

When Mr. Clinton and George W. Bush worked this year to win votes for normal trade relations with Beijing—so that China could enter the WTO—Mr. Gore again dodged responsibility. In fact, he told union protectionists behind closed doors that if Mr. Clinton failed with the China vote, he—Al Gore—would insist on labor provisions in any new agreement.

Third: Mr. Gore's experience with the environment should be of concern to Americans, regardless of their views on climate change. He locked our climate change policy into a bureaucratic, restrictive, and impractical Kyoto treaty. The Senate, Democrats and Republicans alike, voted 97 to 0 in protest against this agreement. The treaty has many flaws, not the least of which is a failure to include greenhouse gas requirements for China, India and other countries whose growing emissions could dwarf America's own reductions.

Even some environmentalists are concerned privately that this impractical agreement—like other in Mr. Gore's international file—impedes realistic goals based on scientific evidence and practical plans to deal with greenhouse gases. Indeed, Joe Lieberman, who recognized that the Kyoto treaty had created stalemate instead of progress, tried to fashion legislation that bypassed the Kyoto strictures.

#### POOR JUDGMENT

Finally, Mr. Gore's experience flashes warning signs about his approach to being commander-in-chief. Mr. Gore reminds us that he voted in support of the Gulf War resolution. He does not admit, however, that in critical Senate testimony only about six weeks before the war began, he harshly criticized President Bush's decision to send the military reinforcements to the Gulf that were necessary to launch a successful attack. Instead, Mr. Gore wanted to rely on economic sanctions.

It was also discouraging that Mr. Gore told a national TV audience that he would impose social policy "litmus tests" on appointments to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. After learning that this idea would have politicized the military—and precluded the service of Colin Powell, Norman Schwarzkopf and others who differ with him on gays in the military—the "experienced" vice president reversed himself.

Mr. Gore's spinners are now programmed to blurt out that he has 20-odd years of foreign policy exposure. There is more than a touch of truthful irony in that claim. This is part of a pattern of the vice president relying on references to resumes, committees and agreements—instead of outlining strategies to use U.S. power for sound ends. Mr. Gore does indeed have foreign policy experience. Unfortunately for him, it is bad experience.

STATEMENT BY FORMER SECRETARIES OF STATE, DEFENSE, DIRECTORS OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AND NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISORS ON THE SALE OF RUSSIAN WEAPONS TO IRAN, OCTOBER 24, 2000

The following individuals, who include supporters of both Governor George W. Bush and Vice President Gore, believe strongly that:

"The President's most important job is safeguarding our nation's security and our ability to protect our interests, our citizens and our allies and friends. The military balance in regions of vital interest to America and her allies—including the Persian Gulf, which is a critical source of the world's energy supplies—is the essential underpinning for a strong foreign policy.

"This is why we are deeply disturbed by the agreement made between Vice President Gore and then Russian Premier

Chernomyrdin in which America acquiesced in the sale by Russia to Iran of highly threatening military equipment such as modern submarines, fighter planes, and wake-homing torpedoes.

"We also find incomprehensible that this agreement was not fully disclosed even to those committees of Congress charged with receiving highly classified briefings—apparently at the request of the Russian Premier. But agreement to this request is even more disturbing since the Russian sales could have brought about sanctions against Russia in accordance with a 1992 U.S. law sponsored by Senator John McCain and then Senator Al Gore."

George P. Shultz, former Secretary of State.

James A. Baker, III, former Secretary of State.

Zbigniew Brzezinski, former Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

Frank C. Carlucci, former Secretary of Defense and former Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

Lawrence S. Eagleburger, former Secretary of State.

Henry A. Kissinger, former Secretary of State and former Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

Donald H. Rumsfeld, former Secretary of Defense.

James R. Schlesinger, former Secretary of Defense and former Director of Central Intelligence.

Brent Scowcroft, former Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

Caspar W. Weinberger, former Secretary of Defense.

R. James Woolsey, Attorney and former Director of Central Intelligence.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I commend my colleague from Missouri for bringing up a very important issue.

#### THE RECORD IN TEXAS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, it looks as though we are going to have to respond to the many charges that are being made on the Senate floor in the Presidential campaign. I am sorry it has come to that because I don't like to see that happening on the Senate floor. I am committed to not letting the record go unchallenged when I know for a fact the record is being misrepresented.

In fact, the Senator from Massachusetts earlier this afternoon misrepresented the facts about Governor Bush's record in Texas. I am very proud to say that Governor Bush has an outstanding record in Texas; that Texas is a great place to live; that Texas has surpassed New York now to be the second largest State in America. That is because so many people are choosing to come to Texas to live. They are coming for a variety of reasons. Quality of life is No. 1. A good solid public education system that is improving every day is another. Quality health care is another. We have many reasons to be proud of the record of our State and the Governor and the legislature of our State.

