

proceed. There would be a much stronger opposition if the bill were to be voted on right now, without some of the requests that we have made for amendments—amendments that I think are simple enough that they could have been agreed to as part of a package.

I want to say right up front that my vote was not a vote in favor of taxes. I want to reduce taxes. I want to stop new taxes—particularly at the Federal level. That is a goal we should all work toward. Federal income taxes, FICA taxes, unemployment taxes, and user taxes are always at the top of the list of burdens on working Americans and small businesses. I want to tell you that this bill doesn't reduce any of those taxes. This bill is an easy way for us to look good. We get to be the tax cutters by placing mandates on the other levels of government. We are tying the hands of local government to be able to finance itself, and we make ourselves out to be the good guys.

I wish all the Members who voted for cloture today would get as serious about reducing Federal taxes as they seem to be about reducing local taxes. This bill will create an unfair playing field. Congress does have a constitutional responsibility to regulate interstate commerce, and I understand the desire of the bill's sponsors to protect and promote the growth of Internet commerce. But I am concerned that we are picking the tax winners and the tax losers. I want to tell you, the local Main Street retailers will be the losers, unless we have some corrections in this bill.

There is also nothing in this bill to protect against fraud. The barriers to entry are so low in the Internet commerce and so hard to track that it is difficult to draw comparisons with catalog companies. Catalogs can be tracked. Those orders can be tracked. The Internet is a whole different problem.

The fraud that can exist in it can go so far as to have a retailer in a town set up an Internet web site in a State that does not have sales taxes. And when you go to purchase in that store, you would purchase through their other corporation in that tax-free State and free yourself from paying any sales tax. That is nice if you do not have to pay sales tax, except most of the States in this Nation rely on some form of sales tax for education money. Some States, including mine, rely on sales tax. There is no income tax in Wyoming. There is no income tax in several other States. There are provisions in the bill for States that do not have income tax to be represented on the commission. I think it is imperative that there be a provision in this Internet bill that those States which do not have an income tax but do have a sales tax also have representation on that committee.

There should also be a requirement for legislative suggestions from the commission. Right now the commis-

sion in this bill is required to give a report. A report on what? I think it ought to be much more specific than that and actually get into the instructions for legislation, the actual wording for the legislation that would ensure an end to the moratorium and be sure that we have something we can actually use. There should be a strong reporting requirement for the commission.

I look forward to debating this bill in the coming days. I am not opposed to the idea, but I think we have to move closer to the House version of the bill. The House bill does empower the commission to look at the remote sales issue. It does require the commission to produce legislative recommendations. These are important components of the bill that are necessary to keep it fair for small retailers and small governments.

I come from government that is closest to the people. I was a mayor for 8 years, and I served in the State legislature for 10. In Congress, we make decisions every day that affect the lives of millions of people, but they do not live at the Federal level. They live at the local level. In local government, you make decisions every day that affect the lives of your friends and neighbors, ones who know you and know what you are working on. There is a big difference.

I am very concerned with any piece of legislation that mandates or restricts local government's ability to meet the needs of citizens, and this bill does exactly that. It may not seem like a big restriction, and it may not exceed the \$50 million limit that Congress set in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, but it does establish a national policy against State and local government interference. It takes an affirmative step that ties the hands of local government.

What am I asking here? I am asking that we actually talk about some of the amendments that we need to have that maintain the status quo for State funding—not increases the tax, not decreases the tax, maintains the status quo. There are States that rely on this tax at the present time, and I will do everything I can to make sure that we do not take away the possibility, or the right, for those States to continue to operate.

We have to plug the loophole of the possibility for fraud, the possibility for fraud during the 2 years that there is a moratorium. If that gets established and allowed, we will have some of that happening for the rest of the time, and States again relying on the money will not have it.

That is a brief explanation. I will have an opportunity, I am sure, to expand on those considerably, but we do have concerns. That is why we are trying to make sure that we have an opportunity to have those addressed and to make sure they are addressed up front.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 12:30 p.m. with time equally divided between the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE, and the Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS, or their designees.

