

will continue to work. There has got to be a better way. There are also a lot of ideas around here on how to make a better way. I can only hope some of these ideas are translated into law in the very near future.

So, Mr. President, I wish my colleagues well. I will miss the institution dearly. I will miss the daily interaction with my colleagues, many of whom have become such dear friends to me. Let me thank you for your friendship. And lastly, let me thank staff. My personal office staff, both here and in the state offices, have been like family to me. I have tried to treat them that way, and it has been mutual. The committee staff and floor staff I have been privileged to work with over the years have all been great to me as well—they make this place run and make us all look good from time to time. I thank them all for their support and service to our country. This country would not be nearly what it is without office, committee and floor staff. As I leave the Senate, please know that I will keep you all in my thoughts and prayers, and wish all of you good luck and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. President, for perhaps the last time, I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota wants to be recognized, very shortly I have to take the Chair and I want to make my statement.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if I might ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

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

SENATOR WENDELL FORD

Mr. DORGAN. I did want to say, having listened to the Senator from Kentucky, my expectation is that virtually every Member of this Senate, Republican and Democrat alike, shares my feelings about the Senator from Kentucky. He is tough, he is honest, he gets things done in the Senate, and we are going to miss him a great deal.

I know the Senator from Montana feels that way, as does the Senator from Texas. Some of our other colleagues are not here. But one of the privileges of serving in this body is serving with some of the best men and women I have ever had the opportunity to work with in my life, and I count among that group the Senator from Kentucky, Senator FORD.

I would like to say, as he leaves the Senate, I thank him for his public service to our country. He, because he served in this body, has contributed to the well-being of America. We are going to miss him a great deal. I expect he will not be going far. I know he is going fishing, and I know he is going to be involved in public service in his own

way, dealing with educating young people about civic responsibilities and about government. I just want to say he has contributed a substantial amount of service to his country and we are deeply indebted to him for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I associate myself with those words. We hate to see Senator FORD go.

I ask unanimous consent, after I make a short statement, that my colleague from Texas may follow me because he picks up on the same idea. I have to assume the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURNS. I thank the Chair and I thank my colleague on the other side.

EDUCATION

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, as we started to hear this debate this morning, and talking about different ways of accomplishing things here on a non-partisan basis, it started off a little on the partisan side. Education is very dear to the hearts of all of us because all of us, probably, have had a connection with kids and so have been involved in education. I still have one going to school. But to hear the other side talk, we have done nothing about that.

You know, we have increased the funds for special education since the Republicans took over in 1994.

We passed education savings accounts that would empower parents to make choices for their own children with regard to books and computers and this type stuff. That was a bad idea to the President. He vetoed it. I guess he wants to empower bureaucracy rather than empower parents.

We passed the opportunity scholarships, a highly popular program here in Washington, DC, that would allow parents more choice of where to send their kids to school. That was vetoed.

We passed a \$2.74 billion education bill for classrooms, and we guaranteed that 95 percent of it would get to kids. That met with stiff opposition from the President.

Encouraging States to implement teacher testing and merit pay, what is wrong with that? That got vetoed by the President.

Strengthening safe schools, the antigun program—that was vetoed.

Tax relief to employers who provide workers education assistance, folks we are retraining in this rapidly changing world of technology? Vetoed by the President.

I have to look and say all at once: 2 plus 2 is not making 5, when we start talking about education and who wants to do what for whom.

I just noticed here, earlier this year my good friend from Massachusetts said we have "a relationship with Federal, State, and local community levels in terms of education; it is a partner-

ship." Tell me how good this partnership is. The Federal Government only provides 7 percent of the money but 50 percent of the paperwork. That should not surprise you a lot if you have been around government at any time.

In 1969, our expenditure was \$68 billion; in 1996, it was \$564 billion; and yet even by their own admission, education continues to struggle and go down. That is the point I wanted to make here. I would say whenever we start looking at education, the answer lies in the realization that you cannot kill or do away with an idea. Ideas rule the world. The only way you get rid of a bad idea is with a better one. I think we have come up with some awfully good ideas.

