

want to thank our chairman for his help with that matter, as well.

I also want to take a moment to express a few personal thoughts about this bill. This bill cuts over \$200 million out of the congressional budget. That is about a 10-percent cut. In this time of fiscal deficits, and the need to reduce spending, I believe we did it the way it should be done—line by line, program by program, bill by bill. We thought this through and made tough, but sensible, decisions. Most importantly, we are showing we can lead by example in the battle to reduce Federal spending by cutting Congress first.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the conference report. It makes sense, and it sets the right tone in the broader effort to reduce spending.

(Mr. CAMPBELL assumed the Chair.)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 1854, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

The bill, as reported provides \$2.1 billion in new budget authority and \$2 billion in outlays for the congress and other legislative branch agencies, including the Library of Congress, the General Accounting Office, and the Government Printing Office, among others.

When outlays from prior year appropriations and other adjustments are taken into account, the bill totals \$2.2 billion in budget authority and \$2.3 billion in outlays. The bill is under the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation by \$35 million in budget authority and \$2 million in outlays.

I want to commend the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee for producing a bill that is substantially within their 602(b) allocation.

I am pleased that this bill incorporates most of the changes endorsed by the Republican Conference last December and achieves the goal of reducing legislative branch spending by \$200 million from the 1995 level. It is important that the Congress set an example for the rest of the country by cutting its own spending first.

Another important feature of this bill is that it provides an increase of \$1.1 million over the 1995 level for the Congressional Budget Office to enable that agency to meet the new requirements that were created in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act passed earlier this year.

I urge the Senate to adopt this conference report.

I ask unanimous consent that a Budget Committee table showing the final scoring of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH SUBCOMMITTEE		
[Spending totals—conference report (fiscal year 1996, in millions of dollars)]		
	Budget authority	Outlays
Nondefense discretionary:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed		202
H.R. 1854, conference report	2,125	1,977
Scorekeeping adjustment		
Subtotal nondefense discretionary	2,125	2,180
Mandatory:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed	92	92
H.R. 1854, conference report		
Adjustment to conform mandatory programs with Budget Resolution assumptions	-2	-2
Subtotal mandatory	90	90
Adjusted bill total	2,215	2,270
Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary		
Nondefense discretionary	2,167	2,188
Violent crime reduction trust fund		
Mandatory	90	90
Total allocation	2,257	2,278
Adjusted bill total compared to Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary		
Nondefense discretionary	-42	-8
Violent crime reduction trust fund		
Mandatory		
Total allocation	-42	-8

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with current scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. And on behalf of Senator SIMON, I yield back his time as well.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur immediately following the first vote in connection with the D.C. appropriations bill.

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

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

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

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 1244.

The bill will be stated by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1244) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I am pleased to present the fiscal year 1996 District of Columbia appropriations bill to the Senate. The bill presented is within the subcommittee's allocation and contains a Federal payment of \$660 million, which is the authorized amount and the same amount as last year.

I should make clear that the Federal payment is not a gift from the Federal Government to the local government, it is a payment in lieu of taxes. More than half of the District's property is untaxable to the local government. Of course all Federal property and buildings are exempt, but so are many other valuable properties in the city. In addition to foreign embassies and offices, also unavailable for tax purposes are facilities owned by entities with congressional charters. Properties such as the National Geographic Society, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, the Inter-American Development Bank, and all of the hospitals and universities in the city are also exempt. The properties I just listed account for more than \$1 billion in value that is not taxable to the District.

In addition, the Congress restricts the city's taxing power in other ways. The District is prohibited by law from taxing income earned in the city by those who live in the suburbs. This is no small amount. The Census Bureau estimates that of the \$33 billion earned annually by individuals in the District, \$19 billion is earned by nonresidents—over half—and therefore completely escapes District taxes.

This past year many of the District's financial problems came to a head. Fiscal year 1994 ended with a record deficit of \$335 million. In an unusually cooperative endeavor Members of the House and Senate worked together, along with the Office of Management and Budget, to craft legislation which established a five-member unpaid financial control board for the District. The board, formally known as the Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, has been working since June 1, and has made a significant contribution to the bill we are recommending to the Senate today.

The bill before us represents the recommendations of the authority of the District's fiscal year 1996 budget. The authority is a powerful new player in the District's budget process. This authority must approve annual budgets and multiyear financial plans developed by the Mayor.

This authority is designed to provide the kind of day-to-day and month-to-month oversight as well as fiscal expertise that the Congress is neither designed nor inclined to exercise. The authority has the power to require the city to change its budget estimates of both revenues and expenditures. If the estimates are unrealistic and the city does not make the necessary changes,

the authority can implement those changes on its own.

Each year between now and fiscal year 1998, the District is permitted to submit and operate with an unbalanced budget, as long as it makes progress toward a balanced budget. This will give time to Congress and the local political leaders to address some of the issues concerning our relationship to the local government.