Ms. COLLINS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes from the control of the time of the Senator from Vermont, Senator JEFFORDS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1998

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, as a Senator from a State with an excellent record of accomplishment at the secondary education level, but a discouraging low rate of participation in higher education, I am extremely pleased to rise in support of the conference report on the higher education act amendments of 1998. Mr. President, I have had no higher priority than bringing this important legislation to completion this year.

I am very proud of the record of Maine's primary and secondary schools. We have one of the lowest high school dropout rates in the country, and we rank in the top third of the Nation for residents over 25 years old with high school diplomas. More important, the academic achievement of our schools is impressive. Education Week's "Quality Counts" assessment found that the performance of Maine's students in mathematics, science, and reading was at the very top of the Nation.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, there is one dark cloud in this otherwise very bright and sunny picture, and that is the low rate of participation in higher education by Maine's high school graduates. That low rate results not from a lack of interest or lack of ability, but rather from a lack of opportunity. The legislation we are considering today holds the key for young people of limited means to get through a door that, often for financial reasons, would otherwise remain closed to them.

This reauthorization of the Higher Education Act continues the historic commitment begun 40 years ago when Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act. In the NDEA, Congress stated, "The security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women."

In 1958, Congress was thinking of security in terms of the cold war and the recent launch of Sputnik by the Soviet Union. However, Mr. President, this statement remains equally valid today—although the challenge to our

national security is greatly different. Today, we face an internal threat—the threat of the rapidly advancing technology of a foreign enemy, but the quiet threat of failing to provide educational opportunity to all our citizens. Those deprived of that opportunity lose the chance to participate in our Nation's bright, technology-based economic future.

Given the well-established relationship between educational attainment and lifetime earnings, the consequences of not affording educational opportunity to lower-income Americans are predictable. Indeed, the result is a vicious cycle, in which the income gap leads to an education gap, which in turn leads to an even more pronounced income gap. Unless steps are taken to close the education gap, one that is rooted in economics rather than in ability, we lock the children of America's lower income families into a self-perpetuating cycle of inadequate education and low income.

The Higher Education Act seeks to close that education gap. It assumes that all qualified high school students graduating are entitled to higher education and strives to make this a reality through a program of grants, guaranteed loans, and Opportunity Programs.

The grant programs authorized by the Higher Education Act are the most important part of our attempt to assure access to higher education. Nationwide, Pell grants have assisted millions of students in obtaining postsecondary education. In Maine, 15,000 students were awarded \$24 million in Pell Grants last year. In addition, Maine institutions received more than \$6.5 million in Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants, which they distributed to the most needy students.

My strong belief in the importance of grant aid in expanding access to higher education has led me to introduce several bills to increase the level of Pell Grants for which students can qualify. One of these bills, the Working Students Income Protection Act, eliminated an unfair penalty that is imposed on low-income students who work to pay part of their educational expenses—just the kind of thing we ought to be encouraging. The bill was incorporated, I am pleased to say, into the Higher Education Act Amendments and, as a result, students may now earn \$2,000 a year more before their Pell Grants are reduced.

The act also reflects my efforts to ensure that the formula used to calculate the amount of a student's Pell Grant reflects the true costs of dependent care. As we increase the maximum level of Pell Grants, we approach the point at which this arbitrary cap of \$750, which is in the current law, would limit Pell Grants to some of the most deserving students—those balancing caring for their children and going to college. The changes in the Higher Education Act will prevent such students from having to choose between

supporting their children and pursuing higher education.

In addition to Pell Grants, the Higher Education Act has provided funding for a joint Federal-State effort to award grants to needy students. This program is known as the State Student Incentive Grants Program. This bill incorporates a proposal authored by Senator REED of Rhode Island and myself to not only maintain this important program, but to expand it to fund a series of other State efforts to promote access to higher education for low-income students. This year, for every dollar in Federal SSIG funds, my State of Maine is contributing almost \$50, and the result is that 10,000 students will receive a total of \$5 million to further their education.

