

and the contractual classroom obligations of teachers. Nonetheless, even though we have little longitudinal data for class sizes, average class size will tend to move with pupil-teacher ratios.

²A more detailed discussion of the evidence along with citations for the relevant work can be found in Eric A. Hanushek, *The Evidence on Class Size*, Occasional Paper No. 98-1, W. Allen Wallis Institute of Political Economy, University of Rochester, February 1998. The complete text is also available at <http://petty.econ.rochester.edu>.

³Edward Wexler, et al. *California's Class-size reduction: Implications for Equity, Practice & Implementation*. WestEd and PACE, March 1998.

⁴See Dale Ballou and Stephanie Soler: *Addressing the Looming Teacher Crunch: The Issue is Quality*. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute, February 1998.

⁵A full discussion of the issues of incentives and of experimentation is found in Eric A. Hanushek with others. *Making Schools Work: Improving Performance and Controlling Costs*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1994.

⁶Ibid.

[From the News Journal, Sept. 4, 1998]

EXHIBIT 2

MICROMANAGEMENT BY LEGISLATORS IS MOCKERY OF REAL SCHOOL REFORM

Reducing the size of classes is popular with parents and, in some cases, teachers. It offers politicians a way to make headlines that please constituents.

But most respected academic research suggests that reducing classes by one or two students has virtually no impact on the quality of instruction.

Nonetheless, this year the General Assembly mandated that Delaware's public school classrooms be limited to 22 students. The idea was pushed by Rep. Timothy Boulden, R-Newark, who no doubt thought he was doing the right thing. He wasn't. He was pandering to parents who don't understand the issue any more than he does. Research suggests that a home environment that encourages learning is the most important factor in success in school. But the government can't do much about that.

Next comes teachers. It's no surprise that a highly qualified teacher has enormous impact on students. And that's a factor state government can do something about. But legislators and other reformers have refused to deal with it in any meaningful way this year.

There is discussion about increasing qualifications for teacher certificates, regular recertification thereafter and continuing professional development.

Teachers' salaries also must be part of improving this standard. Delaware pays its teachers too little. We're losing some of the best and brightest to neighboring states. This, too, is something the General Assembly can do something about—but doesn't.

Instead, it micromanages school systems with bills like Rep. Boulden's class-size measure. It's quick, easy, relatively inexpensive and popular. But smaller classes aren't significant unless the numbers go down to 15 or fewer students. That would cost hundreds of millions of dollars (The current 22-student mandate cost \$6.5 million.)

Most school districts are having difficulty meeting that mandate as it is, in part because it came well after they had planned the 1998-1999 school year. Many more classrooms are required in some districts, and others have had to shift art, music and physical education. Others might have to dismiss librarians and counselors.

It's ridiculous. The General Assembly does the most harm when it micromanages state agencies. It should set broad goals and high standards, and then give the professionals the tools they need to achieve them.

Mr. ENZI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent to be able to speak up to 12 minutes, to be followed by Senator DEWINE for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized to speak for up to 12 minutes.

Mr. ENZI. Thank you, Mr. President.

EIA COST ESTIMATES ON GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, we have been talking about the budget and the way that the President of the United States wants to spend Social Security—the surplus. I want to talk to you about that in another line—the way that the White House wants to raise your taxes, and the way they are going to do it in November in a very subtle way. I am going to talk to you about jobs—your jobs—and the effort that is underway by the White House to shift your job overseas. The White House has been denying that. I know that the Energy Information Administration confirms it, and how we will not only shift your job overseas, but we are going to charge more for everything that you buy.

Let me explain how this works. The new Energy Information Administration estimate is very important for a couple of reasons. It proves that the White House is using funny numbers on global warming. In my opinion, it also points out that we are spending a lot of time debating the details of a treaty that is fundamentally flawed. I have always said that something not worth doing at all is not worth doing well. The administration has already bought the global warming treaty, and now we are trying to figure out how to pay for it. We are trying to figure out how to make it work. It is as if we decided to sink the mother ship and now we need to figure out the cheapest way to rescue all of the people.

Mr. President, it is easy. Don't sink the ship. Sink the treaty. It is like saying that the *Titanic* is going down and we need to reorganize how the deck chairs are placed.

