

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

President on the floor of the Senate. But given that Senator KENNEDY is now going to do it every day, apparently, I thought I would take the bait and talk for a moment.

When people were listening to the Presidential debates—the Senator from Utah watched them, I know, because we talked about it the next morning—they kept hearing AL GORE say: 1 percent of Americans get all the benefit. They get all these tax cuts. It is the rich people. It is the people against the privileged. And AL GORE is for the people. That is what they heard.

Those, by the way, are the same slogans that destroyed ancient Rome and destroyed ancient Athens. And I have to say that AL GORE sounds like a socialist candidate running in a Third World country, to stoop low enough to use that kind of language.

I want to explain to people why it is phony. Let me start by talking about AL GORE's record on taxes. Everybody knows he is not for George W. Bush's proposal to cut taxes. We all know that. Let me talk about his record in Congress, and as Vice President, on taxes. How many people know that when Jimmy Carter was President he proposed a tax cut in 1978, that among other things raised the personal exemption from \$750 to \$1,000 for working families with children, and made the earned-income tax credit permanent. When Jimmy Carter in 1978 said the American people deserve a tax cut and because of inflation—remember, Senator BENNETT, the inflation was in double digits when Jimmy Carter was President—he said we need to raise the personal exemption. What did AL GORE say? It is for the rich. It is for the rich. When you raise the personal exemption from \$750 to \$1,000, it will help the rich people. So he voted against the tax cut. Apparently, everybody that got a tax cut was rich.

Then in 1981 when Ronald Reagan proposed reducing taxes across the board for everybody, taking millions of families off the tax rolls completely, AL GORE thought that was a tax cut for rich people, and so he voted no.

Then when we had our effort to reduce the tax burden in 1995, AL GORE again had a chance to support tax cuts, but he supported the veto that killed the bill.

Then when we had the Tax Relief Act of 1999, a tax relief that was aimed at repealing the marriage penalty, AL GORE again supported the veto that killed the bill. He believed that if you make \$21,800 and you meet another person who makes \$21,800 a year and you fall in love and you get married, you become too rich to deserve a tax cut, and you are going to pay on average \$1,400 a year to the Federal Government in taxes for the right to be married.

Why should you do that? Because AL GORE believes that he can spend that \$1,400 better than your family can spend it. So when he had a chance in that tax cut to say yes, he said no.

When we passed the marriage penalty repeal, free standing, in the year 2000, he was opposed to it because we actually stretched the tax bracket for couples with each person making \$21,925 a year so that they didn't go into the higher, 28 percent tax bracket. But AL GORE thought they were the 1 percent who were privileged and so he supported the President in vetoing the repeal of the marriage tax penalty.

Then we passed the death tax repeal. This is a tax that small business people and family farmers pay. They work a lifetime to build up a business or family farm. They scrimp, they sacrifice, they save, and they build up the farm or business. They may not have much cash, but their land, if they are farmers, is worth a lot of money if they sold it. But they don't want to sell it. Their father worked it. They worked it. They want their children to work it. But AL GORE said: No, you are rich. And, besides, if you have to sell your family business, if you have to sell your family farm, it is worth it because the Government can spend this money better than you can spend this money.

Now look, here are all of the tax cuts since AL GORE has been a Member of Congress, or Vice President, that have been considered—major tax cuts by the U.S. Congress in all the years since AL GORE came to the House of Representatives. Guess what. He thought every one of these tax cuts was for rich people, because he never voted for a major tax cut. Not once since he came to Congress has he believed, on a major tax bill, that we ought to be cutting taxes.

I guess he thought, when we were raising the exemption for children from \$750 to \$1,000, that all those children were rich. When Reagan cut taxes across the board, took millions of people off the tax rolls, I guess AL GORE thought they were all rich, because he was against it. The point is, he has been against every major tax cut since he has been in public life; every one of them has been a dangerous scheme, to AL GORE.

Now that is only part of the story. You see, we have raised taxes since AL GORE has been in Congress. In fact, I have here every major tax increase that has been voted on since AL GORE came to Congress and while he was Vice President. Guess what. One thing you have to give him credit for, he is totally consistent; he has never voted against a major tax increase since he has been in public life. He voted for the major tax increase in 1983, 1984, 1987, in 1990, and 1993, and let me talk briefly about 1993.