Mr. President, the combined Federal and State grant aid based on the Higher Education Act totals more than \$35 million to students in Maine who are enrolled in institutions of higher education. This represents a direct investment in equal opportunity and bright futures for Maine families.

The other major financial assistance program in the Higher Education Act is the guaranteed student loan program. This reauthorization assures that students will continue to have access to both private loans, as well as those that come directly from the Department of Education, and it establishes the lowest interest rate in 17 years for guaranteed student loans. This is good news, indeed.

Mr. President, unless individuals from disadvantaged social and economic backgrounds aspire to higher education, no amount of financial aid will help them. Therefore, in reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, we are continuing a very successful effort by the Federal Government to put higher education on the radar screens of disadvantaged youths through the Opportunity or Trio Programs.

In my home State, TRIO programs, such as Talent Search and Upward Bound, have lifted the aspirations of thousands of young people who otherwise never would have even considered postsecondary education. I am very pleased to have worked for the extension and improvement of these programs along with the creation of an exciting new program known as Gear Up, through which colleges will reach out to entire middle school classes.

I have had the opportunity to visit outstanding Upward Bound programs at both the University of Maine at Orono and the University of Maine at Presque Isle. The high school students in these programs were enthusiastic, challenged, and so excited about their opportunities. As one student told me, "No one in my family has ever been to college. I had no idea that college could be part of my future—Upward Bound has given me confidence and experience; it's opened my eyes to all sorts of new opportunities."

The Federal Government cannot guarantee equal educational achieve-

ment, but we can take steps and must take steps to guarantee equality of access by removing the barriers that prevent students from lower- and middle-income families from pursuing postsecondary education. That is the very purpose of the Higher Education Act. Its student loan programs have assisted countless students in overcoming the financial obstacles to higher education while its opportunity programs, such as Upward Bound, have an admirable record of breaking down the social and academic areas.

Despite our successes, the statistics show that we have not yet done the job. The education gap still exists, and to close it we need to reaffirm and extend our commitment to equal access to education. Establishing equality of opportunity is the ultimate goal of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998.

The American people expect their Government to prepare our Nation for the next century. I can think of no better way to carry out that responsibility than to assist today's young people in realizing their full potential to become not just productive members of society but also the leaders upon whom America's future depends.

I am pleased to have played a role in bringing this very important legislation before the Senate today. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, before I yield 5 minutes to Senator MURRAY, serving on the same committee, the Labor and Human Resources Committee, I thank Senator COLLINS for all the work she put into this piece of legislation. She clearly not only has a higher education background but she is very committed to education. It is wonderful to see Senators who have her commitment, and I thank her for her work.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Chair. I thank my colleague from Minnesota for yielding me time.

Mr. President, as a member of the conference committee, I wish to express my deep appreciation for the committee's work and its leadership in crafting the higher education reauthorization bill that is so vital to our country's future. This bill is a major victory for students and teachers across America. The committee provided the opportunity to hear from countless witnesses from across the Nation who testified on everything from default rates to job hunting, campus crime to child care.

Mr. President, throughout the committee's effort on this bill, I worked to strengthen our Nation's commitment to providing the strongest training possible for schoolteachers. I am most

pleased with the bill's focus on teacher training and, in particular, its emphasis on technology training.

A year ago, I introduced the Teacher Technology Training Act to add technology to the areas of professional development and teacher training that are included in current law. I thank the chairman and the ranking members of both sides for their cooperation and support in adding these critical pieces to the bill.

The work of the committee on the teacher education provisions is really very historic and is a drastic overhaul of the previous teacher training section. Teacher quality grants will institute State level reforms to ensure both current and future teachers will possess the skills and academic knowledge to teach children effectively in their assigned areas. As a member of the Labor Appropriations Subcommittee, I will fight to ensure that this section is finally funded at a level that does make a difference in the classroom.

