

The plan the President has put forth would close the gates of college campuses to many students. In a global economy, and increasingly tied to information technology, we will depend more and more on workers with advanced training and skills.

This is more than a student going to college to become a teacher or a doctor or a lawyer or an engineer; it is young men and women getting out of high school and becoming automobile mechanics or working in the health care profession.

When I graduated from high school, if you wanted to be an automobile mechanic, you went to work at the corner service station and became a mechanic. It is not that way anymore. To be hired to be an automobile mechanic at a car dealership, you have to have a certificate indicating you have been properly trained. That is what will happen at our local community colleges. That is something of which we have to be aware, that young men and women who want to do this need to be able to borrow money to get an education.

A college degree, long seen as a ticket to financial success, is becoming a prerequisite for achieving the American dream. At the same time, students face even higher tuition costs. Attending a 4-year private university can cost up to \$40,000 a year. And even public universities are becoming too expensive for many students. Some students face double-digit percentage increases for tuition at State schools next year.

So we cannot allow this administration's plan to proceed as it deals with college loans because it would prevent many capable students from attending college. The administration's plan would also have a negative impact on those who have already attended college.

This month, millions of students will graduate from our Nation's colleges and universities. They and their families will be rightfully proud that they have earned a diploma. Yet they do not know what the true cost of their education will be, which they have largely financed with student loans. The President's plan will cost them thousands of dollars in additional interest payments.

Already, graduates are heavily burdened with student loan debt. As a consequence, they are often unable to pursue a job in the field of their choice and, instead, are forced to work in a higher paying job but a less personally fulfilling job, if they can find it.

There are wonderful young men and women who work in the Senate offices. They each work for one of us because they want to contribute to what they believe is a better society. They could go other places to work. I could pick lots of people from my office and use them as examples.

I have two people with Ph.Ds who work for me: One has a doctoral degree in physics and the other has a doctorate in geology from fine universities around America. They could work

other places and make more money, but they love what they are doing here. I am so happy they work for me. They owe money on student loans. So we have to make sure the plan suggested by this administration will not go forward.

I could pick as examples lots of university graduates who have worked for me. I could pick, as I mentioned, Dr. Greg Jaczko. I could pick Dr. Kai Anderson. But as an example here today, I am going to pick Shannon Eagan.

Shannon is from Las Vegas. She works on my staff, and she is really good. She does legislative correspondence. She also does legislative assistance work. She is intelligent, talented, ambitious, and interested in a career in public service. But she has to repay tens of thousands of dollars in student loans because her parents are not wealthy.

The President's plan would require her to pay thousands and thousands of dollars in addition to what she already owes. Of course, she fears that a relatively low-paying Government job such as she has will not enable her to meet these needs. She is considering, sadly, seeking a higher paying, private sector job, even though she likes what she is doing in her job.

If she leaves my staff, I will lose a valuable employee, the State of Nevada will not be helped as much as it could be, and the Senate will lose a valuable employee. I think it will have a detrimental effect on our country, a very small, but significant detrimental effect.

So we have to watch this very closely. There are hundreds of thousands of young Americans who face the same dilemma as Shannon. They want to dedicate themselves to serving our country as teachers or social workers or working in the Congress of the United States. But when they do the math—calculating their salary and their expenses, including their student loan payments—they discover it simply is not possible.

Since we need more bright, motivated people to work in these occupations, including being a teacher, this is really a double whammy on us. If education is truly a priority for this administration, they will drop this plan to raise the cost of student loans. We all must be aware of this. It affects millions of people, and we should do everything we can so the students get the benefit, not the banks.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 3:45 today and that the time be equally divided from that time until the vote at 6.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:58 p.m., recessed until 3:45 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from Nebraska, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I wish to address my fellow Senators as in morning business for about 7 minutes.

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

MENTAL HEALTH PARITY MOVEMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to express my appreciation to President Bush for his commitment to bringing insurance parity to people with mental illness.

As a long time supporter of mental health parity legislation in the Senate, I found his statement today in New Mexico to be a breath of fresh air in a debate that has languished for too long here in Washington.

I will always believe that when it comes to health insurance coverage, mental illness should be treated like any physical ailment. Unfortunately, those suffering from mental health disorders have for years suffered undue discrimination at the hands of insurers who force them to pay higher costs than patients suffering from physical ailments.

I believe there simply is no scientific, clinical, fiscal or ethical reason for this discrimination.

I applaud President Bush for his commitment to ending it and leveling the health care playing field to require equal access to psychiatric treatment and care.

As President Bush pointed out today in New Mexico, people suffering from severe and persistent mental problems don't suffer alone. Their illness affects their families and loved ones, and even our country.

It is incredibly painful to watch someone you love struggle with an illness that affects their mind, their feelings and their relationships with others, and that difficulty is only exacerbated when care and treatment options are denied or placed out of reach due to high costs.

Remarkable treatments exist, yet many people—too many people in my

view—remain untreated because insurance discrimination limits their access.

I am glad the President has asked all Americans for a commitment to bridge the insurance divide between people who are physically and mentally ill. Americans with mental illness deserve our attention. I believe we can and should this year act on mental health parity legislation that bridges those coverage chasms and also controls new health care costs.