On July 15, the authority made recommendations to the city council for changes in the budget that the District had adopted in May. On August 1, the council responded by adopting an amendment in their budget. Finally, on August 15, the authority submitted to Congress the District's response to their recommendations. The committee's bill is based upon these recommendations.

The District has a long way to go to be a well-run, efficient, and financially stable city. With the control board in place, we have made important first steps.

On September 14, the chairman of the authority, Dr. Andrew Brimmer, testified before our subcommittee that the authority is developing a positive, working relationship with city officials based on cooperation. At a recent budget summit, where authority representing the city officials questioned various agencies about their budget, Dr. Brimmer testified that the discussion focused on improving the city's services, accountability, and getting the information necessary for managers and decisionmakers.

Those inquiries came from both the authority and the senior district officials. Of course, the proof will be in the doing, but the start is good. I am really pleased with the way they have been working.

While the control board will be charged with overseeing the restoration of the District's financial health and improving its management effectiveness, the Congress must review the complete relationship with the local government. Its fiscal problems are not caused by lack of revenue. The city elects and spends more than \$3 billion of local revenue each year. That ought to be enough to operate this city.

In order for the city to maintain its long-term financial health, we, the Congress and the Federal Government, must reevaluate our relationship with the city in a dispassionate discussion with the District residents and their elected representatives. When we began drafting the control board legislation, we asked the General Accounting Office to talk to people in other cities that have had similar financial difficulties and established similar boards about their experiences.

One factor that everyone volunteered in our interviews was that the poor quality of public schools had exacerbated the middle-class flight from that city and was a major impediment in economic development. This is not just an economic development issue. Na-

tionally, we are creating a generation of kids that cannot read or write properly.

This is not just bad educational policy; it is a devastating implication for unemployment, welfare, and crime policy in the near future, and especially in our cities like Washington. Each kid that we do not teach to read is a lost asset to this Nation, and we cannot afford to let our national assets decay. The District is no exception. We do not need to recite all the statistics.

Washington, DC, spends more per student than any other school district yet has the poorest student outcomes on standardized tests of any school district. We have old, high maintenance school buildings and too many of them. The problems of the District schools have been studied over and over and proposal after proposal has been made, but something happens between the commitment to reform and the implementation of a plan. It is time that we stop studying, analyzing, and strategizing, and start implementing and holding accountable those who are responsible for realizing set goals.

Mr. President, the committee is recommending establishment of a commission to hold consensus around public school reform in the District. I emphasize consensus. The seven-member commission will be made up entirely of local citizens charged with working with the school board and the superintendent to develop and implement a reform plan.

What we are providing is the structure for effecting reform, not dictating what the details of that reform should be. I want to emphasize that again. It is a structure for effecting reform, not dictating what the details of that reform should be.

Some District leaders have reacted to this proposal with charges that it thwarts home rule and circumvents the citizens of the District, charges which I might add were made before having access to the entire proposal. Mr. President, to make these charges is to completely ignore and cast scorn on what Congress has been all about this last 9 months. The District of Columbia is in trouble fiscally, managerially, and I think most important, educationally in public schools.

In difficult times, the city of Washington has no one to turn to but the Federal Government. We, the Congress, and the citizens of the District are partners in whatever happens to this city. We are partners in finding solutions to all these difficulties that Congress specifically and the Federal Government generally must be careful not to dictate or impose solutions on the citizens of the city. We need consensus.

Another important charge to the commission and the board is to develop a capital investment plan for the needed school buildings and a separate

funding mechanism to ensure that the work is done.

Mr. President, on August 14, 1995, the superintendent received the report of the task force on education infrastructure for the 21st century. This report is an excellent description of the fiscal state of the public schools and needed steps to remedy the deficiencies. It sets out in plain terms the current condition of the public schools in this city.

Mr. President, 62 percent of the District's public schools are over 45 years old but only 8 of the 163 operating schools have ever had total renovations.

There is an inability to accommodate educational programs and initiatives and technology in these buildings. Continuing from the report: "There is no school building able to support a comprehensive vocational or career focus to prepare students for work in the 21st century."

That is totally intolerable and unacceptable. Based on the current number of schools and administrative buildings, the task force estimates that it will cost \$1.2 billion to restore these buildings to a state of good repair and to modernize the schools and provide infrastructure to support for technology that is available and will be available.

This price tag is overstated because the first priority is to determine how many school buildings will be needed for the future student enrollment. Once the decision is made on how many and in what locations school buildings are needed, a final cost estimate can be made.

I am not just calling for the wholesale closure of school buildings. We must take into consideration the fiscal condition of the current inventory as well as answer questions as, What effect will the success of economic development programs have on enrollment? Or, What effect will the success of drop-out prevention programs have on the number of high schools needed?

Currently, with the discussion on a number of needed school buildings, debate must begin on the funding mechanism. It is imperative that this mechanism be under the control of the District of Columbia financial responsibility authority and that any debt issue to outside the District's 14 percent of the local revenue cap on outstanding debt. We are right at that cap right now for all of the other infrastructure aspects of the city. There is no latitude in that, nor should it be used for the purposes of the school improvement program.