I yield to my friend from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I wanted to give our colleague who has to preside an opportunity to speak first. I thank him for arranging for me to be recognized.

SENATOR WENDELL FORD

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I am sorry our colleague from Kentucky has left the floor. I would like to add my voice to those who thanked him for his service. In an era where there are so many cellophane politicians, when there are so many people in public life who talk like newscasters but you can never quite tell what they are talking about when they get through speaking, I think WENDELL FORD has been a welcome relief from that. He is a politician who has texture. When he speaks you may think he is wrong—which I often do—but you never question the fact that he is sincere, and when he speaks you know what he is talking about. I find the longer I serve in this great Senate, the more respect I have for people who stand for something and who speak up for it and who say what they think.

EDUCATION AND THE BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I wanted, today, to come over and talk about education. I have come back to town to help in some of these negotiations to try to complete the session, but upon hearing Senator KENNEDY this morning, I felt compelled to come over and speak. I have several ideas I want to talk about. I would like to first talk about why we are talking about education. Here we are, 2 days before the session ends. In fact, as of last Friday, in the budget negotiations, no one at the White House had brought up education at all. Why suddenly do we have the focus on education?

I would like to explain why this focus has come about and what I think it is trying to hide. I would like to talk about Senator KENNEDY's education proposals. I would like to talk about the budget debate we have before us. I

would like to talk about the failure of our current system. And then I would like to talk about how we ought to change it. That is an awful lot of subjects, but having listened to Senator KENNEDY, I feel compelled to speak a little on this subject.

I would say this is a subject I know something about. I taught for 12 years at Texas A&M prior to coming to Congress. In fact, I often say that I taught economics for 12 years at Texas A&M and I have been teaching it in Washington, now, for 20 years. You will not be surprised to hear me say my students at Texas A&M were a lot smarter than the students I have now. And, also, they were a lot more interested in learning. I say that partially in jest.

So when I talk about education, it is something I know something about, because I have had the great experience of people calling me "Teacher." I don't know of any title—maybe "Rabbi," maybe "Preacher," maybe "Mr. President"—but there are not many titles that are more important than being called "Teacher."

First of all, I want to remind everybody, we were busy negotiating on the budget all last week and up through Friday nobody raised the education issue. And why should they? The President, in his fiscal year 1999 education appropriation, requested \$32 billion. In the spending bill that we currently have pending in the Senate, we provide \$32 billion. So it was not surprising that after a week's negotiation in trying to come together on this budget, there had been relatively little discussion about education, because the President had proposed \$32 billion of spending, we had provided \$32 billion, and while I am going to talk a little bit about the differences of how we provide it, the basic point was, this was not a budget issue.

But over the weekend, in his radio show, and then as his representatives appeared on television on Sunday, suddenly the administration has opened a massive new education front. They are saying this Congress has not done enough for education, they are unhappy about what the Congress has done in education, and they want more. Why is this happening? Sadly, I am here to tell you that it is a smoke-screen to cover up a robbery. There is a robbery underway on Capitol Hill right now. The working men and women of America are in danger of having \$25 billion stolen from them this year and in the last week of Congress.

I have to say, in a city which is marked by cynicism, it is one of the most cynical acts that I have ever observed. I want to be especially critical of the President of the United States on this issue, something I have not made a habit of doing.

The President, in his State of the Union Address—the Presiding Officer was there, and I am sure if the American people remember anything any political figure has said about anything

other than scandal this year, they will remember that the President, in his State of the Union Address—I ask unanimous consent for 25 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object, the Senator from Illinois is waiting to speak. I, by consent, am waiting to speak as well. That brings it to 30 minutes the total requested by the Senator from Texas?

Mr. GRAMM. Excuse me, I didn't hear, Mr. President.