I will address first the issue of education. This has been the most egregious misrepresentation. In fact, the Rand organization that does research

into many areas put out just this last July a comprehensive study of public education reforms in our country. The report based its analysis on the National Assessment of Educational Progress tests given between 1990 and 1996. The authors ranked the 44 participating States by raw achievement scores, by scores that compare students from similar families and by score improvements. They also analyzed which policies and programs accounted for the substantial differences in achievements across States that can't be explained by demographics.

What they were doing is taking 44 States that had significant public education reforms and determining what worked and what didn't. I will read directly from the press release that was issued by the Rand Corporation.

Math scores are rising across the country at a national average rate of about one percentile point per year, a pace outstripping that of the previous two decades and suggesting that public education reforms are taking hold. Progress is far from uniform, however. One group of states—led by North Carolina and Texas and including Michigan, Indiana and Maryland—boasts gains about twice as great as the national average.

I just learned that Senator KENNEDY made the charge that Texas is dead last in public education.

I think the Rand study released in July of this year that looked at a comprehensive set of scores from 44 States should be given some weight.

No. 2, from the Rand report:

Even more dramatic contrasts emerge in the study's pathbreaking, cross-State comparison of achievement by students from similar families. Texas heads the class in this ranking. . . .

I am not going to read the names of the States that are at the bottom because I don't think it is necessary. Texas is No. 1.

Although the two States are close demographic cousins, Texas students, on average, scored 11 percentile points higher on the NAEP math and reading tests than their . . . counterparts. In fact, the Texans performed well with respect to most States. On the fourth grade NAEP math tests in 1996, Texas non-Hispanic white students and black students ranked first compared to their counterparts in other States, while Hispanic students ranked fifth.

The report goes on to say:

The most plausible explanation for the remarkable rate of math gains by North Carolina and Texas is the integrated set of policies involving standards, assessment and accountability that both States implemented in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

I remind you that Governor Bush was elected in 1994 in Texas. That is when we started beginning to see the results of the reforms that have taken place.

Let's talk about Governor Bush's record. Since being elected Governor, George Bush has seen minority test scores increase by 85 percent. Overall test passage rates increased by 38 percent. Governor Bush and the legislature, working together, increased teacher salaries by one-third since his election, increased public funding of education by \$8 billion, and per pupil

expenditures have increased by 37 percent. Under Governor Bush's education reform plan, social promotions were ended. We spent \$200 million in new early education funding to make sure all third graders read at grade level.

That is the emphasis Governor Bush has made in Texas that is beginning to reap the great rewards shown by the students who have been tested in these recent tests that are now being studied. In fact, Texas is at the top of the class. It is because they are going to the third grade level to target students who don't have reading skills. Governor Bush believes that if a child can't read at grade level in the third grade, of course, the child is going to have trouble going through the public education system.

It does not take a rocket scientist to know if the child is trying to progress without reading skills, the child is going to fall behind. That is what we are trying to correct in Texas, and it is working. It is working. That is why our test scores are skyrocketing.

I think we need to put to rest all of the misinformation that is out there about the Texas public education system. We are very proud that we are putting the money into the system; we are increasing teacher's salaries; we are attracting more teachers so that our teacher shortages will go down.

Most public schools have teacher shortages, and we are trying to address that issue with creativity. We are trying to attract people into the classroom who have specific skills that we don't have in the classroom now because of the teacher shortages. So we are targeting math and science and languages and computer skills. We are looking to retired military people, people retired from industry, and we are trying to attract them to the teaching profession because we think it is so important that our young people have access to this kind of quality in the classroom.

We in Texas stand second to none in the improvements in our public education system, and it is going nowhere but up. We know if we can catch those children in the third grade, they are going to have a chance to reach their full potential, and that is what Governor Bush is doing in Texas and what he wants to do for our country.

Let's talk about health care. Governor Bush and the Texas Legislature have led the effort to enact the Nation's first comprehensive Patients' Bill of Rights. In fact, Texas has a Patients' Bill of Rights, and it is a terrific program. It is working. It is working because we have an independent review process, because we are targeting health care; we are not targeting trial lawyers being able to sue HMOs—although that is allowed if all of the appeals are exhausted. It is allowed, but there are caps on noneconomic damages. So that brings more reasonable limits to irrational lawsuits, but it allows the protection of the patient who doesn't get the good care.

But the focus is not on retribution; the focus is on getting health care in the first place. It doesn't help the patient to be able to sue later for a terrible accident. What we want is for the health care decisions to be made by the patient and the doctor. That is what the Patients' Bill of Rights does in Texas. It became law while Governor Bush was our Governor, working with our bipartisan legislature.