This latter point is necessary due to the extensive deferred maintenance that exists in the system because the school fiscal infrastructure has not been maintained routinely. The schools' normal capital program cannot be expected to handle the high annual expenditures that will be needed over the next 10 years.

In order for this new funding mechanism to be viable, it will require a separate revenue stream for debt service.

All potential sources will be considered, including a small dedicated short-term reciprocal income tax to provide a stable and reliable source for debt service funds. Another obvious source is the cash flow generated by the sale to the surplus school property.

These options should be explored by the control board, the board of education, District council, and the Mayor along with all other regional and District groups of interest. Local or Federal legislation should be developed that would facilitate creation of an appropriate funding mechanism and source of income.

The bill also contains language that establishes a charter schools initiative for District public schools to improve and encourage community involvement. The subcommittee developed this initiative in cooperation with Senator SPECTER, who is very interested in this subject and his help was important to its inclusion.

Charter schools offer great promise in reforming public education because they link the important factors of school-site autonomy, parental choice, regulatory flexibility, private sector initiative, accountability for student outcomes, and community participation. The committee believes that the autonomy of individual charter schools from external controls, such as those of the school district and union requirements, is essential for their success.

To ensure charter schools' autonomy, the committee has defined them as public schools that operate with independence from the District of Columbia public schools as local education agencies. This definition in no way removes charter schools from the oversight of the District of Columbia public schools or other charter granting authorities. Unlike traditional public schools, these schools must meet the terms of their charters, including specified student outcomes. If not, their charters can be revoked or not renewed.

I want to note the efforts of the current superintendent who has established schools-within-schools charters and enterprise schools within the public schools. These schools-within-schools share some of the same attributes of our proposed charter schools but are chosen by only one entity and are not as independent as they ought to be. It is our intention to build upon this good start, not reinvent the wheel.

In closing, Mr. President, I thank my other colleagues on the subcommittee, our able ranking member, Senator KOHL, and my colleague on our side of the aisle, Senator BENNETT, who have attended our hearings and taken a genuine interest in the work of the subcommittee. Finally, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Oregon, Senator HATFIELD, and our distinguished ranking member, the Senator from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, for the leadership and guidance we have re-

ceived in bringing this bill before the Senate today.

Mr. President, that concludes my formal presentation, I will be happy to answer any questions or consider any amendments that Senators may have. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL] is recognized.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. JEFFORDS, for his hard work and dedication in bringing this measure to the Senate floor.

The fiscal year 1996 District of Columbia appropriations bill is the result of a bipartisan effort. It cleared the Senate Appropriations Committee by a vote of 28 yeas to 0 nays.

The bill includes a Federal payment of \$660 million, which is the same as the President's budget request and the previous year's level.

The bill also provides the overall budget for the District of Columbia. That budget has been developed and presented to the Congress by city officials and the Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority for the District of Columbia, otherwise known as the Control Board. The Control Board was created earlier this year by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Act of 1995.

The bill recommends a balanced budget for the District government. The funding levels recommended in the budget are the same as those recommended by the Control Board. The Board is expected to work with the Mayor and City Council to oversee and make further reforms in the District's budget, finances, and operation.

The bill would also establish a seven-member Commission on Consensus Public School Reform. The Commission, which is strongly supported by the subcommittee chairman, will seek to develop reform goals and approve and oversee annual reform implementation plans for the school system.

The bill would also establish procedures for public charter schools to open in the District, which would offer innovative educational approaches and opportunities to District students. In addition, the bill calls for city officials and the Control Board to develop options for consolidating and modernizing the public school infrastructure.

Mr. President, I again commend the distinguished subcommittee chairman and urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, is the bill open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The bill is open to amendment.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2768

(Purpose: To improve order and discipline in District of Columbia Public Schools)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes an amendment numbered 2768.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 53, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

(H) The Chief of the National Guard Bureau who shall be an ex officio member.

On page 66, strike line 15 and insert the following:

#### SEC. 211. IMPROVING ORDER AND DISCIPLINE.

(a) DRESS CODE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the first day of the 1996–1997 school year, the Commission shall develop and implement, through the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools, a uniform dress code for the District of Columbia Public Schools.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The dress code—

(A) shall include a prohibition of gang membership symbols;

(B) shall take into account the relative costs of any policy for each student; and

(C) may include a requirement that students wear uniforms.

(b) COMMUNITY SERVICE REQUIREMENT FOR SUSPENDED STUDENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any student suspended from classes at a District of Columbia Public School who is required to serve the suspension outside the school shall perform community service for the period of suspension. The community service required by this subsection shall be subject to rules and regulations promulgated by the Mayor.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect beginning on the first day of the 1996–1997 school year.