Mr. DORGAN. Will that bring to 30 minutes the time requested by the Senator from Texas?

Mr. GRAMM. I didn't request any time. I don't know where the 5 minutes came from.

Mr. DORGAN. I thought I heard the Senator request 25 additional minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. I was told by the Chair there was 5 additional minutes. I don't know if the world comes to an end—

Mr. DORGAN. I have no objection. I thought he asked for 25 additional minutes. I have no objection to 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. GRAMM. Going back to my robbery occurring on Capitol Hill, the reason it seems to me we are suddenly discussing something that was not an issue all last week is because there is a real issue now that the White House doesn't want to talk about, and that real issue is that we are in the process of seeing a demand from the White House that the Congress spend \$25 billion that was never in the President's budget.

Many of you will remember in the State of the Union Address when the President stood up and said, "Save Social Security first; save every penny of the surplus; don't spend any of it; don't give any of it back in tax cuts; save Social Security first." Quite frankly, Mr. President, I thought it was a good idea.

I have opposed efforts by some in my own party to go ahead and cut taxes now rather than waiting until next year when we can fix Social Security. I believe, permanently and then debate a tax cut. But what happened is that in January, February, March and all through the spring, the President said, don't increase spending and don't cut taxes. Then suddenly during the summer, his message started to change, which was the first giveaway. The message suddenly became: Don't cut taxes, and he stopped talking about spending.

Now the President is demanding in the final days of this session that we spend an additional \$20 billion to \$25 billion, every penny of which would come out of the surplus, and every penny of which would come out of Social Security. So a President who threatened to veto a tax cut that would have taken \$6.6 billion away from the surplus is now demanding that Congress, as a price to be able to finish business and adjourn, spend an additional \$25 billion.

We had a surplus for the first time since 1969 as of October 1. Today is October 12, and so far, if the President's requests are met, we are spending an additional \$2 billion a day. In other words, this is going to be the shortest recorded surplus in American history, and I am concerned about it.

Let me talk a little bit about education, since the President has raised the subject. First of all, in Senator KENNEDY's remarks today, we heard the same old song that people have sung in Washington since 1960. That basic siren song is: If we just had a little more money, we could make it work; that the only thing wrong with education in America is we don't have enough money, and if we spent more money and we let Washington tell you how to spend it, everything would be great.

Let me just review a few facts and figures in response to Senator KENNEDY.

First of all, in 1969, we spent \$68.5 billion on education in America. Today, we are spending \$564.2 billion on public education, K through 12.

What has happened during that period? As spending has grown almost 1,000 percent, SAT scores have stagnated, reading scores have declined and American students have moved from the top of the list in math and science to either the bottom or near the bottom in both math and science. Today, American students on international tests rank last in physics; they rank next to last in mathematics.

When you look at those scores you say, "Well, if we just had more money, we could change that." But I remind my colleagues, we have increased spending during the period where these scores have plummeted from \$68.5 billion to \$564.2 billion.

One of our problems is we spend the money so inefficiently. Listen to these numbers: For every dollar we spend on education in Washington, DC, 15 cents never gets out of Washington; 15 cents stays here in our massive Federal bureaucracy; 48 cents ends up going to bureaucrats between here and the classroom; and 37 cents out of every dollar we spend in the name of education in Washington, DC, actually gets to the classroom for actual instruction, providing facilities, or providing that teacher in that classroom.

No wonder that we rank last in physics and next to last in mathematics when our current program, which Senator KENNEDY helped build and which he loves, gets 37 cents out of every dollar we spend in Washington into the classroom.

We are hearing today that what we really need to do is we need to do something about class size.

First of all, I think it is obvious to anybody that you would rather your child be in a small class than a big class. But if you can see this chart, what has happened since 1960 is that class sizes have gone down dramatically.

The pupil-teacher ratio for public K through 12 education was 25.8 to 1 in 1960 when SAT scores were close to their maximum they ever achieved. In 1996, there was 17.1 to 1 or, in other words, a 51-percent decrease compared to today's level.

