

exist, and we need to continue to push to do that. We have not been able to bring to closure some of these things that we have tried to do over the past year, largely because most of them have been vetoed by the White House. Many of them have been opposed by our friends on the other side of the aisle.

Balancing the budget: We came within one vote of getting a constitutional amendment to ensure that the budget would be balanced. We need to continue to do that. I think that is a critical item for our future, for our kids and for our grandkids.

We have made some progress in reducing spending, but we need to tie that in to the future so that through the changing of entitlements that will continue. If we do not do it, it will be right back up.

Regulatory reform passed this Senate. We have not been able to get it past the White House.

So the results, Mr. President, have been that we have had slower growth. Unfortunately, we hear these reports in the State of the Union that this is the best economy in 30 years. Sorry, but when you examine it, it is not very good. We had 1.9 percent growth last year. In the last quarter, we had a .9 percent growth.

If I had charts like the Senator from North Dakota, I could show you the earlier years, in the eighties and prior to that, growth was more commonly in the neighborhood of 3.5 to 4 percent. That reflects in the ability of families to earn a living, a living with which they can support their families.

Mr. President, I hope that we can establish a priority, an agenda for this year, and I hope that we can spend our time on that; that we can move forward.

I am not discouraged by the fact that we did not come to closure last year. On the contrary, I am encouraged with the fact that we are now talking about a balanced budget. Two years ago, we were talking about a budget that had a \$200 billion deficit, as far out as you could see. We have not talked about regulatory reform before. We are now talking about that.

So we have changed the discussion in this body, and I think we need to pursue that. I think we need to do it for economic growth. We need to do it so that people in this country and wage earners can enjoy the same kind of prosperity that we have had in years past. We do that, I think, by some tax relief, capital gains tax relief that encourages investment and encourages the economy to grow. We need to do it by regulatory relief so that businesses will have more money to pay. There will be more jobs and more competition, which causes wages to go up. We need to have a balanced budget so we are not only fiscally responsible but so we can bring and keep interest rates down so there will be encouragement for investment.

After all, the real role of economics in this country is for the Federal Gov-

ernment to establish an environment in which the private sector can function. That should be our priority for this year.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant 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 ACT, 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 2546, the D.C. appropriations bill.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2546) 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective House this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, once again we are here debating the District of Columbia appropriations bill for the current fiscal year, which is now fully 5 months old. The city began the year strapped for cash and it has not received \$254 million of Federal funds that will be available once this bill is enacted.

The kids in the public schools are still faced with a community and system that has not made them a priority. The Committee on Public Education, known as COPE, is a group of local civic and business leaders who have spent nearly 6 years studying the D.C. public schools. In its report a year ago is stated that too many remain too invested in the status quo. COPE also found that the District has not really tried reform.

The kids in many District public schools continue to attempt to prepare for life in the next century in school buildings that were built in the first half of this century, and are in deplorable physical condition. Many schools lack the infrastructure to accommodate the same technology that the neighborhood grocery store employs.

If we do not begin the process of educational reform and fiscal recovery by passing this conference agreement we can never hope to achieve the goals we, the Congress, set for ourselves last year. A financially fit and economically stable Nation's Capital that is able to attract businesses, jobs, and

people to support a tax base that will enable a public education system that prepares our kids for the future is an absolute necessity for this community and for our Nation. If we cannot do it in the District, where can you?

Mr. President, we have a limited amount of time for debate and I do not intend to restate the arguments that were made on Tuesday. But it is important to restate that this scholarship program, limited, in both time and scope, is not the occasion for a national debate on the question of private school vouchers. We have an appropriations bill that should have been enacted months ago. We resolved most of the issues, some of which were controversial and the subject of intense discussion, including the other education reform initiatives, in relatively short order. But we had great difficulty finding common ground on a scholarship program, which had to be a part of this conference agreement with respect to the interests of the House.

Mr. President, I hope that Senators will consider the financial plight of the District government and the educational future of D.C. kids when they cast their vote today and not the fears of a few who are invested in the status quo. I ask Senators to vote for cloture and allow the city to get on with its important rebuilding work.

