

State	Amount spent on testing (in thous)	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Number of 3-8 tests	New tests required	Revenue sharing proceeds
Nebraska	1,650		R				R	2	10	12,374,005
Nevada	3,300	B	B	B			B	8	4	13,876,879
New Hampshire	2,500	B			B			4	8	10,802,081
New Jersey	17,000		B				B	4	8	37,746,447
New Mexico	650	B	B	B	B	B	B	12	0	13,633,052
New York	13,000		B				B	4	8	77,283,719
North Carolina	11,300	B	B	B	B	B	B	12	0	39,659,706
North Dakota	208		B				B	6	6	7,883,693
Ohio	12,300		B			B		4	8	53,078,486
Oklahoma	2,500	B		B			B	6	6	20,932,225
Oregon	7,000	B		B			B	6	6	19,516,428
Pennsylvania	15,000			B	R		B	5	7	52,955,297
Rhode Island	2,300	R	B			R	B	6	6	9,150,790
South Carolina	7,800	B	B	B	B	B	B	12	0	22,849,169
South Dakota	720		B	R			B	5	7	8,412,279
Tennessee	15,600	B	B	B	B	B	B	12	0	28,600,739
Texas	26,600	B	B	B	B	B	B	12	0	108,915,567
Utah	1,400	B	B	B	B	B	B	12	0	17,026,566
Vermont	460		B				B	4	8	7,730,061
Virginia	17,900	B	B	B	B		B	10	2	34,846,313
Washington	7,700	B	B		B	B		8	4	31,448,887
West Virginia	400	B	B	B	B	B	B	12	0	12,494,530
Wisconsin	2,000	R	B				B	5	7	27,306,317
Wyoming	1,700		B				B	4	8	7,415,370
Total	422,070							387	213	

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, we are spending \$422 million this present year in testing back home. We have been testing since you were a little boy and I was a little boy. The folks back home know what is really needed. But here we come and say they don't know what they need and they never have had any accountability. We want to discover for them what schools are flunking and close those schools down, and in the meantime hurt the students who have never even had the course, so to speak.

If you did not benefit, as a poor child, from the Women Infants and Children Program, you don't have a strong mind coming into this world. If your school did not receive Title I funding, if you didn't have access to a Head Start program, if you didn't get a good teacher, if your class was so big that you were unable to listen and learn, you are unprepared. All these programs figure into giving students the course and they are less than 50-percent funded. Now we are going to test students because we know from the debate they have not had the course. We haven't really gotten to the crux of the matter. Congress has decided what is needed. So we have had testing.

Right to the point, if you really believe in harming students, as my distinguished colleague from Minnesota points out so vividly and forcefully, and you are merely trying to give yourself political credit, then vote against the amendment. That crowd that has been trying to abolish the Department of Education now comes in saying they are going to get responsibility in education, accountability, and set up a straw man and knock it over with a 7-year bureaucracy of \$2.7 billion to \$7 billion. That is what it costs.

Mr. President, yesterday I had printed in the RECORD this particular survey by the National Association of State Boards Of Education.

If you believe in bureaucracy at the cost of some \$7 billion, if you believe that Washington knows best, that the people back home don't know what they need—while we have heard on the floor about needs ranging from librar-

ies to curricula to teachers to reducing class sizes to school construction to after-school programs—then don't vote for this amendment. Every Senator over the 7 weeks has put out the needs. But what we need to do is take that money, like revenue sharing, send it back to the local folks, and say: If you want to have testing, test. If you want to have further testing, do that. If you really think you need to increase the teachers' pay, if you need to hire more teachers, those kinds of things, then do it. But that is really assisting; not spending extra money.

This is not an increase, this is giving flexibility to the money under the bill to address the needs back home. It is playing as if, fast forward 3 or 4 years, we have had the testing, we know what is needed, and we know what schools are flunking. I could flunk 30 or 40 in South Carolina this afternoon with this so-called quality test, and students do not have another school to go to and you cannot close their school down. So we spend billions, and we are in the same place as we are this minute.

If you believe in that bureaucracy, if you believe in unfunded mandates, if you believe in one size fits all, if you believe in harming the children just to get political credit on the floor of the Senate, then vote against this amendment.

But if you want to help the children back home and help the local school boards, if you want to help America advance education, then take this same program money and send it back on a revenue-sharing basis so that schools can address their needs, whether those needs be testing or otherwise.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 2½ minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise to support the Hollings amendment. Hearing the Senator from South Carolina makes me think that, our motto should be, perhaps: We should invest before we test.

I think of what the American people said about Dr. King when he left the

pulpit and went out into the community: He went out and walked his talk. I don't think we are walking our talk. If we were walking our talk, we would not only be demanding our tests, but we would be demanding that every child have an opportunity to do well on the tests. We have not done that, and I think Senator HOLLINGS raises what I think is the most important question.

I believe I am one of the few Senators who is troubled by this and agonizing over the question of whether or not the Federal Government should be telling the school board, the school district, which epitomizes the grassroots political culture of America: 'You do not get to decide what is best.' We are telling them, every school district in America: You are going to test every child, grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 every year, with consequences for your school and your school district depending on how these children do in these tests.

What this amendment says is we should maybe have a little more faith in people at the school board level.

We should have maybe a little more faith in people back in our States to decide what they think is best, and they should have the option on whether they want to do the testing or use the resources to help children. That is what this amendment says.

I am all for national community standards for civil rights and human rights and for the first amendment and in making sure there is a floor for an educational commitment below which no poor child falls. I think that is what we are about as a nation. But I think when it comes to this kind of decision, is it right for the Federal Government literally to tell every school district what to do to test every child? I think we might rue the day we have voted for this. I struggle over the question right now. That is why I think this is such an important amendment. I fully support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield such time as I might use.