I think lowering the class size is a wonderful thing, but I simply point out that contrary to all the rhetoric about how perfect the world would be if it were lowered, we have lowered it by 51 percent in the last 36 years, and the net result has been a dramatic decline.

Is the Senator telling me that my 25 minutes is up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. I asked for 25 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, it was limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, my point is that while declining pupil-teacher ratio is a wonderful thing, and we would all like to have our own children given the maximum instruction in the most intense way, the plain truth is that in the last 36 years, we have had a dramatic decline in the ratio of pupils to teacher while results have declined.

This gets me to what the real debate is on education. Obviously, the real debate is not money. The President requested \$32 billion; the Senate bill provides \$32 billion. The debate is about who is going to spend the money. Republicans have proposed something that sounds revolutionary in Washington, but in America it sounds eminently reasonable; and that is, except for that money which is targeted to things like special education, we want to give the bulk of the money directly to school systems so that local teachers, local administrators and local school boards can set priorities for using money, so that if in my hometown of College Station we think the answer is a lower pupil-teacher ratio, we can use the money for that purpose; if we think the answer is something else, we can use it for that purpose.

Another thing we are hearing about is building schools. I know our dear colleague who is presiding said that a bad idea never dies, that you can't kill an idea with facts. And I understand this will not kill that idea. We will be talking about it for the next 10 years. But I want to point out something which shows, I think clearly, why the Federal Government should not be setting policy where we have Members of the Senate voting for education policy in schools we have never put our foot in, children we have never personally met, families where we do not know their situation.

What I have here is the population of enrollment in K through 12. I do not

want to draw on this chart which I got from somebody else, but I want you to look right here where we are in 1998. We have just come off a very rapid increase in students, but we are now in a period where the population of students in K through 12 is flattening out.

Doesn't it strike you as interesting that we are talking about the Federal Government mandating that local communities spend more of our money and theirs on schools at the very time where it is clear that in the past 10 years our problem has been school construction, but as we look at the future it is obvious that the population of students is beginning to flatten out? That is typical of the Federal Government. That is what happens when you have people in Washington setting education policy for students in College Station—when only two Members of the Senate have ever been in a school in College Station, and they are the two Senators from Texas.

What is the difference between what the President wants to do and what the Congress wants to do? The biggest difference is, the Congress wants to spend the same \$32 billion but let local school boards, local parents, local teachers decide—do they want to build more schools, do they want to do something about the pupil-teacher ratio, do they want to buy computers. We want them to decide.

Finally, let me put this chart up here and just remind anyone who is interested in this debate that this Congress has been very active on education matters, that, first of all, we have the \$32 billion appropriation bill—the same amount the President asked for; it is just spent differently. More of it is spent locally and not in Washington. We happen to believe that is better. The President thinks it is not better.

But rather than debating us on the issue—because I am sure someone at the White House has done a poll or focus group and they have discovered what we know, and that is, parents in College Station think they know a little bit more about their children's needs than we know in Washington—so rather than debate those, the President is now saying that we are shortchanging education.

The truth is, we have provided every penny the President asked for, roughly \$32 billion—both the request and appropriation—it is just that we are letting local school boards and local teachers spend it. The President would spend it here in Washington.

But finally, before my time runs out again, I remind my colleagues that we have done quite a bit on education in this Congress. First of all, we passed a bill that provided education savings accounts which let parents set aside up to \$2,000 a year which they could use for tutors, they could use to send their children to summer school enrichment programs, they could use for after-school programs; and, yes, if they chose to send their children to parochial or private schools, they could do

it. And what happened? Vetoed by the President. It did not represent the teachers union agenda and so the President vetoed it.

We provided literacy funding. The President vetoed it.