#### SEC. 212. EXPIRATION DATE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it is no secret that over the years the District of Columbia Public School System has suffered from a lack of discipline in the classroom. It appears that the situation is not improving and is probably deteriorating. The lack of discipline in a public school classroom by even one student can thwart the education process for the teacher and the students who want to learn. Mr. President, it is time to reclaim the classroom—for the teachers and for the serious students—from the disruption caused by problem students lacking in self-discipline and a desire to learn.

I commend the distinguished Subcommittee Chairman, Mr. JEFFORDS. His is a thankless task. He has done a good job. One of his initiatives has been to propose the establishment of a seven-member Commission on Consensus Public School Reform. I will have more to say about that in a moment.

Mr. President, the thrust of the amendment I am proposing builds upon the initiative of the Subcommittee Chairman. In the first place, it proposes that any student suspended from classes at a District of Columbia Public School, who is required to serve the suspension outside the school, shall

perform community service for the period of the suspension.

Mr. President, often the misbehavior detected in the public school system is punished by a suspension; however, this suspension is very often looked upon as a vacation by the individual suspended. The thrust of my amendment is to see that any student that finds himself or herself suspended shall use that time to perform a community service. A community service required by my amendment would be subject to rules and regulations promulgated by the Mayor. Thus, the individual under suspension would not be rewarded by a week off of idle time, but would be required to make some contribution to the community during that time.

Students who are expelled and then left to their own devices tend to become bored and then, as a result, may get into further trouble. Requiring them to perform service for the community benefits the community, provides supervision for the time the student is out of the classroom, and demonstrates to the student that job opportunities will likely be limited without the benefit of an education.

A second part of my amendment is related to a dress code. I am advised that in the year since Long Beach, California, made uniforms mandatory for all elementary and secondary school students, the Long Beach School district has seen a 36-percent drop in school crime and a 32-percent reduction in student suspensions. Many parents now spend a great deal of money on elaborate, fashion-conscious clothing ensembles, which cost far in excess of most uniforms. One reads newspaper articles about young people fighting and even murdering each other over articles of clothing, high-priced tennis shoes, and so forth. A dress code would keep obnoxious or inappropriate clothing out of the classroom, minimizing the differences between income levels among students, and removing the focus from clothes and gang symbols and placing it, instead, on scholarship and school activities.

The amendment I am proposing would implement through the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools a uniform dress code for the District of Columbia Public Schools. The dress code would include a prohibition of gang membership symbols; it should take into account the relative cost of any policy for each student; and, it may even include a requirement that students wear uniforms. It does not require that, but this would be up to the District authorities. This modest proposal has yielded improvements in discipline in some of the jurisdictions in which it has been employed, and it appears to be a worthwhile effort.

The third aspect of the amendment that I am proposing relates to the initiative of the Subcommittee Chairman to establish a Commission on Consensus Reform in the District of Columbia Public Schools, to create a consensus

around reform goals and to oversee and monitor the implementation phase of the reforms. This Commission, according to the Subcommittee's legislative proposal, will consist of a member appointed by the Senate Majority Leader; a member appointed by the Speaker of the House; two members appointed by the President—one who should represent the local business community and one who is a teacher within the District of Columbia public schools. Also, the President of the District of Columbia Congress of Parents and Teachers and the President of the District of Columbia Board of Education, as well as the Superintendent of Public Schools of the District of Columbia would be members of the Commission. The Mayor and Council Chairman would each name one non-voting, ex-officio member. The amendment that I am proposing would add the Chief of the National Guard Bureau as an ex-officio member.

Mr. President, for the past two years, the National Guard has been directly involved in youth programs throughout the United States. During this time, the National Guard has had a direct and positive impact on "at-risk" youth in over thirty states and territories through its sponsorship of five separate youth programs. I am told that all of these programs have been a success. With this in mind, I am recommending that the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, Lieutenant General Edward D. Baca, be an ex-officio member. The purpose would be to increase National Guard participation in the District of Columbia Public Schools, so that a number of new and positive programs can be pursued, which will tend to promote discipline in the District's schools and which will assist "at-risk" youth. The National Guard is an organization comprised of the local interested citizenry. They have proven themselves to be dedicated professionals, who have displayed time and again their commitment not only to the national defense, but to the community as well.

In summary, Mr. President, I am proposing an amendment that would initiate a program of community service for suspended students. It would also propose a dress code and would strengthen the initiative of the Subcommittee Chairman, by making the Chief of the National Guard Bureau an ex-officio member of the Commission on consensus reform in the District of Columbia public schools.

Discipline is a problem in classrooms all across America. Students cannot learn and teachers cannot teach when the classroom is disrupted by disorder, and, in many cases, even by fear of violence.

