

happen. Some school districts are considering shortening the school year in order to be able to live within their budget. Some schools no longer have money to hire substitute teachers for the remainder of the school year.

We have a responsibility to ensure that every individual has the opportunity to receive a high-quality education, from prekindergarten to elementary and secondary, to special education, to technical and higher education and beyond. Unfortunately, any gains that have been made in education achievement are currently in jeopardy due to the lack of funds at the local, State, and Federal levels.

There is nothing more important to our Nation's future, to our homeland security, and to our economy than ensuring we have a top-notch educational system that is the envy of the world.

I call on the Bush administration to make education funding and our children's future a higher national priority.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. President, I also want to briefly discuss the Bush administration's record on environmental issues.

As the ranking member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, I am sorry to report that the Bush administration continues to move us backward instead of forward in our efforts to protect our environment.

Weekly, usually on Friday afternoons, when the press is all asleep, or whatever, the Bush administration stages the below-radar attacks on public health and the environment. The administration ignores the abundant proof of imminent and long-term threats from pollution that endanger our lives and our ecosystems.

Today and every day since the administration took office, approximately 82 people will have died prematurely due to sickness and lung disease caused by fine particulate matter from powerplant pollution, which could and should be prevented.

Today and every day since the administration took office, up to 160 acres of vital wetlands have been converted for development or paved over. Instead of trying to slow the rate of wetlands destruction, the administration is seeking to ease existing wetlands protection.

Today and every day since the administration took office, the Nation adds around 16 million tons of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere, each year contributing 25 percent of the world's total carbon. This raises the risk and threat of global warming.

Shortly after being sworn in, the President reversed his commitment to control greenhouse gases and has not looked back once. I am afraid the Bush administration's environmental policies have been more focused on protecting the special interests than protecting the air and water and land that we all share.

In closing, on the issues of education funding and the environment, I am

afraid our Nation has taken two steps back rather than one step forward. I can only hope that for the good of this Nation we can come together and once again move this Nation in the right direction.

How much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators have 10 minutes of their 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I reserve the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, Senator REID asked if I could extend this time until 3:30. I make that unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in my capacity as a Senator from Alaska, objects.

CONCERNS OF CALIFORNIANS

Mrs. BOXER. All right. Madam President, I was here earlier to discuss the State of the Union as I saw it in California, and I reported that my constituents—Democrats, Republicans, Independents, young, and old—are very anxious about where we are. They are anxious when they see that we had a surplus that, in 2 short years, has turned into a raging deficit. They are anxious that we are on the brink of war without a lot of our allies coming along. They are anxious about their pension plans. Many are having to work longer and harder because of what happened with the stock market losing trillions of dollars in value. They are anxious about seeing a Nation that has lost its way on foreign policy and domestic policy. They have asked me to address some of these issues in every way that I can.

This afternoon, I am here to address the issue of the environment. I am very proud that Senator JEFFORDS is here on the floor, because he is fighting very hard for clean air. He has introduced legislation—the Clean Power Act—to take on the challenges we face with 2 billion tons of carbon dioxide, which causes global warming; 45 million tons of mercury, which poisons fish and endangers the health of children and pregnant women; 6 million tons of nitrogen oxide, which creates smog and causes asthma; and 13 million tons of sulfur dioxide, which causes acid rain, premature death, and lung disease. He has authored a very good bill to cure this problem.

The administration is not supporting his bill. They have written their own bill called "Clear Skies." Many I know are calling it "dirty skies." If we would just leave the Clean Air Act intact, as it is, we would clean up the air far faster than this administration rollback. That is just one more example of a series of rollbacks that we are seeing done by this administration.

Frankly, the people of California, from both political parties, who cherish their environment, love to see the ocean, the forests, the lakes, and the

rivers, and they cherish clean air. We have made so much progress and we want the Clean Water Act to stand intact. They are anxious, they are concerned, and they are puzzled as to why this administration is turning its back on Presidents—Republicans and Democrats, starting with Teddy Roosevelt who made the environment a non-partisan issue, and President Eisenhower who said the Alaskan Wildlife Refuge should be left intact, and President Nixon who created the Environmental Protection Agency, and President Clinton who did so many far-reaching things on the environment, protecting acres of land of roadless, beautiful areas, and used his executive pen to make sure that beautiful areas of our country are off limits to special interests because we believe when we got this land from God that it is our responsibility to preserve it and leave it in better condition than we found it.

We take this very seriously in California. This is not a partisan issue. I have people who voted for President Bush coming up to me and tugging at my sleeve: What is the matter with this administration?

Every Friday, late at night, when the press operations have shut down, they are making yet another rollback. The people in my State want me to fight against it, and I intend to do so.