We had a merit pay system for teachers. Can you imagine paying good teachers better than we pay bad teachers? Can you imagine having a system where you would actually pay a teacher more if they did a better job of teaching? Well, we could imagine it, but the President and the teachers union could not imagine it, nor could they tolerate it, so the President vetoed it.

We provided a school choice system for low-income families so that working families in cities like Washington could do what President Clinton did, and that is, they could choose to send their children to private schools if they chose to. But the President vetoed it.

We provided tax relief for parents whose kids used a State prepaid tuition plan. This is one of the most exciting new developments around the country where if you want your child to go to Texas A&M—that is your dream—you have to do two things: One, you set up a program and you pay in advance and pay off the tuition, and, obviously, you get a big discount if you start when your child is 6 months old or before they are born; and the second thing they have to do is get in. But we had a system to make it easier for working parents who had the big dream to realize it. The President vetoed it.

We had a system for tax relief for employer-provided education assistance. Employers all over the country are saying, "Our kids do not have the skills we need." So we had a better idea in Congress. We said, OK, if you want to send your employees back to school, to junior college or technical school, or to the University of Missouri, or anywhere, you can do it on a tax-free basis because you are investing in the future of America. And guess what? The President vetoed it.

And finally, our major initiative of this Congress—for the first time since I have been in Congress, we have been successful in doing something that I came to Congress to try to do, and that is, to get the Federal Government out of the business of dictating education policy to local school boards. We, for the first time ever, passed a provision that would allow local school boards to take the money and spend it as they believed to be in the interest of their children.

Maybe people in Washington know better about what children should do and take; but it is interesting, when you ask them, "Well, if you know so much about kids in the elementary school at College Hills in College Station in the first grade class, tell us their names," they don't know them. But they think they know an awful lot about what should be done.

We believe that local people should set priorities. We passed a bill to do

that. The President threatened to veto it.

So my final message is, Mr. President, first of all, your administration did not even raise education until Friday. We have been negotiating for a week. This is a ruse to cover up an effort by this administration to bust its own budget and to spend Social Security money. That is what this is about.

Secondly, the President proposed \$32 billion for educational appropriations. We have provided \$32 billion for education, but we have provided it so that local school districts make more decisions and Washington makes fewer.

So if the President wants to debate, let's debate about the real issue. The real issue is not how much money is spent, it is who is doing the spending.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, am I correct in assuming I am recognized under the previous unanimous consent order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE BUDGET AND PRIORITIES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the Senator from Texas. He is always interesting in his presentations. During my presentation, I will take issue with a number of the comments he has made.

At the start, I want to indicate it is not, in my judgment, the case that this issue of education has just recently been raised in recent days. The last few days, certainly, have included a lot of references to education by the President and by others, but going back to January and February of this year, the President and Members of Congress on this side of the aisle were pushing very hard for education changes that we think would strengthen the school systems and strengthen opportunity for education for all children in this country.

I want to speak more generally, first, and then I will address a couple of those issues. I am enormously disappointed that we come to the middle of October in this session of Congress, the 105th Congress, and find that at the end of this long, arduous Congress, we have half a dozen, maybe a dozen people somewhere in a room—Lord only knows where the room is—negotiating a third to half of the Federal budget in appropriations bills that the Congress didn't get completed.

First of all, in this year, the Congress passed no budget. It is the first time, as I understand it, since 1974—no budget. The requirement is that the Congress shall pass a budget by April 15. This Congress didn't pass a budget. This Congress, by its inaction, said, no, we don't think there ought to be a budget. That is No. 1.

No. 2, because the Congress didn't even bother to pass a budget, it didn't pass a good number of its appropri-

tions bills. So we came to the end of the fiscal year, months after when the appropriations bills should have been completed, many months after the budget should have been passed, and the Congress had to pass a continuing resolution to keep the government operating. Then we have this closed-door bunch of folks in a room making deals on how to resolve these final issues.