Mr. President, I will briefly mention again two other issues. We have gone over the abortion issue many times, and about what was reached as a compromise between what the Bush and Clinton administrations did. I talked to you yesterday and, hopefully, removed from your mind any concerns about Davis-Bacon problems. If there are concerns under the interpretation, we are ready to take care of that before this goes into law.

So I urge Senators, please, review what was said yesterday and please pass this conference report by allowing us to have cloture.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. KOHL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, just 2 days ago, on Tuesday of this week, the Senate failed to invoke cloture on the conference report H.R. 2546, the District of Columbia appropriations bill. The vote was 54 to 44. For the benefit of Members who may have turned their attention to other matters, let me inform the Senate that we are about to repeat Tuesday's vote. However, and unless Chairman JEFFORDS otherwise indicates, I am unaware of any developments affecting the issues that led the Senate to reject the first cloture motion. My position therefore remains the same, and I urge Members to vote against the motion to invoke cloture.

Although I am urging Members to oppose the motion at hand, I do so with great reluctance. As Chairman JEFFORDS and I have already indicated, the District is in dire financial straits. The

Chairman of the Control Board, the Mayor, and other officials agree that the city will run out of cash if the balance of the Federal payment—some \$212 million—is not released within the next several weeks. We need to act, not to debate. With respect to the voucher program set forth in the conference report, the Senate has spoken. We need to respect the decision of this body and move forward to develop a legislation that will allow the city to pay its bills and operate in an orderly fashion.

Mr. President, the Senators who voted against cloture on the conference report are not satisfied with the status quo in the D.C. public school system. In my opinion, it is a national disgrace that children in our Nation's Capital do not have access to schools that prepare them to succeed in an increasingly competitive global economy. I believe that all of us agree that District schools need to change, and that they will be changed. The conference report includes a broad array of reforms that received bipartisan support. These reforms address many of the shortcomings in the District's schools and I urge my fellow conferees to work with congressional leadership to find a way to enact them.

Mr. President, I know other Senators would like to address the Senate so I will yield the balance of my time to Senator KENNEDY. Thank you and I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, first of all, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin and also the Senator from Vermont for understanding that if we did not have these three inappropriate sort of riders that have been placed on the conference report, this legislation would go through in a moment by a voice vote. But it has been the judgment of the House of Representatives to add three different measures—one dealing with Davis-Bacon, in order to depress the wages of workers in the District; second, in restricting even private funds that could be used to help and assist a woman if she makes a judgment and determination for abortion; third, the issue on the vouchers in an appropriations bill that reduces the total funding, cuts back \$11 million, but provides \$5 million for vouchers.

Now, Mr. President, just at the outset of this discussion, we have to understand that there are certain issues where there is a public response and a recognized public obligation. We have recognized that with regard to national security. We have recognized that with regard to electricity, for example. And we have recognized that with regard to the Postal Service. Nobody would say we ought to have just the market of electricity and postal. Why? Because we know that the houses at the end of the street would not receive it, or those houses at the end of the street would not receive their mail.

As a nation, for education it will require public investment of funds, and it will be compulsory. We are asked to accept this particular amendment because we are told that it will be an experiment, but it is not an experiment, Mr. President, because what you are doing is rigging the system at the very outset. What you are not giving is the choice and decision for the independent student to make a judgment to go to a private school. What you are basically doing is taking scarce resources from the local community and transferring them to the school. The school makes the judgment as to which young person it is going to select. It is not the individual, it is the school that makes that judgment. It is not choice for the individual or the individual parents, it is choice for the school.

What are we going to learn from this? If the school system accepts 2 percent of the 80,000 students in the District and are able to educate them, are we supposed to assume that because they can, in effect, skim, they do not have to meet other responsibilities or requirements in accepting students that may have some language difficulties, or may be homeless, or have other kinds of difficulties? Are we going to say, well, it is a great experiment? Well this has been rejected by 16 different States. The only city that has tried that has been Milwaukee, and any fair evaluation would show that it is not successful.