I came to the floor in July and raised serious doubts about the numbers that were dreamt up by the Council of Economic Advisers. The council chairman, Janet Yellen, has testified twice that Kyoto would cost American families somewhere between \$70 and \$110 per year. I don't know how you feel about it, but the people in Wyoming think that \$70-odd to \$110 per year more for Government taxes is a lot. But I want to point out that the independent economists put those costs as high as \$2,100 per year per household. That is a pretty good, hefty tax. And it is a \$2,000 difference from what the administration is saying that it will amount to.

I have tried to get the real numbers on this before. I have been stonewalled by the White House. Then I finally got some numbers that were rather unin-

telligible. I asked questions about them. I got a letter from the White House Counsel's Office that said that public disclosure of the real terms would set an unfortunate precedent that could chill the free flow of internal discussions essential to effective executive decisionmaking.

In other words, the White House can't really share the numbers with us because we, the Congress, would have a chilling effect on policy-making? That is our realm. We need to have the data on which to operate. And the White House is the one in charge of providing that data.

We have a credibility gap. We have a credibility gap with the administration.

I think it is interesting to compare the cost estimates from the White House with the cost estimates from the independent Energy Information Administration, part of the administration. The White House says the annual average increase in household energy would be \$70 to \$110.

I have a little chart. This shows a few of the studies that have been done on global warming. The red line is the administration. You will notice that all of them that have been done are on the very bottom level. This is the one that says it is only going to cost you \$70 to \$110 a year. The blue line is the Energy Information Administration, part of the administration. This blue line, you will notice, appears at the top of the list. That is what they say it is going to cost you—\$335 to \$1,740 per year per family.

The White House says gasoline would only go up to \$1.31 a gallon. The Energy Information Administration says \$1.91 a gallon.

How about fuel oil? That is something our friends in the Northeast worry about. The White House says, "Don't worry, it will only go up to about \$1.17 a gallon." The Energy Information Administration says it will go up to \$1.90 a gallon. Who do you want to believe? The administration's low numbers or the administration's high numbers? You are the one paying the bill; which one would you trust?

I wanted you to know what kind of assumptions the Council of Economic Advisers used. How did they get things to look so rosy? It turns out they brought the cost down using two tricks. Their own internal report said they had to figure out some way to bring down the cost or it would not be feasible. They already bought the treaty, now they have to figure out why they bought the treaty. They want the American people to think they got a good deal for you.

The two tricks they use are electricity deregulation and emissions trading. That is how they make it seem to cost less, even though I thought we wanted to deregulate electricity to save the people back home money. What we are going to do is deregulate it and use that money to pay for the global warming treaty. I guess now we

need to go back and tell them that the money is already spent if we deregulate, and it has to be deregulated because we have to spend the money. That seems to happen a lot around here.

Then the emissions trading scheme, that one takes the cake. Each of the cost estimates I have seen include a range of credit trading scenarios. The assumption is the more credits we can buy, the cheaper it will be to meet our Kyoto commitments. That is the assumption: The more we buy, the cheaper it gets. That is like going to the mall and saving money by taking advantage of as many sales as you can. You still spend the money.

The Energy Information Administration says the credits will cost us \$70 to \$350 a term. In people terms, that is 15 cents to 70 cents a gallon of gas, up to an 80 percent increase in your electrical bill. And we thought deregulation would save us some money.

The range is as a result of not knowing how many countries will participate. If we have to buy all our credits only from Europe and Russia, they are going to be very expensive. That puts us in the \$350-per-ton range. If we get countries like China and India to sell us their emission credits, we can get that cost down to \$70. That is the assumption.

Do you know why they will sell us theirs for so low a price? They don't have any ceiling. Last year I went to Kyoto. I got to meet with the Chinese delegation. By the year 2012 they are going to be the biggest polluters in the whole world and they will not be a part of the treaty. Why not? They are a developing nation. They cannot be put under those constraints. I asked them when they would be done being a developing nation. They said, "Never." Good negotiating. They even developed a fine system so that if we pollute, we get fined, and the money goes to, guess who, the developing nations. They get the money that way.

Now there is another scheme—sell credits. We buy the right to pollute from China and the developing nations. They will sell it to us for just \$70 a ton because they have no limit. They are not really selling a quantity. They can sell as many units as they want. They are already polluting; they can continue to pollute. Good deal for us? That is what the White House says we can do. We will pay China so we can have the right to drive our cars and turn on our lights. We will pay China so we can drive when we want to and where we want to. Just pay China and you can turn on all your Christmas lights whenever you want. They will already have the jobs.

