

(d) APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide financial assistance in accordance with this section.

**SEC. 202. PROVISION FOR ROADS IN PICTURED ROCKS NATIONAL LAKESHORE.**

Section 6 of the Act of October 15, 1966, entitled "An Act to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, and for other purposes" (16 U.S.C. 460s-5), is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (b)(1) by striking "including a scenic shoreline drive" and inserting "including appropriate improvements to Alger County Road H-58".

(2) By adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION.—A scenic shoreline drive may not be constructed in the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House.

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

**OREGON PUBLIC LANDS TRANSFER AND PROTECTION ACT OF 1998**

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senator proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4326, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4326) to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Federal lands located within or adjacent to the Rogue River National Forest and to clarify the authority of the Bureau of Land Management to sell and exchange other Federal lands in Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 4326) was considered read the third time and passed.

**AUTOMOBILE NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA**

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3910, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3910) to authorize the Automobile National Heritage Area in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be

read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 3910) was considered read the third time and passed.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Chair very much.

I thank the Senator from Texas for his time in allowing us to complete these bills.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, my understanding is the Senator from Texas has the floor now.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of his 30-minute allocation that I be permitted to speak as if in morning business for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair. I thank my colleague from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, thank you for the recognition. I guess before I speak I need to thank several people. I thank Senator BYRD, who has left the floor, for insisting on a unanimous consent request that allowed me to have the opportunity to speak today. Senator BYRD is a Member who always reminds us that we do well to be courteous to one another. I appreciate his generosity.

Second, I am going to speak today on education and on other subjects. Much of the material that I am going to use was developed by Senator FRIST in the Budget Committee Task Force on Education. I want to be sure to give Senator FRIST credit for developing much of this material.

Mr. President, today, as we reach the end of the term, I want to say a little bit about four different subjects. I rarely get up and speak on more than one subject because many Senators, myself included, have trouble doing one subject justice. But I need to say a few words about education. I want to say a few things about home health care. I want to talk a little bit about R&D tax credits that are now pending in both Houses. And, finally, I want to talk about the world economy and what I see the lessons to be, and say a little bit about IMF.

**EDUCATION**

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, let me begin with education. First of all, I want to express some concern about the fact that the administration has decided, in the waning hours of this Congress, to suddenly bring education up as an issue in this omnibus spending bill that we are working on. I want to explain why I have concerns about this.

First of all, so far as I am aware, the administration never mentioned edu-

cation as an issue, despite the fact that we have been negotiating now for several weeks, until last Friday. All the time we were working, trying to finish the business of the American people, the administration never raised education as an issue, and suddenly on Saturday the President brings it up in his radio address, and now every day the President is somewhere doing a photo opportunity, or a press conference, or having a fundraiser on the education issue.

I want to say a little bit about that because part of what makes it possible for you to finish your work, under very difficult circumstances at the end of a session, is when you have mutual trust, when you believe that both sides to the negotiation are acting in good faith and that we are trying to do the work of the American people and not gain political advantage. I am afraid that in this case the President is not acting in good faith in dealing with us on this issue.

A second reason I was surprised this issue surfaced so late in our negotiations is that the President, in January, proposed in his initial budget that we spend \$32 billion in appropriations on education. When we reported our funding bill, we spent \$32 billion on education. So it seems strange to me to now have this issue raised about education when, in fact, we have provided almost exactly the amount of money that the President sought in January. But whether we think it is political or not, whether it makes any sense, given that we have funded almost identical levels to those requested by the President, the President has raised the education issue and I thought it was important to give a brief response of what the difference is.

The dispute is not about how much money is going to be spent on education. As I said earlier, the President requested \$32 billion; we have provided \$32 billion. The question is not about how much money is going to be spent but the debate is about who is going to do the spending. Despite all the rhetoric of the President and the administration, the debate is not about the level of spending but who is going to do the spending. They want the Federal Government to do the spending. They want bureaucrats in Washington, DC, to do the spending. And what Republicans have done in the first change in national education policy in over 30 years is, we have voted to pass money back to local school districts so that local parents, local teachers, and locally elected school board members can set education priority. So the debate is not about how much money is going to be spent, the debate is about who is going to do the spending.

Since the President has raised the issue, let me tell you our side of the story. Our side of the story first points out that we spend a lot of money on education, and we should. In 1969, we were spending \$68.5 billion on primary and secondary education in America.

Today, we are spending a whopping \$564.2 billion. So, in dollar terms, we have almost increased education funding tenfold.

But yet, while education funding has exploded since 1969, we have seen SAT scores, which measure high school achievement, stagnate, we have seen reading scores stagnate, and we have seen, since 1969, a systematic decline of American student performance on international tests, where we have gone from virtually the top of each major learning category to near the bottom on each learning category.

In fact, I just pick two here. This last year on international tests on physics, of all the nations that participated in the program, the United States of America ranked dead last. On math, a critically important ability given the modern era we live in—and we all understand the importance of mathematical skills in the information age—America ranked second to last of all nations that participated in the math testing program. This despite the fact that, on a per capita basis, we are one of the largest spenders on education in the world, spending in some cases two or three times as much per student as the nations that achieved the top scores on these tests.