This teacher quality section particularly highlights training in the effective use of technology in our classrooms. All of us have witnessed the tremendous impact that technology now plays in our daily world. It affects the way we communicate, the way we conduct commerce, and the way our children learn in school. Young people today are in the midst of a technology explosion that has opened up limitless opportunities and possibilities in the classroom. In order for students to tap into this potential and be prepared for the 21st century, they have to learn how to use new technologies. But all too often teachers are expected to incorporate technology into their instruction without being given the training to do so.

We simply cannot allow students to teach our teachers in the rapidly expanding area of technology. I have toured several teaching schools and found them well supplied with up-to-date equipment. However, teaching students are often not provided adequate instruction in the use of that technology beyond simple communication purposes. It is not enough for a teacher to be able to just e-mail. They must use this education technology to advance their curriculum and to provide their students with resources along the information highway.

Last year, amazingly, just 10 percent of new teachers reported that they felt prepared to use technology in their classrooms; and only 13 percent of all public schools reported that technology-related training for teachers was mandated by the school, the district or teacher certification agencies; and only 18 States required preservice technology training.

This act will significantly turn those numbers around and provide our teachers with the training so critical to harnessing new technologies. So, again, I thank the conferees for their leadership on this effort. I also thank my colleague, Senator WELLSTONE, for his

work on the TANF amendment. It is so important for literacy instruction and lifelong learning. I know this issue remained unresolved, and I hope my colleagues will listen to Senator WELLSTONE and will soon see the direct link between educational opportunities and economic self-sufficiency.

I believe this first generation of the new millennium will benefit immensely from the efforts put forth over this past year. From increases in financial aid, to campus security improvements, to technology instruction, this legislation will stand as a proud trademark of this Congress.

I thank the Chair. I yield my time back to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington. I also echo what I said. There are some Senators here who have really dug into the committee. The same could be said for the Chair, who is on the Labor and Human Resources Committee. I think this is a bipartisan effort. I love Senator MURRAY's passion for children and education. I say to the Senator from Washington, I think probably more people and more families in Washington, Minnesota, Wyoming, and the country are more focused on education right now than any other issue. The Senator has been a real leader in the area, and I thank her.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I also want to thank colleagues on both sides. Senator JEFFORDS has done a great job in our committee. I feel a little awkward because there is a lot in this higher education bill that I worked on myself and with other colleagues in the committee. I think this is a good piece of legislation. I was pleased to vote for it. I am very pleased with the bill's distance education provisions, which I worked on a great deal. I think the Chair also is very interested in these issues, and we worked together on this portion of the bill. Distance education is very important for those of us who come from communities where we really still have strong rural parts to our States.

I think the bill's focus on applying Pell grants to summer school is really important, especially for our "non-traditional students," students who are older and going back to school. The bill's coordinated response dealing with violence on campus between local law enforcement and the institutions of higher education is real important; the bill's coordinated response to the problem of binge drinking also is terribly important.

I think there is much in this higher education bill that is important for our country. I thank colleagues. I also thank Roger Wolfson, who has been working with me, on my staff, and has really been responsible for some of the good amendments that we were, work-

ing with others, able to incorporate into this legislation. I have not covered all in this legislation that I feel very strongly about.

But I want to speak to one flaw in this higher education bill. I am going to speak about this with, I guess, some indignation. When we passed this higher education bill on the floor of the Senate, there was an amendment that dealt with the welfare bill, though it was an amendment to the higher education bill—and that is where it should have been. It passed 56 to 42; 11 Republicans joined Senate Democrats in supporting the provision. There were over 125 higher education and civil rights organizations that supported this amendment; there were strong editorials in the Boston Globe, the New York Times, Minnesota Star and Tribune and other newspapers around the country. As I think about Senators who were out here on the floor speaking about this, the Senator who maybe spoke with the most eloquence, certainly the strongest feeling, was the Senator from Kentucky, Senator FORD.