For my part, I intend to continue working with my friend and colleague, Senator DOMENICI, on this important issue to ensure that nondiscrimination is the law of the land. We can do this in a bipartisan, fiscally responsible way, and I look forward to getting it done this year.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, with respect to calling up the Andean trade pact for debate, someone could immediately question why the delay, trying to hold up on the actual calling of the bill? There will be plenty of time to submit amendments. I do not know of a more serious topic that will be discussed this year in the Congress, and yet discussion should be two ways: Those who are ready to propose and propound, and those who are ready to object to and explain why this is not in the economic interest of the United States. It is a one-way street, though, as it appears, in the Senate.

The temptation is to have a live quorum so somebody can be talked to. This has been the typical treatment of trade in the United States now for the past several years. What really happens is those for the fast-track agreement work on the members to vote their way. By one vote, the House passed it, with what my friend from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, would call pork—little favors here, little favors there. After the passage of NAFTA some 8 years ago in 1994, the New York Times ran a story of the 26 different favors done by President Clinton at that particular time to get NAFTA and fast track passed. I think it was Congressman Pickle, who got a cultural center down in Austin, TX; another Congressman got a round of golf; another Congressman got a round of golf personally with the President of the United States; another Congressman got two B-17 contracts, and so on. The New

York Times wrote of the 26 different votes that were changed.

There was only one important vote to change this particular time in the House. When it comes to the Senate Finance Committee, it is an easy fix. Once it is fixed and ready to be presented in the Senate, they withhold the presentation of the particular measure until they have 60 votes to make sure they can get cloture as they cut off debate, limit the amendments, and limit the time for each of the individual Senators. And since the Senators know the debate is limited and the vote is fixed, no one listens.

I have to express my gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for coming because I do not know of a more important subject than this. While cloture is obtained later at 6 p.m. today, we will again try to withhold the actual finalizing of the debate with another cloture vote after we present some amendments.

The bottom line is, if one had to answer their opposition it would be difficult to do. They are putting out the Andean trade bill, combining it with the come-ons not only of fast track but trade adjustment assistance, and they put those amendments on and then pass it altogether. After they have bundled together various wants, namely trade adjustment assistance and the fast track which the White House wants; and, of course, the Andean trade bill which others interested in this particular hemisphere want, what happens then is they package together and get a bad deal for America.

I say that advisedly for the simple reason, we are exporting jobs faster than we can create them. What happens is that in trying to create them, we are really facing organized society politically, economically, financially, and otherwise, in the United States against us. It is a very interesting thing.

I think about my friend Robert Kennedy. I have had his desk for years in the Senate. Robert Kennedy came to political notoriety in a book called "The Enemy Within." He was writing about James Hoffa and organized labor.

Today I could write a book on the enemy within. Instead of labor, it is management. How does that occur? It occurs because 30 percent of production costs, 30 percent of volume, is in labor. In manufacturing, particularly, 20 percent of manufacturing costs can be saved by moving production or manufacturing offshore, to a low-wage country such as Mexico. If you have \$500 million in sales at a manufacturing facility, you can make \$100 million pretax profit by moving offshore. Just keep your executive office and your sales force in-country and move your production offshore and you have made yourself \$100 million. Or you can continue to work your own people and go bankrupt.

That is the job policy of the U.S. Government today. That is the job policy of the Senate. Who is supporting

this? The Business Roundtable, the Conference Board, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the National Federation of Independent Business.

My friend, Tom Donohue, at the Chamber of Commerce, has it orchestrated where the five move in. I saw it with Y2K. Chicken Little, the sky was going to fall if we did not hurry and pass that particular provision to protect Silicon Valley. Of course, the Republicans and Democrats were fighting hard in the Silicon Valley to get their financial contributions. The fight was not to protect the computers. It was to protect the financial wherewithal of campaigns. They could care less about Main Street America. They are for offshore production, thereby the offshore creation of jobs outside of America.

There is more. I will never forget the debates we had with respect to textile bills in my time. We passed five textile bills through the Senate. One did not get past the House; the other four that did were all vetoed after the President, of course, promised to sign them. The President promised to sign them in my State, in the city of Greenville, the heart of textile industry. They forget about that.

I bought a shirt made in China and one made in New Jersey. I bought a catcher's mitt. One made in Korea and one made in Grand Rapids, MI. I showed that the markup on the imported article was much greater.

So the retailers are getting behind the movement of big business. Who follows behind? The newspapers. The retailers are seeing the newspapers hand out free trade, free trade, fast track, fast track. They are like parrots. The majority of the newspapers are for retail advertising. So they, in turn, join in. You ought to see how the special trade representatives are representing the Government in these giveaway programs. They have literally drained the jobs from the United States of America.

I was reading a book that has become required reading in the Washington area, "Theodore Rex," by Mr. Edmund Morris. He is describing the United States of America at the turn of the century, 100 years ago: The United States could consume only a fraction of what it produced.

More than half the world's cotton, corn, copper, and oil flowed from the American cornucopia, and at least one third of all steel, iron, silver, and gold. Current advertisements in British magazines gave the impression that the typical Englishman woke to the ring of an Ingersoll alarm, shaved with a Gillette razor, combed his hair with Vaseline tonic, buttoned his Arrow shirt, hurried downstairs for Quaker Oats, California Figs, and Maxwell House Coffee, commuted in a Westinghouse tram (body by Fisher), rose to his office in an Otis elevator, and worked all day with his Waterman pen under the efficient glare of Edison lightbulbs. "It only remains," one Fleet Street wag suggested, "for us to take American coal to New Castle."

Behind the joke lay real concern: The United States was already supplying