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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. Now, that will be the last vote of the night, then. There will not be recorded votes tomorrow, although the Senate will be in session for debate on the NATO enlargement and, hopefully, on an amendment, with a vote on that amendment scheduled for probably 5:30, around 5:30 on Monday. The reason we did this, there is a serious effort underway, on a bipartisan basis, of those who support this legislation to work with the leaders on both sides of the aisle to get a process where we can have a fair consideration of this bill and amendments that are important to the Members, and get to a conclusion on the whole process by late Wednesday afternoon. I think that is fair. I think that Members on both sides would like to do it. But I do think, as is the tradition in the Senate, the leaders on both sides need to work with their Members to develop a process that they can be comfortable with. I think I have shown a willingness to do that, and I believe Senator DASCHLE is going to be working on that with me and the bipartisan supporters of this legislation. Thank you for your effort. I will see some of you tomorrow and the rest of you Monday afternoon.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia will be recognized as soon as we have order in the Senate. The Senator from Georgia.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Georgia.

EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I thank the majority and minority leader for efforts to bring to resolution the ability to deal with this education proposal. I do want to make one comment for which there was not sufficient time in the 15 minutes allotted to each. Mr. President, in the final minutes of the last half-hour allotted to our debate before the vote, once again I heard the suggestion that the amount of tax benefit that would accrue to these 14 million American families that the Joint Tax Committee feel would take advantage of these education savings accounts is minimal and insignificant. Of course, I find it ironic that we would be operating under Presidential veto threats and five filibusters for something perceived to be so insignificant.

What these arguments fail to measure is the other information from the Joint Tax Committee. One says 14 million families will use this; 70 percent of them will be families with children in public schools; and in the first 4 years, these families with, I admit, just a little tax incentive, will save voluntarily about $5 billion. In over 8 years it will exceed $10 billion. That is not insignificant. That is putting billions of all new money behind improving education in America.

The Joint Tax Committee says about half of that will go to students in public schools and half in private. That may be. They have not evaluated the fact that sponsors, churches, corporations, friends, neighbors, and grandparents can also contribute to the account. The value of that has yet to be interpreted.

The other argument was that this account tends to benefit the wealthy. The Joint Tax Committee says 70 percent of it goes to families of $75,000 or less. But I think you have to step back and understand that the governance of these accounts—who can use them, which is pushing towards middle income and lower—is identical, I repeat, identical to the formula that was adopted by the other side and signed by the President for savings accounts for higher education. There is no difference.

So, I find it ironic that we would be arguing about this benefiting someone who they do not think should receive the benefit when it was just fine and dandy when it was signed on the White House lawn last fall. It is the same.

I guess the piece that is forgotten in this debate over how much is saved is they only focus on the interest saved, which is marginal. But they forget that it is the interest on a big piece of principal, and that for most families who open this savings account, the net effect of their savings will be 50 to 100 percent greater than the average family is saving in America today.

If nothing else was done at all, isn't it a good idea to cause Americans to save billions of dollars? But, in fact, it won't be just saved. This money is going to go to help children.

So far, this filibuster—and I will stop with this, Mr. President—this filibuster would keep 14 million families from opening a savings account; 20 million children from benefiting from it; in the first 4 years, $2.5 billion going behind kids in public schools; $2.5 billion going behind kids in private schools; 1 million workers who will receive benefit from their companies to extend their education; 1 million students who would have a tax advantage who bought prepaid tuition in 21 States; 250,000 graduate students who would now become eligible for employer-paid continuing education; and 500 schools won't be built because it makes new financing available for school districts across the whole land to build schools, and we are filibustering that kind of growth.

I am very hopeful that the work of the two leaders over the weekend will untie this knot and we can get on to being a good partner for families with children in schools in America. We sure need to do it. I yield the floor.

Mr. DEWINE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

FAMILY GROUP CONCERNS

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I would like to begin today a discussion on a piece of legislation that I have been working on, and others have been working on, for the past 7 months. I believe this legislation is vitally important to the economic well-being of our country—and I hope the full Senate will have an opportunity to debate this bill in the very near future.

The legislation that I am referring to is S. 1186, the Workforce Investment Partnership Act.

I have come to the floor on a number of occasions in the past to stress the immediate need to reform the Federal job training system. This need increases each day the Congress does not act.

During the numerous oversight hearings held in the Senate over the last 3 years, we have heard that we face in this country a fragmented and duplicative maze of narrowly focused job training and job-training-related programs, programs administered by numerous Federal agencies that lack coordination, lack a coherent strategy to provide training assistance, and lack the confidence of the two key consumers who utilize these services; namely, those seeking the training and those businesses seeking to hire them.

Throughout the hearing process, I have heard that reform is needed because the economic future of our country depends on a well-trained work force. Employers at every level are finding it increasingly difficult to locate and attract qualified employees for high-skilled, high-paying jobs, as well as qualified employees for entry-level positions.

Let me just give, Mr. President, one example. Right outside the Capital, right outside Washington, DC, in Northern Virginia, there are 19,000 high-tech, high-paying jobs that remain unfilled because individuals lack the skills to fill them. However, even with the shortage of skilled workers in Northern Virginia, you will still hear radio ads during morning drive time urging people to move to North Carolina to fill high-tech jobs down there.

Ohio faces a similar problem. Manpower, Incorporated recently released a poll which indicated that the Dayton area had a bright future in terms of job growth. Forty-two percent of area companies plan on hiring more manufacturing workers. However, while employers plan to hire, the availability of skilled workers to fill those jobs remains low. A Cleveland Growth Association survey recently showed that employers are becoming increasingly