Any number of Senators supported this amendment which I am about to describe, even though they also supported the welfare bill. I did not support the welfare bill. They did. I will talk about that in a moment. But this amendment said nothing other than this: That any State that wanted to would be allowed to allow a parent, a welfare parent—almost all of these parents are women; I think the Chair, from what I know of him, would agree with me that men ought to be taking more responsibility for their children as well—that when it comes to single parents, mothers—we would allow States to allow these women to complete at least 2 years of higher education without having any State penalized for doing so.

Wyoming would not have to provide these two years, Minnesota would not have to provide these two years, but if Wyoming and Minnesota decide it would be better for these women to be able to complete 2 years of higher education, which could be vocational-technical or another program like a nursing assistant program, then the State should be able to do that and the State would not be penalized. It would not count against the State meeting its work participation requirement.

That amendment passed the U.S. Senate, and then it went to conference committee.

Mr. President, this is a single photograph. It is of Troyce Williams, but there are a lot of women like her. This all translates into human terms. She is a single mother of four children who is at the Minneapolis Community College, a community and technical college, at which she is trying to get her higher education completed. There are many, many women like her.

What I felt good about as a Senator was that after this amendment passed, we got all sorts of calls and all sorts of letters from people all across the country. This was an amendment that

would have really made a difference. It would have really made a difference because what a lot of people in our community colleges and in our higher education community were saying was that we were going to speak up for our students. This was a mistake we made when we passed the TANF. When we passed the welfare bill we probably should have been clear at the Federal level we would have some language that would give States the flexibility, if they wanted to, to allow these parents to complete at least 2 years of higher education.

Now I am not going to bore anybody here today about all of the statistics that make the point that every single citizen in this country understands: If you are able to go on and complete 2 years or 4 years of higher education, you are going to be in a better position to find a good job and give your children the care you know they need and deserve.

This amendment passes. Then we go to conference committee. I am just furious about what happened in conference committee. We met, and the House conferees, the majority House conferees, Republicans, said no to the amendment, and they were not interested in talking about anything else by way of maybe something else we could do that would make a difference.

Mr. President, it is just simply bitterly ironic that the very women who are on the path to economic self-sufficiency, because they are trying to complete at least 2 years of higher education, all too often get driven out of school because States feel like they will be penalized if they do not get these women into the workforce. Then they get into the workforce and they find a job at \$6 an hour, and then 1 year later they lose their medical assistance and they and their children are worse off. Whereas, if they could complete 2 years of higher education they would be better off.

We come to conference committee and I am just going to repeat what happened. I do no damage to the truth, because I want to make a point about what is at stake here—not just on this amendment but, sort of, politics in our country. The Chair may not agree with me, but I get to speak my piece on the floor of the Senate.

Now, the Republicans in the House come in and they say, "We want this Wellstone amendment out." Forget my name. I am not important. "We want this amendment out." And I will not use names because there is no one here to debate me and that would not be fair. On the House side, they are not here to debate me. So the person who is kind of the point person in making this argument says, "This would be a terrible amendment." And then I hear everybody saying, "This welfare bill was hallmark legislation. It is the best thing we have done in a half a century. It is so successful that we cannot touch it—this is nothing less than an effort to undermine this welfare bill."

Mr. President, first of all, a lot of people who voted for this amendment did not vote for this amendment to undermine the welfare bill. They thought it was a modification that was needed. They thought that the welfare bill would work better if we allowed States to allow these women to complete at least 2 years of higher education. But I am going to make another point.

I then turned—and for all I know the Chair was there at the conference committee—I turned to people who made this presentation and I said you keep talking about how successful this welfare bill is, and you talk about the number of people who are no longer on welfare, the number of women and children who are no longer on our welfare rolls. That is true; maybe 4 or 5 million fewer people.

My question for you, since you told me how successful it is—even though I would rather debate this in a higher education framework, let me raise this question. Let me raise this question on the floor of the U.S. Senate. We have seen a dramatic reduction in the welfare rolls. Have we seen a dramatic reduction in poverty? Can any of you, from any State, provide me with any data as to where these mothers and children are, what kind of jobs are these mothers receiving? What are the wages? Is there child care available for their 3- or 4-year-old? And when their first and second graders come home alone, sometimes in very dangerous neighborhoods, is there anybody there?

