available to his or her child.

As we work to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in its 50th year, we have yet to see its promise of equal access to educational opportunity fulfilled for all of America's students. As we look to the next half-century of supporting public education, it is critical that we take steps to ensure that all children have access to the educational resources that will help them succeed, regardless of race, ethnicity, or family income.

I understand there may be a vote on this amendment early next week. I certainly hope so. I urge my colleagues to support this very important bipartisan effort.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXPERIMENTS IN POLICY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, when I return home to my State during our district work periods—the time when the Senate is not in session—as I get a chance to travel my State, as the Presiding Officer does in his, I always feel as though I learn something, and I appreciate a little bit more how different policies can have a different impact and produce different results.

As the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin was speaking about the importance of education, I couldn't help but think that we all agree with that, but we have maybe some differences on which policies actually produce a better result. I couldn't help but think a little bit about that last week as I was visiting some of the ranchers and folks

in west Texas in the ag sector who were very interested in what we were doing here in Washington on trade promotion authority, as we have worked with the President on a bipartisan basis to pass this structure by which the next big trade agreement—the Trans-Pacific Partnership—will be considered and voted on.

I do have a bias. I think experiments in policy are best conducted at the State level, not at the national level. We have seen, for example, as the Presiding Officer knows, a huge experiment in health care reform where, under the Affordable Care Act, one-sixth of our economy was effectively commandeered by the Federal Government in a one-size-fits-all approach. Of course, the results were much worse than even its most ardent opponents predicted. Many of the basic promises that were made in order to sell the Affordable Care Act simply aren't true. They haven't come to pass.

So I think it is helpful to do just the opposite. Rather than experiment at the national level with what kinds of policies actually work, let's try these at the State level. Indeed, on the matter of trade, I would say I come from a State that is the No. 1 exporting State in the country, and that is one reason why our economy grew last year—2014—at 5.2 percent. The economy across the United States grew at 2.2 percent. There are a lot of reasons for that difference, but don't we think it would make some people curious about whether there were actually policies or practices at the State level that produced a better result—a growing economy with rising wages and more jobs?

This isn't just me being proud of where I come from. I guess people are accustomed to Texans being proud of their State and bragging about it. That is just kind of who we are, and we accept that. But this is more than that. This is talking about the policies that actually work, that have been embraced and implemented here at the national level, once tested at the State level—we could actually see a better outcome for all of America.

For example, Texas farmers and ranchers know from our experience in Texas that trade is a good thing. As we begin to explain and explore the importance of trade promotion authority, the idea that we comprise roughly 5 percent of the world's population—in other words, 95 percent of the world's population is beyond our shores but we represent 20 percent of the world's purchasing power—why wouldn't we want to open up our goods and services and the things we grow and make to these markets abroad so that more people can buy the things we grow and raise and what we make?

I wish to speak about another innovation or at least another practice at the State level that has had an impact on the quality of education at the State level. As we continue the discussion of the Every Child Achieves Act—