Let's talk about this attack in specifics. One in every four Americans lives within 4 miles of a Superfund site. This chart has little dots that represent Superfund sites. Seventy million Americans live within 4 miles of a Superfund site. Ten million of those are children who are at risk of cancer and other health problems.

My State happens to have the second highest number of sites after New Jersey, but as we can see, there are sites in almost every State in the Union. These Superfund sites are dangerous. They include chemicals such as arsenic, benzene, DDT, and brain-damaging toxins like lead and mercury.

In 1980, Congress enacted the Superfund law. During the last 4 years of the Clinton administration, an average of 87 final cleanups occurred each year. Let's look at what is happening under George Bush. Half of those sites are being cleaned up. Worse than that, who is now paying? Under Bill Clinton and under Republican Presidents before him, including George Bush's father, we taxed the polluters. The polluters paid to clean up their mess.

When I was growing up, my mother always said: Clean up your mess. She did not want to hear me say: It is somebody else's responsibility, mom. It is not mine.

Wrong. If you make a mess, you clean it up. Simple. That goes for polluters. That is why we set up the Superfund. The polluter pays was the rule of the day.

Now what is happening? This President does not support the Superfund fee on the biggest polluters. We see where the taxpayers used to pay only

18 percent of the cleanup costs, in this year are going to pay 50 to 54 percent of the cleanup costs. After this year, there will be almost nothing left in the Superfund, and this will be 100-percent paid for by taxpayers at a time when this President is depleting the money we already have by giving tax cuts to the people who earn over a million dollars a year, who do not need it.

So what is wrong with this picture? This President refuses to stand behind a bipartisan effort to reinstate the Superfund fee. I have introduced the bill with Senator CHAFEE, a Republican. This President will not support that and instead supports using general taxpayer funds to clean up Superfund sites.

Polluter pays is a principle that has worked. It has been supported by people of both parties and Presidents of both parties. It seems to me our people are in danger, and this administration is walking away from the Superfund.

I want to talk a little bit about clean water because this is very important. The Bush administration is working to remove Federal protection from many waters, including many creeks, streams, small ponds, and wetlands. These bodies of water have long been protected by the Clean Water Act. There was a rule published late in the day, and the effect of the rule is that 20 to 30 percent of our bodies of water could be exempted from the Clean Water Act. Why on earth would anyone want to do that when we see the results of the Federal Government's now saying that 20 to 30 percent of our water bodies no longer are covered by the Clean Water Act will be more polluted waterways? We already know the Nation's waters are getting dirtier, and almost half of our lakes, streams, rivers, and coastal estuaries are not safe for fishing, for swimming, or for boating.

How many people have taken their children on a vacation only to go down to a lake, go down to an ocean and find the sign, "Polluted. You may not enter this body of water"?

We will kill off the remaining populations of 43 percent of endangered or threatened species that rely on wetlands for survival. We will deplete drinking water sources.

Mr. President, I ask about the time. My understanding from Senator HARRY REID was we had time until 3:15. He asked me if I could then extend that to 3:30. No one is on the floor from the other side. Because there is no one on the other side, I ask unanimous consent—and I think if I do not get that unanimous consent, it says to me that people on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans, are not interested in allowing free speech to move forward. There is no one in the Chamber. I am happy to cease and desist when the next speaker comes. I ask unanimous consent that until another speaker comes that I be able to complete my remarks on the war on the environment that is going on each and every

day, that is hurting our air, hurting our water, hurting our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). I have been advised by the leadership of the majority that they do intend to use their time, and so in my capacity as a Senator from Idaho, I object to the request.

Mrs. BOXER. I once more ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak until the next speaker comes to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous rules, the Senator from California's time has expired. However, her side has until 3:15. She may ask unanimous consent to use that time.

Mrs. BOXER. That is what I have been doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator has until the hour of 3:15 or until a Senator from her side wants to claim that time.

Mrs. BOXER. I have been asked to take that time. That is what I was trying to convey to my friend. I ask for an additional 2 minutes because it took 2 minutes for the Chair to figure out that I actually could take HARRY REID's time. Would that be all right?

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

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I am very feisty today because I see an attack on our environment. I want to make the case, and I am going to try to do it in the remaining 7, 8, or 9 minutes I have.

If we move away from the Clean Water Act, what we will see is more polluted waters, more waterborne illness, higher drinking water filtration costs, more flooding, fish kills, and impaired sports fishing—that is why we have so many sports fishermen with us—fewer waterfowl and less recreational hunting. That is why we have so many recreational hunters with us as we try to resist this move to remove bodies of water from the Clean Water Act.