One of the reasons we are spending so much money and getting so little for it is really encapsulated in this chart. What this chart seeks to do is to show the 23 different federal government agencies that we have funding education through 300 different Federal programs, in trying to provide money for teachers, for at-risk students, and for young children. As you can see, looking at this chart, what we have created is a massive bureaucracy which has overlapping responsibilities and where we have 300 different programs basically all trying to achieve the same thing.

Looking at this chart, you will not be shocked by the next chart. The next chart really is the measure of how efficient we are in getting the dollar we spend in Washington through to the classroom where the child is learning. What this tries to show is, starting out with \$1 we spend here—not just through the Department of Education, but all federal education spending—how much of it actually gets to the classroom. Fifteen cents of every dollar we spend never gets to the school district because, for all practical purposes, it never gets out of the State and Federal bureaucracy. It basically is consumed here and in various State capitals, with Federal bureaucracies that we are basically paying to tell people how to run education. Forty-eight cents out of every dollar can go to support local bureaucracies—support staff, administration staff, people who are not directly involved in classroom instruction.

So the bottom line is, from all of this mass of bureaucracy, we are getting 37 cents out of every dollar the federal government is spending on education

into the classroom. So no wonder we are spending all this money with such poor results. This is the existing system. It is the 37-cent solution. And the President says, many of our colleagues say, give this system more money.

Our answer has been, look, if this system can only get 37 cents out of every dollar to the classroom, this system is fundamentally broken and it needs to be changed. What we would do in changing it is, basically, we want to go to a block grant system which takes much of the money that we spend in Washington, except for the amount that is targeted to critical needs such as children with special learning disabilities, special education programs, and what we would like to do is take \$10.2 billion of the money we are spending in Washington and, rather than giving 63 cents out of every dollar of it to bureaucrats, which we do now, we would like to take the \$10.2 billion and give it directly to local school systems. So local parents, local teachers, and locally elected school board members would determine how that money is spent. That gives us a 100-cent solution, because then every dollar will go to local teachers, local parents, and locally elected school board members.

The President and, obviously, many people in Washington believe we know better; that it is worth having a program where only 37 cents out of every dollar gets to the classroom because the bureaucracy is adding so much value by telling parents and teachers and locally elected school board members, who do not understand education, how to do it.

If anybody ever believed that, surely when we are in a situation where our test scores have stagnated, our reading scores are flat or declining, and where we are ranking last, or near last, in every achievement test given internationally, I just think it is unconscionable and hurtful to the country and to the children to stay with a system where only 37 cents out of every dollar we spend gets through to the classroom.

That is what the debate is about. When you hear the President say, "We want Congress to act on education," we have already acted. The President wanted \$32 billion. We have given the President \$32 billion. But where the difference is, the President wanted the Federal Government to spend the money, the President wanted to keep a system where 63 cents out of every dollar gets lost before it gets to the classroom, and what we are trying to do is to give the money directly to local school systems and cut the bureaucrats out of it.

When you hear the President talking about this issue, understand that, despite what he appears to be saying, the dispute is not about how much money is going to be spent, the dispute is about who is going to do the spending. Bill Clinton and our Democrat colleagues want the Federal Government to do the spending with an old system

where bureaucrats get 63 cents out of every dollar. We want local parents, local teachers, locally elected school board members to do the spending, because we believe that people love their children more than the Government does. We believe that parents know better about education than the Government does.

Let me also say for those who say, "Where are the education bills that have been passed in this Congress?" let me just remind those who are interested that we passed a bill in this Congress, this year, that provided parents with the ability to set aside tax free up to \$2,000 a year to use to send their children to summer school or to get afterschool tutoring or to buy education equipment, like a computer, or to send their children to parochial or private schools, if they choose. The President vetoed that bill.

We passed literacy funding. The President vetoed that bill.

We passed a teacher merit pay program. The President, standing with the teachers unions and not with the students, vetoed that bill.

We passed a bill giving low-income families some choice in education. The President sent his child to private school in the District of Columbia, and he had every right to do it. The point is, however, that we wanted to give working families the same rights the President had, and the President vetoed it.

We had tax relief for parents whose children use the State tuition prepaid plan where you can start paying, even before your child is born, for him or her to go to Texas A&M, and you can do it at a discount because your money is building up. If they pass the test and can get in, you have paid for it. We wanted to give tax advantages to encourage families to do that. The President vetoed it.

We had tax relief for employer-provided education assistance. We have all heard employers everywhere saying to us, "The kids who come to work for us out of high school don't have the skills they need. They can't read, they can't write, they can't reason." So employers are beginning to pay their own money to reeducate their workers. We wanted to encourage it by making it tax free if they do that, because they know the skills they need. The President vetoed it.

Finally, we now are trying to give local school systems more control, to take control away from Federal bureaucrats. The President says he will veto it unless we change it to spend the money his way, which is 63 cents for bureaucrats and 37 cents for classrooms. That is not good enough for America anymore.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 13 minutes left.