Jurisdictions around the country are trying to craft new approaches to curb classroom violence and restore sanity to our institutions of learning. New approaches must be tried. I believe that the steps proposed in my amendment may enable the District's schools to

get a handle on some of the violence and disruptive behavior which are all too common in our Nation's classrooms.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2769 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2768

(Purpose: To limit the amendment to 2 school years in order to evaluate the effectiveness of amendment)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I send an amendment in the second degree to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] PROPOSES AN AMENDMENT NUMBERED 2769 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2768.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, after line 25 insert the following:

(c) EXPIRATION DATE.—This section and the membership provided in section 202(a)(2)(H) shall expire on the last day of the 1997-1998 school year.

(d) REPORT.—The Commission shall study the effectiveness of the policies implemented pursuant to this section in improving order and discipline in schools and report its findings to the appropriate committees of Congress 60 days before the last day of the 1997-1998 school year.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the second-degree amendment makes this a pilot program. It very well may be instructive and helpful for the rest of the country to have a pilot program here in the District of Columbia. This would be a 2-year pilot program and would require a report to the Committee of Congress after a 2-year period on the effected school discipline resulting from the initiatives embodied in the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the second-degree amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank both managers. I have discussed this measure with both the majority and minority managers. They have been very careful in their study of the amendment. They will speak for themselves in regard to it. But I do appreciate their cooperation and courtesy, which are characteristic of both of them.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], is recognized.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I want to commend the senior Senator

from West Virginia for what I think is an excellent suggestion as to how we can help the District of Columbia find some of the answers that have been lacking in our educational system in this country.

I think the pilot program to take care of those who get turned out of the school system is an excellent one. One of the greatest problems we have in the city of Washington and the cities throughout the country is kids that are dropping out and those that leave involuntarily. At the same time nationally, we are cutting back on the number of young people that are being brought into the military, and often those young people who have that problem have found that the military has helped them greatly in their ability to straighten their lives out and to get back into the school systems and get an education.

I, therefore, am willing to accept both the second-degree amendment and the original amendment on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished manager of the bill for his comments in support of the amendment and for his willingness to accept the amendment.

Mr. KOHL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL] is recognized.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I must reluctantly object to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from West Virginia. While I believe this amendment has many fine parts to it, and it certainly is well-intentioned, I believe that it would interfere with the development of a cooperative relationship between the Congress and the District.

I have consistently supported the principle of home rule, and I continue to feel that it is a very important objective.

I do not intend to debate my distinguished colleague. But I do feel it necessary to lodge my objection. I hope at some point that we will have a rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I know there is a desire to stack votes so that Members will not be interrupted in their committee meetings. I suggest at this time that this amendment be set aside so that the leaders can meet and give us a suggestion as to how we can proceed. I believe there may be one other vote on an amendment. The other amendments, I believe, will be accepted.

So, at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2770

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on tax cuts and Medicare)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) proposes an amendment numbered 2770.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the suspension of the reading of the amendment?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I object to suspending the reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following new section:

#### SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON BUDGET PRIORITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996 (H.Con.Res. 67) calls for \$245 billion in tax reductions and \$270 billion in projected spending reductions from Medicare;

(2) reducing projected Medicare spending by \$270 billion could substantially increase out-of-pocket health care costs for senior citizens, reduce the quality of care available to Medicare beneficiaries and threaten the financial health of some health care providers, especially in rural areas;

(3) seventy-five percent of Medicare beneficiaries have annual incomes of less than \$25,000;

(4) most of the tax cuts in the tax bill passed by the House of Representatives (H.R. 1215) go to families making over \$100,000 per year, according to the office of Tax Analysis of the United States Department of the Treasury.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Committee on Finance and the Senate should approve no tax legislation which reduces taxes for those making over \$101,000 per year; and

(2) the savings from limiting any tax reductions in this way should be used to reduce any cuts in projected Medicare spending.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JEFFORDS. 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. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside for the sole purpose of considering the following amendments: An amendment by Senator INHOFE, an amendment by Senator DOLE and myself, an amendment by Senator BINGAMAN, and Senator BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JEFFORDS. After those are taken care of, we would return to the status quo.

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

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2771

Mr. INHOFE. I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] proposes an amendment numbered 2771:

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following: "None of the funds provided in this Act may be used directly or indirectly for the renovation of the property located at 227 7th Street Southeast (commonly known as Eastern Market), except that funds provided in this Act may be used for the regular maintenance and upkeep of the current structure and grounds located at such property."

Mr. INHOFE. I asked the clerk to go ahead and read it in its entirety so people could understand that this is simply a one-sentence, very simple, straightforward amendment, one that I have had before this body, successfully passed by the other body, on numerous occasions.

We have a very unique institution not far from the Capitol known as the Eastern Market. The Eastern Market has a unique type of a character of its own. And for a number of years, there have been notions trotting around that it should be renovated and contracted out to various people, against the wishes certainly of everyone I have ever talked to. The neighborhood associations want to keep it as it is and the same vendors who have been in there, not for years, but for decades.

So, this would preclude, and it would be clearly the intent—I want the RECORD to reflect this—that no funds directly or indirectly could be used for renovation or for construction or for changing the character of this institution; in other words, not using local funds to be replaced with Federal funds. I think it is something we have dealt with every year.