You heard, if you watched all those debates, that AL GORE wants to tax rich people. He loves capitalism, but he seems to hate capitalists. He loves economic growth, but he seems to hate people who create it. He wants to pit people against each other, so if somebody is creating jobs, you ought to resent them if you are a worker.

I do not know about our colleague from Utah, but neither of my parents

graduated from high school. No poor person ever hired me in my life. Every job I ever got was from somebody who had a lot more money than I had. I was glad to have the job. Those jobs made it possible for people such as me to be successful in America. But AL GORE supported every major tax increase that has been voted on since he has been in public life—he voted for it.

Do you remember the point in the debate where he said: I am proud to have cast the deciding vote on the 1993 Clinton economic program. He did not tell people that that deciding vote was for a gasoline tax increase. The rhetoric of AL GORE and Bill Clinton was their 1993 tax bill only taxed rich people—it did not tax anybody but rich people. But listen to their definition of rich.

If you drove a car or a truck in America, you paid a higher gasoline tax, so, by AL GORE's definition, you were rich. If you remember, in the bill that was voted on in the House, that AL GORE supported, it had a Btu tax that would have taxed everybody's utility bills. Guess what. If you have heating or air-conditioning, if you use electricity or heating oil or natural gas, AL GORE believes you are rich, because he said he was only taxing rich people. Yet he supported taxing everybody's utility bill.

The final one, which was the ultimate, it seems to me, was the tax on Social Security. You know, it is funny. When you are not in these debates, you watch them on television, and you are brilliant. If you were just there, you would know exactly what to say. It is funny, when you are there, you never quite know what to say. But when AL GORE was talking about Social Security and he was accused of never having done anything about it, he didn't defend himself. But in fact he has done something. AL GORE, in fact, cast the deciding vote on something that profoundly affected Social Security, and that deciding vote was to tax the Social Security benefits of people who make over \$25,000 a year—in fact, to tax 85 percent of the benefits of every retiree in America who made over \$25,000 a year.

Wait a minute. AL GORE said, when he was for this bill, that it only taxed rich people. If you make \$25,000 a year and you are drawing Social Security, to AL GORE you are rich.

A final thing, and then I will stop. I thought it would be interesting. We heard all this business about who gets AL GORE's tax cut. I decided to do a little experiment. It is a little bit clever—it is not too clever—but here is the basic point. I decided to take a page out of the Washington Post. This is a want ads page of the Washington Post. It is page D11, on Tuesday, October 24. I have reproduced it up here.

I went through this list of jobs and asked: Who taking a job in this list would not be too rich to get AL GORE's tax cut? I am not talking about a tax cut you get if you do what AL GORE wants you to do. I am talking about a

cut in your income taxes, where you get to keep more of your money. So follow with me, if you will. This is page D11 of the want ads. Here are all the jobs: From Fairfax Yellow Cab, "cash daily"; dispatcher; we have here a sports entertainment local branch office for a national sports marketing firm; we have here a newspaper carrier; we have a driver for a warehouse chain—pretty much typical jobs in America.

If you go through this and you say, OK, take off every job that was on the want ads page in the Washington Post on Tuesday so that you just leave those jobs that, if you take those jobs, you get AL GORE's tax cut, there it is.

Now look. This is page D11 of the Washington Post. These are jobs that are out there right now for people: Landscape foreman and laborer, janitorial; interior design, sales; driver, class A tractor-trailer; drafter, 2 years of experience needed. These are real jobs in the real world. If you took one of these jobs, would you be too rich to get AL GORE's tax cut? When you take all the job ads off that would make you too rich for AL GORE's tax cut, that is what is left. Those are the jobs you could take and you would get AL GORE's tax cut. Here they are: Dry cleaning, pants pressers.

You can take a job in Vienna. Let me make it very clear, I am not denigrating these jobs. These are tickets to success in America. Thank God people are creating these jobs.

I do not want to go too far in reading it. Here is the point: You could get a job pressing pants, you could get a job as a lifeguard and cleaning a swimming pool, you could get a job as a newspaper carrier, and you could get AL GORE's tax cut. But if you have any of these other jobs—one can see the difference between them—if you got any of those other jobs, you do not get AL GORE's tax cut. I guess this says you are in the 1 percent. That comes as a big surprise to people as to who is rich and who is not rich.

I will sum up, make my point, and then yield to Senator BENNETT.