During this Congress, at a time when no budget was enacted and a good many appropriations bills were not completed, the Congress said no to campaign finance reform, not once, not twice, a good number of times. No, we don't want to do campaign finance reform. They said, no, we don't want to do HMO or a Patients' Bill of Rights reforming the managed care system and providing certain rights to patients in this country. They said no to tobacco reform, don't want to do that; no to the education proposals offered in the President's budget calling for reduction in class size.

Incidentally, I take issue with the charts used moments ago, and I guess most parents who have kids in school will take issue with that chart, suggesting somehow that classroom sizes are decreasing rather than increasing. I think most parents understand that is not the case in their schools. It is not unusual for kids to be going to school with 22, 24, 28, 30 children in their class. The question is, Does that make a difference? Does it make a difference for a teacher when there are 15 in the class versus 30 in the class? Does it make a difference in terms of the personal attention a teacher can devote to children with 30 kids in a class versus 15 to 18? The answer is, of course.

This Congress, in passing no budget and missing most of its appropriations bill, said no to campaign finance reform, no to tobacco, no to Patients' Bill of Rights, no to the education proposal offered by the President on school construction and reduction in class size.

In the old western movies you will recall the folks that rode themselves into a box canyon, took their hat off and scratched their heads wondering why they were being attacked on all sides. Because they road into a boxed canyon is why they are under attack. That is exactly what happened in this Congress.

Is it surprising that a Congress that doesn't pass a budget and doesn't finish its appropriations bills finds itself today, on Monday, October 12, in a situation where we are scrambling, trying to figure out who is doing what with whom, to determine what kind of spending we have in dozens and dozens and dozens of areas? Does it surprise anybody we have this kind of a mess at the end of this session? I don't think so.

The previous speaker just spoke of a robbery. He used the term "robbery" to describe the amount of money that some are proposing to be offered to deal with certain education issues. I

personally think it is a significant and exciting and wonderful investment in the young children of our country to invest in education. That is not a robbery. That is a remarkably effective investment for this country.

Investment in health care is not a robbery. That is a remarkable investment for the people of this country.

How about for family farmers? Part of this debate is what we do for family farmers in the middle of a farm crisis. No one should think that would be a robbery, to take some funds during the middle of a farm crisis and say to family farmers when prices collapse and you are down and out, we want to give you a helping hand to help you up and help get you through this tough time. That is the issue here. The issue is what are our priorities?

Let me give an example of a robbery. Yes, there are robberies taking place. I understand there is a tax extender bill that some in Congress are trying to slip in, another \$500 million little tax incentive for some of the biggest economic interests to move their jobs overseas, make it a little sweeter deal. We have a perverse incentive in our Tax Code to say if you want to move American jobs overseas, we will pay you for it, we will give you a tax break. Just take those good old American jobs, shut your plants, move them overseas, and we will give you a tax break. Talk about perversity. We have people working to try to juice that up, increase the tax break. That is a robbery. It robs America of jobs it needs, it robs us of the revenue we ought to have to invest in kids and invest in health care.

The point is, priorities. What are our priorities? What do we think is important? At the start of this century, if you lived in America you were expected to live an average of 48 years of age. Almost 100 years have elapsed and now if you live in this country you are expected, perhaps, to live to be 78. Forty-eight to 78—30 years added to the lifespan of the average American. Is that success? Yes, I think so. You could solve all the Social Security problems and all the Medicare problems, all the financing of those issues could be solved if you simply take the life expectancy back to the 1940s or the 1920s or the 1900s. However, for a range of reasons, life expectancy has increased dramatically in our country in one century.

We have invested an enormous amount in health care research, National Institutes of Health. I am one, and some of my colleagues have joined me, who wants to increase the investment in health research. We know 50 years ago if someone had a bad heart, bad knee, bad hip or cataracts, they wouldn't be able to see, they wouldn't be able to walk, and they would probably die after a heart attack. Now they have knee surgery, get a new hip, get their heart muscle and arteries unplugged, have cataract surgery, and they come to a meeting in that small