In theory, China will limit its own emissions at some future level. In the meantime, they will sell us permits, in theory. In theory the whole world would participate and we would reduce the growth of carbon emissions and save the Earth from certain devastation—in theory.

I got to meet with those nations that are island nations; if global warming happens, they will be inundated by water. They are not going to be a part of the treaty. If this were a real problem and your country was going to be inundated by water, wouldn't you sign the treaty? Wouldn't you push every nation in the world to sign the treaty? I can tell you, they are not, which tells you what they think about global warming.

It is a way to get jobs. It is a way to sell emission credits. The whole world is not participating and the Earth will not be saved because the treaty will not reduce carbon emissions. In fact, we cannot even get the developing world to abide by copyright treaties, what makes anybody think they will abide by an emissions treaty even if they sign it? Oh, no, the joke will be on us. It will be on the American people. We are planning to pay China for a piece of paper that says, "We reduced our emissions by 1 ton so you can increase yours by 1 ton." And we will pay them for that right. That is what it says.

What are we going to do if they just take the money and keep on polluting? And they have assured us they would. Are we going to send in troops and demand our money back? The Energy Information Administration has pointed out that this treaty would cost American families between \$350 and \$1,740 per year. That is what the private economists have been saying. And it will eliminate jobs.

I urge my colleagues to get a copy of this report and read it. In November the administration will go to Buenos Aires, Argentina, to continue negotiations on the Kyoto treaty. They plan to work out emissions trading enforcement provisions. These are two critical parts of how this treaty will hurt American families. People need to be mindful of this process. People need to protest this process. Now is the time, not during the negotiations, not after the President has signed and sent a treaty here that we have already said, 95 to 0, does not meet the requirements for the economy in the United States, that it is just selling our economy.

A study conducted by DRI-McGraw-Hill estimated Kyoto could cost us 1.5 million jobs. Charles River Associates put that figure as high as 3.1 million jobs by 2010.

Even the Argonne National Laboratory, pointed to job losses in a study on the impact of higher energy prices on energy-intensive industries. Argonne concluded that 200,000 American chemical workers could lose their jobs. All of the American aluminum plants could close, putting another 20,000 workers out of work. Cement companies would move another 6,000 jobs overseas. And nearly 100,000 U.S. steel workers would be out of work.

Americans have a right to know what is going on, even if the Office of White House Counsel does not think so. They should have a chance to see who is playing with their livelihoods.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JEFFORDS). Under a previous order, the Senator from Ohio is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, let me first congratulate my colleague from Wyoming for a very eloquent and very thoughtful statement about a very serious issue, a very serious problem.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE DRUG ELIMINATION ACT

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago we introduced the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. This bipartisan legislation, which now has over one-third of the Senate as cosponsors, calls for an additional \$2.6 billion investment in international counter-narcotics efforts over the next 3 years. With the additional resources provided in this legislation, we can begin to restore a comprehensive eradication, interdiction, and crop substitution strategy. I say "restore." I say restore because we currently are not making the same kind of effort to keep drugs from entering the United States that we used to. Drugs are now easy to find and easy to buy. As a result, the amount of drugs sold on our streets and the number of people who use drugs, particularly our young people, is at an unprecedented high level. The facts demonstrate the sobering trends.

The August 1998 National Survey of Drug Abuse report by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration lists the following disturbing facts: One, in 1997, 13.9 million Americans age 12 and over cited themselves as "current users" of illicit drugs, a 7 percent increase over 1996's figure of 13 million Americans. That translates to nearly a million new users of drugs each year.

Second, from 1992 to 1997, the number of children age 12 to 17 who were using illegal drugs has more than doubled and has increased by 27 percent, just from 1996 to 1997 alone.

For children age 12 to 17, first-time heroin use—which as we all know can be fatal—surged an astounding 875 percent, from 1991 to 1996. The overall number of past-month heroin users increased 378 percent from 1993 to 1997.

We cannot in good conscience and with a straight face say that our drug control strategy is working. It is not. More children are using drugs. With an abundant supply, drug traffickers now are seeking to increase their sales by targeting children age 10, 11, 12. This is nothing less than an assault on the future of our children, on our families, and on the future of our country itself. This is nothing less than a threat to our national values and, yes, even our national security.

All of this, though, begs the question: What are we doing wrong? Clearly there is no one, simple answer. However, one thing is clear: our overall drug strategy is no longer balanced; it is imbalanced. To be effective, our national drug strategy must have a