We do not reject innovative, creative ways at the local community to enhance the achievements of education, and we have included and supported many of those proposals in the Goals 2000 legislation and other proposals.

Basically, those people who are supporting this system said, "Let's have a competition." What happens in the United States when you have a competition, you have winners and you have losers. What happens on the stock market, you have those that make money and those that close their doors.

That should not be the test for education in America. We are not saying you will have winners and losers. We are saying that those children who have those needs ought to be educated in our society, and that reaches the fundamental objection to this proposal. Effectively, we are saying, OK, the 2 percent will be winners, they will be able to go ahead in terms of a private school system, and we are basically abandoning all the other children with scarce resources.

Mr. President, I think it is very clear what the will of the people in the District of Columbia is. It has been so interesting during the course of this debate and other debates. We hear the statements that Washington does not know best. We have here an issue that was rejected 8 to 1 by the District of Columbia and is being jammed down the throats of the people of the District of Columbia. They do not want it. The very way it is constructed in this conference report says that, if they do not

use it, they do not get the money. That is a fine choice. That is a fine choice to give the people in the District of Columbia. We do not here know what is best. The people in the District of Columbia have rejected it and 16 other States have rejected this, but we, in our almighty knowledge, are saying you will have to take it, people in the District of Columbia, or otherwise we will not provide these resources.

It is an unwise education policy. It will not demonstrate any different kind of factors in terms of schools. It is so interesting that those who make the argument talk about what is happening in the schools. Give the children an opportunity to escape from crime and violence. At the same time we are reducing the support for drug-free schools by 50 percent. Give those children a chance to learn. And at the same time we are reducing our commitment to give those children the advancements in the title I programs and math and science and other literacy programs.

What is happening, Mr. President, is a choice. Now, are we going to abandon the children of the District of Columbia? I say we should not. By doing so, we will vote "no" in terms of the cloture vote.

I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Massachusetts. The truth of the matter is that this is really a dirty trick on the schoolchildren of the District. Mr. President, 51 schools are in the District of Columbia, and only 8 of the 51 qualify for this so-called \$3,000 scholarship. Mr. President, seven of the eight are religious schools. The \$3,000 scholarship is not going to get them into schools. They will get them into the courts. It is a dirty trick. It is throwing a 50-yard line to the child 100 yards offshore and telling them to swim for it.

Most of all, the very crowd that is sponsoring this nonsense—here I call it nonsense. We are not living up to the needs of public education. The fact is, in order to get this, this year, this Congress would be going into the \$5 million a year program, cut \$3 billion from public education. It is unheard of to try to start a private program. And the very crowd that sponsors this nonsense is a group that comes around here and beseeches us about balancing the budget and constitutional amendments to balance it and everything else of that kind. We are without money, running a \$286 billion deficit last year, 1995. We do not have the money for this, and we are going to start a multibillion-dollar spending program?

I said that was my suspicion earlier this week. Now I find it to be the fact, looking at the "Education Daily," and the plan of Representative STEVE GUNDERSON, Republican of Wisconsin, saying the national program authorizes the spending of up to \$1 billion a year for vouchers. The \$5 million program

over the 5 years, in a few days' time, has already gotten to \$5 billion. Suppose the program works? Where is the money? Where is that crowd that is going to come up now and start talking about balancing the budgets?

Yes, we have to cut spending; yes, in this Senator's opinion, we have to increase taxes in order to pay for what we get—not cut taxes. More than anything else, we should not start off on fanciful programs not the responsibility beyond the constitutional function of this Congress that will cost billions more. Do not have this group saying they want to balance budgets and in the same breath start \$5 billion programs for private endeavor.

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

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I thank my friend and colleague from Vermont. Here we are again. Here we go again. I do not know whether we will change any minds, but I do think this is an important issue to debate and an important vote.

I am disappointed by the extent of opposition to this bill that is desperately needed by the District of Columbia apparently primarily because of the portion that would establish a scholarship fund for poor children. I do not get it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mayor Marion Barry dated February 23, 1996.

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

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, DC., February 23, 1996.