I will respond to any questions.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Oklahoma would yield to me for a question.

Mr. INHOFE. Yes. I would be happy to.

Mr. DORGAN. My understanding is that—I ask if it is correct—the Senator from Oklahoma is attempting to prevent the use of funds to essentially

come in and raze the Eastern Market and create a new gasoline station with 26 pumps and 1 person working there, or for that matter a motel or an office complex.

I very much support what the Senator is doing. I supported him when he did it in the House of Representatives. The Eastern Market, for those who have never seen it, is a very unique place. It is a market where individuals come and set up fruit stands and sell fruits and vegetables, and they sell fresh meats over there.

It is a wonderful neighborhood magnet, unique in character. It has been there for many, many years. And I know a lot of people think progress is knocking all those things down and paving it all over and building something bright and shiny. Boy, I will tell you, it would not be progress, in my judgment, to see the Eastern Market destroyed in this town. It is a wonderful, wonderful thing.

I think the Senator's amendment makes a great deal of sense, and I supported him previously on it. I compliment him on it.

Is it the case that the Senator is simply trying to prevent the razing of the Eastern Market in one form or another and trying to preserve it in this town?

Mr. INHOFE. Either razing it or transforming it. It would lose its character that it has had for the last 150 years. That is correct.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I am prepared to accept the amendment for this side.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, we are also prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2771) was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2772

(Purpose: Making a technical correction to the bill)

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] proposes an amendment numbered 2772.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2 at line 17: Strike "\$52,070,000" and insert "\$52,000,000."

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, this is a technical amendment to bring the printed bill into compliance with the committee's recommendations and the tables in the back of the committee report. The amendment eliminates \$70,000 that was not part of the committee's recommended amount.

I believe this amendment has the support of the Democratic floor manager.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. KOHL. We have no debate on the amendment. We are prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2772) was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2773

(Purpose: To make a technical change to the membership provisions of the Commission on Consensus Reform in the District of Columbia Public Schools)

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS, proposes an amendment numbered 2773.

Mr. KOHL. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 52, strike lines 13 through 16 and insert the following:

"(A) 1 member to be appointed by the President chosen from a list of 3 proposed members submitted by the Majority Leader of the Senate;

"(B) 1 member to be appointed by the President chosen from a list of 3 proposed members submitted by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;"

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, this amendment is a technical amendment to remove a possible constitutional challenge to the Commission on Consensus Reform in the D.C. public schools. The amendment provides that the President shall appoint two of the commission members from a list provided by the majority leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

There is a constitutional question whether these congressional leaders could directly appoint members of the commission. This amendment cures that potential problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, we have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2773) was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2774

(Purpose: To reduce the energy costs of Federal facilities for which funds are made available under this Act)

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator BINGAMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], for Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 2774.

Mr. KOHL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. . ENERGY SAVINGS AT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FACILITIES.

(a) REDUCTION IN FACILITIES ENERGY COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each agency of the District of Columbia for which funds are made available under this Act shall—

(A) take all actions necessary to achieve during fiscal year 1996 a 5 percent reduction, from fiscal year 1995 levels, in the energy costs of the facilities used by the agency; or

(B) enter into a sufficient number of energy savings performance contracts with private sector energy service companies under title VIII of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287 et seq.) to achieve during fiscal year 1996 at least a 5 percent reduction, from fiscal year 1995 levels, in the energy use of the facilities used by the agency.

(2) GOAL.—The activities described in paragraph (1) should be a key component of agency programs that will by the year 2000 result in a 20 percent reduction, from fiscal year 1985 levels, in the energy use of the facilities used by the agency, as required by section 543 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253).

(b) USE OF COST SAVINGS.—An amount equal to the amount of cost savings realized by an agency under subsection (a) shall remain available for obligation through the end of fiscal year 2000, without further authorization or appropriation, as follows:

(1) CONSERVATION MEASURES.—Fifty percent of the amount shall remain available for the implementation of additional energy conservation measures and for water conservation measures at such facilities used by the agency as are designated by the head of the agency.

(2) OTHER PURPOSES.—Fifty percent of the amount shall remain available for use by the agency for such purposes as are designated by the head of the agency, consistent with applicable law.

#### (c) REPORTS.—

(1) BY AGENCY HEADS.—The head of each agency for which funds are made available under this Act shall include in each report of the agency to the Secretary of Energy under section 548(a) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8258(a)) a description of the results of the activities carried out under subsection (a) and recommendations concerning how to further reduce energy costs and energy consumption in the future.

(2) BY SECRETARY OF ENERGY.—The reports required under paragraph (1) shall be included in the annual reports required to be submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Energy under section 548(b) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 8258(b)).