Today, we have 100,000 children enrolled in the CHIP program. We will enroll 425,000 by the end of next year. We are in the process of educating parents about who is eligible for the CHIP program. We are going to reach every child who is eligible for this program so that our children will have health care.

Let me tell you what Governor Bush and the legislature did to make sure of that coverage. They allocated the largest part of the tobacco settlement that Texas got to the CHIP program for health insurance for every child in Texas, and they put into a trust fund billions of dollars from which the interest will go to every county in Texas for the purpose of providing indigent health care in those counties because, of course, in many counties in Texas the buck stops with them for the provision of health care for their indigent population.

This money will come in perpetuity to every one of the 254 counties in Texas. Every one of those counties will participate in the interest on that trust fund for their health care needs in that county, and that is a huge help for those counties providing that health care. That was done under the leadership of Governor Bush and the great speaker of the Texas House and the Lieutenant Governor of Texas. It was a bipartisan effort that made that happen.

So I think our Texas health care system is very sound. I have heard a lot of charges being made about the quality of our public education and our health care, and I just happen to know firsthand that those making the charges are misinformed. I don't think we need to run down one of the great States in our Nation in order to get advantages in the Presidential race.

I am disappointed, frankly, in my colleagues who would do this. I am disappointed that they don't have enough to say about their views and their visions for our country, that they have to come to the Senate floor and run down Texas in their campaign for President of the United States. I don't think it is necessary, I don't think it is proper, and I don't think it is seemly. I think we can do better in this country, and I don't think—at least I hope that not one person in this country is going to have his or her vote swayed because of what is happening in Texas.

I would like to think that if people are looking at Texas they have the facts and that they have a good feeling about my great State. I certainly don't think running down my State is the

way to run a Presidential campaign because people are moving to our State by the thousands. That is why Texas is now the second largest State in America—surpassing New York. They are coming there because it is a good climate in which to do business; it is a good climate in which to create jobs; and it is a good climate in which to raise a family. It is a good place to live. And we have a Governor who has contributed a whole lot to make that happen. We have a great legislature that has worked with our Governor in a bipartisan way.

That is what our Governor would like to bring to the Congress. We would like to be able to work in a bipartisan way to make the laws that will achieve the dreams of every American child. We would like to have cooperation between the Republicans and the Democrats. But I don't think we are fostering cooperation when people come to the Senate floor and run down my State. I don't think that is very bipartisan, and I don't think it is very honorable.

I hope we can turn off the Texas bashing. I hope we can talk about the dreams and aspirations of our Presidential candidate. I hope we can give Governor Bush the credit for the reforms in the public education system that are making such a difference in the lives of so many Texans. Our children are learning to read and they are beginning to like school. They are wanting to stay in school, and they are not going to drop out of high school if they have a chance to see that their public education is going somewhere. We are giving hope to our children. We are taking care of them. That is what we should all want for all of our States.

I don't think we should have to continually come to the floor to defend our State. I hope I don't have to do it again. But I guarantee that I will be here again if I hear that one of my colleagues is bashing Governor Bush and the State of Texas. Every time I hear that is happening, I am going to come to the floor and I am going to ask for time to set the record straight because the record is a good one. The record is one of education reform that has a goal, that allows every child in Texas to reach his or her full potential, and a goal that we want for every State in this country. We want no child to be left behind. We want every child to reach his or her full potential with a public education—not that we don't wish the children who have private education well. We want them to have those choices. We want children to be able to go to private schools, or parochial schools, or public schools, or charter schools. We want all the options out there because we believe with all of the options that every child will then have a chance to do what is best for that child, and we believe the base of all of this is a strong system of public education.

We believe that a public education that has competition is a better public education. That is why we want the

choices and the creativity for our children's education.

I hope this is the end of Texas bashing. I hope this is the end of our congressional session so we can have our Presidential campaign on the merits so that the people of our country will be able to listen to the Presidential candidates. But I don't think we need to have a Presidential race that runs down the State of one of our candidates. Thank goodness we don't see that happening on the other side of the aisle. The Republicans are not bashing Tennessee. We like Tennessee very much. We don't think it is necessary to run down a State from which another Presidential candidate comes in order to get advantages. We happen to believe Tennessee is a great State. We believe Texas is a great State, too.

I hope this is the end of this kind of politicking. I hope it is the end of using the Senate floor for political advantage in the Presidential race.

I hope we can give the credit that is deserved to the Governor of Texas and to the Legislature of Texas working together and for their willingness to address the issues of education reform, for their willingness to address the issues related to health care and health care coverage for our children because we have made it a priority in Texas. That is why it is such a terrific State; we believe in the jobs that are created in Texas and the good working people who live in Texas have been able to do very well because we have a healthy climate in Texas and a healthy business climate, as well as a healthy environment and a healthy climate in which to raise families. Those are the fundamentals of what our State has to offer, and it is why so many people are moving to our great State and why we welcome that move.