I have said this on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I am going to say it again. We all say how much we love children. These children count, too. There are children—I know, I have been in these neighborhoods—that go home alone, now, because their mothers are working. They are 7 years old. And they are told to go into their apartment and to lock the door and to take no phone calls, and don't go outside. There are children, when there is beautiful weather, they don't play outside because there is nobody there to take care of them. And these single mothers who are working are terrified as to what might happen to them.

I asked my colleagues on the Republican side in the House of Representatives, because they eliminate this amendment, since they are talking about how successful the welfare bill is, could they provide me with data? Not one of them could; not one of them.

I will debate anybody on the floor of the Senate, and I will debate anybody on the floor of the House on this question. The Swedish sociologist Gunnar Myrdal once said, "Ignorance is never random." Sometimes we don't know what we don't want to know. We don't know what is going on in these States. We don't know what is going on with these mothers and children.

I can't believe how punitive people can be. I can't believe how harsh they can be. Not one single argument was made against this amendment. Not one

bit of data was presented to show that these mothers and these children are better off now, but they just eliminated it because they had the majority.

I am not whining. I am telling people in the country that this one small example, one small story, tells a larger story about what is at stake.

I am not out here, by the way, to defend the President's behavior, but I don't think the President is the issue this fall. He is not on the ballot. He will never be on the ballot again running for President. This election, I say to people in Minnesota and people around the country, is about you.

I just ask, what are these kinds of priorities? Just eliminate an amendment to the higher education bill that allows States to allow women, mothers of small children, to complete 2 years of higher education so they and their children will be better off? Eliminated.

Do you know that this past June, America—I think it was in June—in the same week this Republican majority voted to give a tax break to people with estates worth more than \$17 million, they voted to eliminate the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program and voted to eliminate summer jobs for kids? Unbelievable.

People go to their pollsters and say, "What are the issues people care about?" The same Republicans who knocked out this amendment found out it is education—people care about education. They learned how to talk about education—I said "talk about education"—but they have cut funding for education. They have cut funding for K through 12 education.

It is interesting. We are at a crossroads with education. We are going to see a dramatic increase over the next 10 years by about 10 percent of high school students and about 6 percent of middle school students. The average age of our public school teacher is 50. We are going to need to hire about 1.3 million teachers in our country. We can have all sorts of men and women coming into education with creative new ideas, new energy, and all the rest—it is a golden opportunity—but we can't take advantage of a golden opportunity on a tin-plate budget.

The same people who are in the majority in the House of Representatives—so punitive, so harsh, so little compassion—voted to deny a single parent, a mother, the opportunity to finish 2 years of higher education so she can do better for her children. They gave a tax break to people with estates worth more than \$17 million, but in the same week they eliminated the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program so that in my cold-weather State, elderly people, families with children, have a choice of eating or heating, but not both. They eliminate low-income home energy assistance, so people go cold in the winter, and knock out summer jobs for kids. They give speeches about being for education and children and then cut the budgets.

That is what is at stake this election. That is what is at stake. My strategy

would be for people to turn out this fall. I think the Republican strategy is for people to be turned off this fall, low turnout.

I hope that from this example people in the country will realize that there is a lot at stake. If you care about a good education for all of our children, if you are committed to the idea of living-wage jobs, if you are committed to the idea of decent health care for every citizen, if you are committed to improving the standard of living for all the people in our country, if you believe that economic and educational opportunities are important, then I make this appeal to people in the country: Don't let people turn you off to politics.

This election this fall is not about President Clinton. We can talk about his behavior at another time. Nobody needs to approve of it. I don't know of anybody who does. But this election, I say to people in the country, is about you; it is about your families. This election this fall—the President is not on the ballot—is about these kinds of issues.