We will see reduced tourism, less spending on bird watching, ecotourism, and wildlife photography. I know my colleague understands the importance of tourism to our States. People come to see the beautiful wildlife, have a hunting or fishing trip, to take photographs, to show their children what wildlife really is. It is a hard time for those of us who believe so much that protecting the environment is a bipartisan issue.

I want to talk about something that is very near and dear to my heart because when I came to the House of Representatives in the 1980s, we learned that 100,000 dolphin were being killed every year because of destructive fishing practices, including Purse-Seining on dolphin. Many people now know what that is because Greenpeace called it to the world's attention. When tuna swim, they swim underneath the dolphin, and so unless one is really careful, they are going to throw their nets over the dolphin, and the dolphin are

going to be killed or harmed. This practice was occurring in the 1980s. One hundred thousand dolphin were being killed each and every year because of dolphin deadly methods of fishing.

I have to say the young people of America turned the tide because kids would say to their parents: This is wrong to do to the dolphin, and if it means we are not going to take a tuna sandwich in our lunch, fine. We will boycott tuna until the tuna fishermen catch the tuna in a way that does not harm the dolphin.

Happily, the Congress passed the law I wrote. All the law said was we should create a label called a "dolphin safe" label, and if the tuna in that can was caught in a way that did not harm the dolphin, the manufacturer could, in fact, put that on the can.

What happened as a result of that legislation? By the way, it costs no money at all. It was just letting the consumer know the truth. The dolphin kill went down to 2,000 a year from 100,000 a year. That was because of the "dolphin safe" label of 1990.

The label was not that well respected. In about 1997, there were moves to weaken it. Basically, we held firm. Now the Commerce Department under George Bush has decided, forget all that, you can use the "dolphin safe" label even if you go back to purse seining on dolphin—as long as no one saw any dolphin die.

Scientific studies say that just does not work. When you harass the dolphin and you use the helicopters and you chase the dolphin and you torment the dolphin, we know what happens. They are not reproducing and they are not healthy. Yet this Bush administration wants to change the label. Now, fortunately, groups have gone to court and gotten the administration to guarantee that it will not change the meaning of "dolphin safe" until the court has examined this issue. For the moment, the "dolphin safe" label stands.

I put the administration on notice: If they persist in this, we will start another boycott. Americans do not agree with the administration putting free trade ahead of the dolphin. I can state that 75 percent of Americans want to make sure that label means something.

I have been in public life having first been elected in the 1970s, and I have always been a fighter for a clean and healthy environment. In all the years I have been in office, I have never seen such an attack on the environment. I have a list of every single attack on the environment this administration has made. It is published. We did it in chart form. We have four charts. Each shows repeals or rollbacks of an environmental law or regulation. It can be found on the NRDC Web site. If I were to have it on a piece of paper, it would roll out 32 feet.

Two hundred rules and regulations have been rolled back by this administration against the will of the American people, many of them on Friday afternoon. I am here to say on behalf of

many on this side of the aisle—and some on the other—we believe protecting the environment is an American value.

It is not a Democratic value or a Republican value, it is an American value. We cherish our God-given environment. We cherish our forests, our streams, our lakes, our oceans. We believe it is important we keep the air clean, the water clean.

We will continue to come to the floor and make the case that this is the most anti-environmental administration in recent history. It is amazing when we compare contributions of a Republican President, Teddy Roosevelt, a Republican President, Richard Nixon, a Republican President, George Bush 1—who, by the way, said we should test poor children for lead in their blood. That is important to find out if they are sick or healthy. If they have lead in their blood, we should take action. This President tried to repeal that rule until we called him on it and pointed out it costs \$13 a child and he stopped it. He tried to say we should not try to take arsenic out of water. We called him on it.

Mr. President, the state of the Union is anxious—*anxious* about the economy, it is anxious about jobs. It is anxious about a number of things: The possibility of war; it is anxious about a foreign policy that is in totally different directions where one country has inspections going on and we don't trust the leader of that country, we are ready to go against him, and another country has nuclear weapons and we are going to resolve that diplomatically. The country is anxious. They are anxious about the state of their environment. They do not want to have another Friday come and find out their rules for clean air, clean water, beautiful forests, are under attack.