(3) CONTENTS.—With respect to the period since the date of the preceding report, a report under paragraph (1) or (2) shall—

(A) specify the total energy costs of the facilities used by the agency;

(B) identify the reductions achieved;

(C) specify the actions that resulted in the reductions;

(D) with respect to the procurement procedures of the agency, specify what actions have been taken to—

(i) implement the procurement authorities provided by subsections (a) and (c) of section 546 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8256); and

(ii) incorporate directly, or by reference, the requirements of the regulations issued by the Secretary of Energy under title VIII of the Act (42 U.S.C. 8287 et seq.); and

(E) specify—

(i) the actions taken by the agency to achieve the goal specified in subsection (a)(2);

(ii) the procurement procedures and methods used by the agency under section 546(a)(2) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 8256(a)(2)); and

(iii) the number of energy savings performance contracts entered into by the agency under title VIII of the Act (42 U.S.C. 8257 et seq.).

#### ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the two floor managers of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, Senator JEFFORDS, and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, Senator KOHL, and their staff, for their excellent and efficient management of the Fiscal Year 1996 Appropriations Act for the District of Columbia.

I would like to take a few moments to discuss an amendment I am offering on this appropriations bill. My amendment encourages agencies funded under the bill to become more energy efficient and directs them to reduce facility energy costs by 5 percent. The agencies will report to the Congress at the end of the year on their efforts to conserve energy and will make recommendations for further conservation efforts. I have offered this amendment to every appropriations bill that has come before the Senate this year, and it has been accepted to each one.

I believe this is a commonsense amendment: the Federal Government spends nearly \$4 billion annually to heat, cool, and power its 500,000 buildings. The office technology assistance and the alliance to save energy, a non-profit group which I chair with Senator JEFFORDS, estimate that Federal agencies could save \$1 billion annually if they would make an effort to become more energy efficient and conserve energy.

Mr. President, I hope this amendment will encourage agencies to use new energy savings technologies when making building improvements in insulation, building controls, lighting, heating, and air-conditioning. The Department of Energy has made available for Governmentwide agency use streamlined energy saving performance contracts procedures, modeled after private sector initiatives. Unfortunately, most agencies have made little progress in this area. This amendment is an attempt to get Federal agencies to devote more attention to energy efficiency, with the goal of lowering overall costs and conserving energy.

As I mentioned, Mr. President, this amendment has been accepted to every appropriations bill the Senate has passed this year. I ask that my colleagues support it.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, this amendment that I am offering on behalf of Senator BINGAMAN is intended to reduce the energy costs of the Federal facilities for which funds are made available under this act. This amendment has been attached to nearly all of the other appropriations bills and reemphasizes the energy conservation

requirements mandated under the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

I understand that there is no objection on the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, we have no objection to the amendment. We believe it is a good amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2774) was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask the managers if they have any further business pending, or may I at this time offer my amendment?

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent request that we have allows the Senator to offer her amendment at this time provided that she does not intend to require a vote.

Mrs. BOXER. That is correct.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2775

(Purpose: To provide that Members of Congress and the President shall not be paid during Federal Government shutdowns)

Mrs. BOXER. I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration. I send it up on behalf of Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DOLE, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. BRYAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DOLE, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. BRYAN, proposes an amendment numbered 2775.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

#### SEC. . PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT DURING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Members of Congress and the President shall not receive basic pay for any period in which—

(1) there is more than a 24 hour lapse in appropriations for any Federal agency or department as a result of a failure to enact a regular appropriations bill or continuing resolution; or

(2) the Federal Government is unable to make payments or meet obligations because the public debt limit under section 3101 of title 31, United States Code has been reached.

(b) RETROACTIVE PAY PROHIBITED.—No pay forfeited in accordance with subsection (a) may be paid retroactively.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the amendment I have just sent to the desk

would stop the pay for Members of Congress and the President during any period in which the Government fails to meet its obligations because of our failure to enact a budget. President Clinton supports this amendment.

Americans are being warned every day that we may come to a train wreck over the budget. If we fail to enact appropriations bills by the end of the fiscal year or if the debt limit ceiling is reached, the Government will stop paying its bills and its debts. Small business people holding Government contracts, senior citizens with questions about their Medicare coverage, even major financial institutions holding Government securities would be severely impacted by that so-called train wreck.

Certainly there are major differences among Members of Congress and the President over what our national priorities should be. Yes, we have a Democratic President and a Republican Congress. But we were elected to work together, Mr. President. And I believe if we fail to do that, the most basic job we are sent here to do, then we should pay a price.

The way this amendment would work is simple. If any part of the Government shuts down because of a lapse in appropriations for any Federal department or agency, or there is a shutdown because the debt ceiling has been reached, Members of Congress and the President will not get paid.

Mr. President, some here have raised legitimate constitutional questions regarding this amendment. But I think the amendment is constitutional. I think it sends an important message to the people across the country that we understand that we are paid to do our jobs fully.

Today, the House Speaker threatened to take the Nation into default saying, and I quote him, "I do not care what the price is." Mr. President, this is the greatest country on Earth. We must not default on our financial obligations. I truly believe my amendment will help prevent a Government shutdown. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I hope that we will do it right now very quickly without further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mrs. BOXER. I do yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. JEFFORDS. This amendment is acceptable to us on this side.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, this side also accepts the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2775) was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I move to lay that motion on the table.