I thank the Presiding Officer for allowing me to correct the record that was created with some misinformation earlier today. I hope we will not have to defend Texas again. I hope we are very close to ending the Texas bashing because I don't think anybody is going to vote against Governor Bush because of misinformation about Texas. I think the people of America are smarter than that. I think the people of America deserve better than that. It is my fervent hope that they are able to hear the candidates' views on the issues without the negative campaigning on what is happening in Texas. I think if anybody would just come to Texas and see for themselves, they would be very pleased with the leadership of Governor Bush and our Texas Legislature.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFEE). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed in morning business for 20 minutes.

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

## TEXAS

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I thank my dear colleague from Texas for her comments on the floor. It seems that our colleague, Senator KENNEDY from Massachusetts, has decided that now he wants to come over daily and tell people how terrible Texas is. I think my dear colleague from Texas has done a very good job answering Senator KENNEDY. But I don't think, quite frankly, the charges need to be answered per se in any other way other than saying that in America, thank God, we have a freedom where people can move. So if Texas were this terrible State that Senator KENNEDY says it is, then we would expect people to be exercising their freedom to move out of Texas and to move to paradise States such as Massachusetts.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a quick unanimous consent request?

Mr. GRAMM. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I am thrilled with the presentation of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when he is through I be recognized.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, Senator KENNEDY would have us believe that Texas is a terrible place. But we can look at what is actually happening in Texas. We created 1.6 million new, permanent, productive, tax-paying jobs for the future since Governor Bush has taken office. This is 50% faster than job growth nationwide. And while the Nation has lost manufacturing jobs, we have created almost 100,000 new manufacturing jobs in Texas under the leadership of Governor Bush.

But there is a simple, empirical test as to whether people want to live in a State and what the quality of life is and how good the political leadership is of that State. People vote with their feet. People vote with their feet by leaving places that have bad government and they come to places that have good government.

Senator KENNEDY wants us to believe that Texas is this terrible place. The incredible paradox is, consistently now for over 30 years, people have been leaving Massachusetts and moving to Texas. For over 30 years, Texas has exploded in population as Americans have chosen to move there, make their life there, and cast their lot with those who were elected to represent them in Texas. And for over 30 years, people have cast their lot by picking up, packing up their children in the station wagon, and driving out of Massachusetts. It seems to me that is the empirical test.

I personally believe that this silly business about attacking States as part of a political campaign doesn't make any sense. I don't know why Sen-

ator KENNEDY feels compelled to talk about it. I don't know why he feels compelled to try to attack Texas. The last fellow that tried to attack Texas was General Santa Ana. It did not turn out too well for him. Maybe Senator KENNEDY thinks it is going to turn out better for him than it did for General Santa Ana.

I think the message here is not that Massachusetts is a bad place because people are picking up and moving out of it; in fact, it is a very nice place. They have very good people. But they have politicians who have implemented in Massachusetts the program that AL GORE wants to implement in America. They have spent and taxed, spent and taxed, spent and taxed. In the process, every time we take a census, every time we reapportioned representation in the U.S. Congress for the last 30 years, relatively speaking, as compared to the population growth of the country, people have moved out of Massachusetts and moved to Texas. We have gained congressional representation, and Massachusetts has lost congressional representation.

I don't think that says that Massachusetts is a bad place. Everything I know about their people, they are wonderful people. But it says something about the key issue in the campaign for President of the United States. It says that when Americans have the right to vote with their feet, they turn their backs on the policies of AL GORE—spend and tax, spend and tax, spend and tax—and they vote with their feet by walking away from those policies.

Senator KENNEDY has come over today and yesterday and instead of defending GORE's policies, which no one can defend, he tries to attack Texas. But the plain truth is, the people who have moved out of Massachusetts in the last 30 years have moved because they were rejecting AL GORE's policies of spend and tax that have been implemented in Massachusetts.

Here is the problem. If we implemented those policies in America, the policies that have been implemented in Massachusetts and that AL GORE has proposed, with almost \$3.3 trillion worth of new Government spending, over 70 massive new Government programs and program expansions, if we adopted those policies in America, where would you move? How would you move with your feet? Who is ready to walk off and leave their country?

The problem is, we can vote with our feet to leave Massachusetts and flee bad government and come to Texas. But we can't vote with our feet, we don't want to vote with our feet, to leave America. So again we don't want to leave America. I say to my dear colleague from Utah; we need to turn our back on the policies of tax and spend that have been imposed by politicians in Massachusetts and we need to reject them for America.

I have thought it is bad policy and bad form to debate the campaign for