I am here to say to the President: I know you are doing the last-minute rewriting of your speech. Think about what we are saying today. Democrats have come here in good faith to point out their differences. Reach out to us. Have a plan for the economy that is going to work. Say you will follow in the bipartisan traditions of environmental protection. Work with us on a foreign policy that is consistent and does not wait until a crisis hits but actually is proactive. Work with us on prescription drugs. Work with us so that people can get health insurance. We are ready, we are willing, and able to work with you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, it is my understanding we now have 1 hour from this minute under our control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

THE PRESIDENTIAL BURDEN

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, the President of the United States has an

awesome responsibility. I don't think anyone in America would say that he does not realize what his responsibility is and that he is not working as hard as any person could to try to do the right thing for our country, in both our domestic agenda, our homeland security, and, of course, our national defense.

He has a heavy burden. He must do something that stimulates the economy, that puts people back to work, and at the same time he must spend everything that is necessary to secure the people in our country who live here and to make sure that our young men and women who are fighting the war on terrorism, who are fighting for our freedom and our country, wherever they may be in the world, have everything they need to do the job we are asking them to do.

I have been listening to a lot of the comments that have been made on the floor today. I would like to take each of the areas that have been mentioned and try to talk about what the President's agenda is and why he is trying so hard to beef up our economy, at the same time fighting a very long and, frankly, iconoclastic war on terrorism.

This is a new kind of enemy. It is not the kind of enemy that is one country or two countries. It is no particular country. It is not the kind of enemy we always have had one which wanted to kill or harm us but didn't want to hurt themselves. No, this is an enemy that is willing to blow itself up in order to harm Americans. It is even an enemy that would tell their children, teach their children, educate their children, that suicide, in order to harm Americans and freedom-loving people, is a good thing.

This is a difficult kind of war. Our President knows we are fighting on every front, that we are trying to find the enemy, no matter where they are. If they are in the caves in Afghanistan or if they are in Iraq or if they are in North Korea or if they are in our own country, the President is doing everything he can to execute this war and to tell the people of the United States we must stand together. We must stand together and keep the spirit of our country if we are going to have the patience and the resolve to beat this new kind of enemy.

That is what our President is trying to do. He doesn't want to make war. He doesn't want to make war on Iraq or anyone else. But he also knows that if we are going to keep another 9/11 from happening—God forbid a 9/11 with a nuclear weapon or biological or chemical weapon—if he is going to prevent that from happening in our country, he is going to have to have the full support of the American people. That is exactly what he is trying to get, by talking about the problems in Iraq, talking about what Saddam Hussein is doing.

The people who have seen Saddam Hussein, who have seen the treachery of this despot, know he is someone we must not have in control of a country and with the potential of having a weapon of mass destruction.

I know the President tonight is going to talk about the war on terrorism and all the things he is doing and all the young men and women who are on their way to the Middle East to make sure we are negotiating from a position of strength. But I know this President's very last resort is war. It is not the 1st resort, nor the 2nd resort, nor the 3rd resort, nor the 100th resort. But he knows that unless Saddam Hussein knows we mean business—we will do what we say we are going to do—we are going to lose this war on terrorism. That is the leadership the President of the United States is showing.

The President, in addition to the burden of having to prosecute a war, also has the burden of having to make sure our domestic economy stays strong, because it will be very difficult to prosecute a war if our domestic economy continues to erode.

We passed a tax cut 2 years ago under the leadership of President Bush and with strong support from Congress. That tax cut has helped a lot of people. I believe that tax cut kept us from going into a deeper recession. Now the President is trying to stimulate the economy, and the President is looking at history, and what has happened when we have had tax cuts in history has been phenomenal.

In 1964, President Kennedy led the fight for tax cuts. In 1965—1 year later—the gross domestic product rose 8 percent. Over the next 5 years, it rose 48 percent. Unemployment fell from 5.2 percent in 1965 to 3.5 percent in 1969. Five years later, revenues had risen for the U.S. Government by 66 percent. There was a \$5.9 billion deficit in 1965 but a \$3.2 billion surplus in 1969. That was the effect of the tax cuts of 1964.

After the Reagan tax cut of 1981, the gross domestic product rose 4 percent the next year, 1982; 42 percent over the next 5 years; unemployment fell from 7.6 percent to 7 percent in 1986. Five years later, revenues had risen by 28 percent.

So it has been proven that tax cuts will give the economy the boost it needs.

We have seen a situation in America where corporations have been dissuaded, because of double taxation of dividends, from giving dividends. So people who are saving and investing in order to have retirement security have been getting fewer and fewer dividends because companies get nothing for paying the dividend. They have to pay taxes on the money first before they would issue a dividend. It is cheaper to go into debt. So we have seen debt financing rise, and dividends that go to shareholders that can help secure retirement have been going down.

Today in America, 50 percent of the people own stock and 50 percent of the people who get dividends are our senior citizens. These are people who have tried to provide for their retirement security, not looking to their Government but looking to themselves. That is what we want to encourage. That is