The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President, and I thank my colleagues.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rules, a Senator cannot reserve the right to object in calling off the quorum call.

Mr. DORGAN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An objection is heard. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk continued to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for 5 minutes, and further, that the Senator from North Dakota be allowed 5 minutes as in morning business for debate only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator has 5 minutes and the Senator from North Dakota has 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. THOMAS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1268 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCAIN). The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes as in morning business.

#### EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 2770

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to tell my colleagues who may be watching these proceedings where we are and why we are where we are.

I offered an amendment some while ago, about half hour ago. We intended to offer a second-degree amendment to it to slightly modify it. We intended to get a vote on it. At that point, the Senate was put into a quorum call. Since that time, two noncontroversial amendments have been adopted. Except for this morning business, the Senate has been in a quorum call.

I wanted to use this 5 minutes to explain what this amendment was and

why I am offering it and why there is no intent at all to delay the proceedings of the Senate today. I understand we want to finish this appropriations bill. I think we can do that quickly. On my amendment I would agree to a very short time limit. I told the chairman of the committee I would agree to a half hour time limit, if necessary. So we can finish this bill quickly.

My amendment does something very simple. Because the Finance Committee in the Senate next week will deal with Medicare and Medicaid, and because we have proposals on the table for substantial cuts in Medicare, proposals that were included in the budget that call for a very substantial tax cut, my amended is an amended amendment to try to send the sense of the Senate to the Finance Committee about priorities. I suggest if there is a tax cut coming out of the Senate Finance Committee—and I do not think we ought to cut taxes at this point; we ought to keep our eye on the goal of reducing the Federal deficit. Cutting taxes may be popular but, in my judgment, it ought to be discussed after we have managed to balance the Federal budget. My sense-of-the-Senate amendment is that if there is a tax cut that comes out of the Finance Committee, it be limited to those making \$100,000 a year or less. And by limiting the tax cut to those making under \$100,000 a year, the savings could be used to reduce the cut that is anticipated in Medicare. It is a very simple amendment with respect to priorities.

I know people here will grit their teeth because of this amendment. But the reason there is the requirement to offer it is that the minority will have very little opportunity in the Senate Finance Committee; they are not involved in writing the bill. I am not complaining about that. That is the way the system works. The majority won, they control, they write the legislation.

But we have an opportunity, it seems to me, to try to express ourselves on priorities. The priority here is the juxtaposition between tax cuts and the cut in Medicare. I hope very much that if there is to be a tax cut, it be a tax cut that is focused on those who earn less than \$100,000 a year. I was on a television program two mornings ago with a member of the majority party. The member of the majority party said, "Look, our tax cut is a family tax cut. It is going to go to working families, modest-income families." I said, "Then we will give you chance to vote on it. As a matter of priorities, let us decide that is what we are going to do." That is what my amendment does. When we tried to second-degree it, of course, there was an objection to the amendment being considered as read and, therefore, we were not able to offer the second degree, and the Senate was put into a quorum call.

I say to the chair that I have no intention of holding this bill up. But this amendment is not going to go away ei-

ther. You can second-degree this amendment and do it three or four times, and I will offer it again as a second degree to something else, because I believe we ought to have the right to vote on this. So it is not going to go away. We can dispose of it very quickly. I will agree to a time limit. I have no intention of impeding the working of the Senate this afternoon. I hope very much that you will allow us the opportunity at an early time here to vote on an amendment of this type.

Again, as I said, I think we should finish this bill this afternoon. The timeliness of this amendment is—the Senate Finance Committee begins work on this next week. I have no choice, really, but to offer this at this point. It is not a breach of any agreement or a breach of understanding by anybody. It is not an attempt to stretch out the time. It is about priorities in this country, and these are important priorities which I will speak on at a point in time when the opportunity exists for debate on the amendment itself.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPRO- PRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2770

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I understand the desires of the Senator from North Dakota, and this obviously is a very important amendment. However, we are dealing with the appropriations bill for the District of Columbia. It is my intention—after a brief period of time for the leader to debate—to move to table the Senator's amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President we have already discussed the amendment. I wonder if we need anymore time. It has been explained two or three times by the Senator from North Dakota. If we can just have 1 minute on this side to explain our side, that would be sufficient. He has had 15 or 20 minutes. I do not see any reason for additional debate. A lot of colleagues on both sides of the aisle had hoped we might be finished with this bill and the other conference report by 12:30.

If the Senator from North Dakota could accommodate that, we will be prepared to table the amendment immediately.

Mr. DORGAN. I say to the majority leader that I have not had 10 or 15 minutes to debate this, but 5 minutes under morning business.

I have no intention of delaying. If the Senator wants to proceed and there will be a tabling motion, I accept that. I appreciate that.