I hope people will turn out. I hope you will vote for education. This amendment was knocked out of the higher education bill in spite of the good support of Senator JEFFORDS. We supported it on the Senate side. I tell you, this GINGRICH-House Republican majority agenda is harsh, it is mean-spirited, and if you are committed to education for children, make sure you vote this election. If you believe in the importance of health care and you think good jobs are important, just make sure you vote this election. If you think it is wrong in the same week in the House of Representatives to give a tax break to people with estates over \$17 million and eliminate the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program and eliminate summer jobs for kids—that is exactly what this majority did in the House—you make sure you vote this election.

If you are angry at people in Washington, DC, and the U.S. House and the U.S. Senate because you think that neither party is doing enough about your concerns and you think too much of our decisionmaking is dominated by special interest or big money or you feel locked out or all the rest, make sure you vote. Don't opt out. Don't let people turn you off. There is a lot at stake in elections in our country, and this is but one example.

I will get to speak more about this after our caucuses. I see my colleague, Senator GRAHAM. I wanted to start out congratulating my colleagues for the good work on the higher education bill.

Roger Wolfson, thank you for your help.

I want to tell you that what happened in the conference committee is just outrageous. There is nothing I can do about it, not now. I will bring this amendment back on the first bill I can amend. Of course, for the last couple of weeks there hasn't been an opportunity

to amend any bills. I want to make sure people understand what is at stake.

In my not too humble opinion—and the Chair is a good friend; I really like him, and I hope it is mutual, so I don't mean this in a personal way—but what is at stake in these fall elections is critical.

I say to people in the country, this small story tells a larger story. I shudder at the thought of Speaker GINGRICH or, for that matter, on the Senate side as well, there being even more of a majority or more power, because I think it will be an agenda that will move our country back 60 years. People have learned how to talk about education, I say to my colleague from Florida, but the budgets don't reflect that. On the House side, they cut funding for education. There was no action whatsoever on health care. There is very little concern about what I call some really important family-value issues, and this is but one example.

Mr. President, I yield the floor to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, is there a set time for the recess?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a set time for the recess, 12:30 p.m.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak until 12:35.

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

(By unanimous consent, the remarks of Mr. GRAHAM are printed earlier in today's RECORD.)

#### MEASURE READ FOR THE FIRST TIME—S. 2529

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I understand that S. 2529 is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2529) entitled the Patients' Bill of Rights Act of 1998.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading, and I object on behalf of the Republican leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The bill will be read the second time on the next legislative day.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:39 p.m., recessed until 2:14 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. SANTORUM].

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a

period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 3:15 p.m., with time to be equally divided between the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE, and the Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS, or their designees.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1998

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, what is the legislative schedule now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an hour of morning business under the previous order equally divided between the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE, and the Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS.

Mr. FORD. I thank the Chair.

Will the Senator from Minnesota give me 10 minutes?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will be pleased to yield the Senator from Kentucky 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Up to 10 minutes.

Mr. FORD. I may give back some.

I rise to speak about the conference report to H.R. 6, the Higher Education Amendments of 1998. I take this opportunity to commend my colleagues on the conference committee for the truly outstanding work they have done on behalf of our Nation's students and the higher education community. This legislation includes an important expansion of the Pell and work study programs, provides the lowest interest rates in 17 years for student borrowers, provides for loan forgiveness for teachers working in high poverty areas, and makes a continued commitment to improving our teacher preparation programs.

I know that the passage of this bill will have a significant impact on students and colleges in my State. While I am pleased with many provisions in this bill, I am extremely disappointed that the conference committee did not include the text of the Wellstone amendment. This amendment allowed up to 24 months of postsecondary or vocational education, removed the 30-percent limitation on education as a work activity for teen parents, and clarified that participation in a Federal work study program is a permissible work activity.

Instead, the conference report calls for a GAO study on this issue. I am personally aware of at least a half dozen studies—a half dozen studies—which already indicate that this is a problem for many low-income, single mothers. Why do you have to have a study to tell you that the more education you have the better job you can receive and the better the employer likes you? Instead of doing the right thing for these