AL GORE has served in public life for a long time. In fact, he took pride in it. Look, it is God's work to be involved in public life. The point is, on every tax increase since AL GORE has been in public life, every one of any size or significance, he has voted for every one of them. Every tax cut voted on since AL GORE has been in public life, he has opposed every single major tax cut.

He has written a so-called tax cut that 89 percent of the jobs in the Washington Post on page D11 on Tuesday, if you took one of those jobs, your income would be too high to qualify for his tax cut.

If you did something he wanted you to do, that there was some kind of favorable tax treatment for, you might get some benefit, but in terms of getting to keep more of your own money to spend, which is what most people call a tax cut, this is what you are down to.

Why? Why has AL GORE in his whole public life never voted against a tax increase, never voted for a tax cut, and why does he want to exclude almost anybody who would get any job at random out of the newspaper? Because he believes in his heart that Government can spend the money better in Washington than you can spend it at home.

AL GORE is not against married couples. He is not against love. I know he loves his family, and he has a wonderful family. He should love them. But he believes that having working couples in America pay \$1,400 a year in a marriage penalty is OK, it is a good thing, it ought not to be repealed, because he believes Government can spend the \$1,400 better than they can spend it.

He believes it is OK to make people sell the family farm or sell the family business and destroy their parents' life's work and everything their family has worked for in America to give Government 55 cents out of every dollar they earn, not because he does not like small business or does not like family farms, he likes them, but he believes with all of his heart that Government can spend the money better than they can. If you have to sell your family farm and you have to give the life work of your parents and grandparents to the Government, he believes the Government will do the right thing in spending it and you will be better off.

If you believe that, your choice in this election is very clear. If you believe that Government, by spending \$3.3 trillion on new Government programs, which is what AL GORE has proposed, can make your life better, then you ought to vote for him. If you believe it is not risky to spend \$3.3 trillion in Washington but it is risky to give back \$1.3 trillion in tax cuts to working Americans, AL GORE is your man.

On the other hand, if you believe the Government is probably about as big as it ought to be, if you believe that you can do a better job spending your money than the Government can do, then you probably ought not to vote for AL GORE. You probably ought to vote for George Bush.

To tie it all together, what does this have to do with bashing Texas and Massachusetts? It has to do with people who have already made these decisions. Millions of people have moved to Texas because they wanted lower taxes, because they wanted more opportunity, because they wanted to decide. It was not that they hated Government. The Government does a lot of good things. It is they believe they can do things for their family better than the Government can do things for them.

Senator KENNEDY does not believe that. He thinks AL GORE is right. He believes we need to spend all this money. He believes we need a bigger Government. His State historically—it has changed; it is getting better, I believe—but historically, his State believed the same thing, which is why so

many people moved to Texas, because they were voting for freedom instead of Government.

Quite frankly, I would rather we not debate the Presidential campaign on the floor of the Senate, but as long as Senator KENNEDY is going to debate it, I am going to debate it. I want to debate the real issues, and the real issue is, do you want more Government or do you want more opportunity for your family? It is just about as clear as the issue can be clear.

Al Gore voted for every tax increase of any significance, against every tax cut of any significance since he has been in public life for one reason: He believes that Government can spend your money better. I do not. George Bush does not. The question is: What does America think?

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized under the previous order.

#### EDUCATION

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Texas for that most enlightening presentation. I agree with him we probably should not be debating the Presidential race on the floor.

I noticed the Senator from Massachusetts comes to the floor every day and talks about education, very often giving the same speech using the same set of charts. So I have decided I ought to respond to some of those charts to set the record straight.

One of the charts which the Senator from Massachusetts uses shows the increased school enrollment in the Nation, and he uses it to justify the Democratic position that we ought to require spending for new school construction. He says: Where are these students going to be housed if we do not pass this bill in the Federal Government that will mandate school construction?

We Republicans have always said we are willing to spend the money on education. Make no mistake, we are not talking about dollars here. Indeed, the bill that is working its way through the process and may come to the floor this week has more money for education than the President initially requested. Understand that. We are not talking about dollars, we are talking about control. Who is going to control the spending of those dollars? Will it be the Federal Government or will it be the people in the local areas?

I came across this chart, which I have had reproduced. It demonstrates what is happening with the percentage changes in public elementary and secondary school enrollment. The Senator from Massachusetts has a chart showing enrollment going up, and I agree with that, but this is a different chart, and it comes from the U.S. Department of Education. This, obviously, is not Republican propaganda. This comes from the administration. It breaks down school enrollment by region.