Hon. JOSEPH LIEBERMAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LIEBERMAN: As a member of the Democratic Party, supporter of the District, and a champion of progressive and democratic principles, policies, and ideals, I want to appeal to you to assist the District on our FY 1996 Budget. The Senate is scheduled to vote on cloture for the District of Columbia Appropriations bill, HR 2546, on Tuesday, February 27th. I urge you, in the strongest terms, to support cloture and conclude this long delayed District business.

Two hundred forty-seven million dollars (\$247) of the District's Federal payment, the compensation that attempts to make up for the significant Congressional limitations on local revenue sources and governing authority, are still unavailable because the appropriations bill, almost 5 months after the start of the fiscal year, has still not been finally approved. The needs of hundreds of thousands of District residents are being held hostage to this delay.

Fiscally speaking, we can wait no longer for our Federal payment. We have just completed our 1995 audit showing that we have significantly cut spending in 1995 by \$281 million and decreased payroll by over 3,000 employees. The FY 1996 budget emphatically shows that we have stopped the hemorrhaging of spending and reversed the tide. Last week, I released my transformation document and the FY 97 budget which shows a decrease of 10,000 employees by year 2000 and a radical transformation of the D.C. Government. However, this transformation and FY 97 budget is predicated on the FY 96 budget and the full Federal payment. Our

radical savings in 1997, 98 and 99 are integrally related to this Federal payment in 1996.

The District is significantly cash short. We are in a desperate situation. If we do not obtain our \$247 million in Federal payment now we will run out of cash by the end of March. We have urgent needs for these delayed funds. Although the Federal payment is less than 20% of the General Fund, it is a critical resource. Our cash flow depends on the \$660 million in Federal payment that we should have received on October 1, 1996. Unlike the Federal Government, we cannot borrow right away.

Public safety is our top priority yet the delayed Federal payment is hampering our crime fighting capabilities. We have business vendors that are going out of business because of our delayed payments to them. Businesses are laying off employees, closing their doors and vowing never to do business in the District again. School books and building repairs are not possible due to lack of funds. Trash pickups suffer because equipment is old and cannot be repaired. We are 3½ months behind in our Medicaid payments. Our situation is desperate. We need this money immediately.

In addition, it is incredible that we have begun the budget process for Fiscal Year 1997 without having Fiscal Year 1996 resolved. We are just beginning our local Council hearings on the FY 97 budget yet we have no FY 96 budget. This situation makes accurate budget determination impossible.

I know that many Senators rightfully have serious problems with the voucher programs established in the appropriations bill. So do I. I have disdain for vouchers and have opposed them at every turn in the District. This Appropriations Bill is not a vouchers bill: it does not authorize the District to initiate vouchers, it only gives local officials the option to do so if they chose. As much as I dislike the voucher issue, I cannot go another week without our full Federal payment. Real human suffering is at stake.

I urge you to vote for cloture. It is crucial that the District of Columbia be fully funded, as it should have been months ago. Senate Democrats need to allow the District's appropriations Conference Report to be considered so that the District can finally receive its fiscal 1996 appropriations. You have been supportive of the District in the past and I thank you for your support. Today I ask for your support again. I urge you to release this budget and allow us to get on with the business of radically transforming the D.C. Government and providing our residents with the services they deserve. If you have any questions, please call me at 727-6263.

Sincerely,

MARION BARRY, JR.,
Mayor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. In this letter, Mayor Barry literally pleads for us, for the sake of fiscal continuity of the District of Columbia, that we pass this bill. In it he says:

I know that many Senators rightfully have serious problems with the voucher programs established in the appropriations bill. So do I. . . . This appropriations bill is not a vouchers bill . . . it only gives local officials the option to do so [which is to say initiate a voucher program] if they choose.

Then he says, "As much as I dislike the voucher issue, I cannot go another week without our full Federal payment. Real human suffering is at stake."

What is stopping us? It is the voucher program. We all know this is controversial. I notice in the paper that some of my friends from the National Education Association claimed victory

on the vote the other day, one saying, "This is much bigger than D.C."

The big point here is the District of Columbia and its future. I think maybe there is something bigger involved in the voucher program, but it is just a question of whether we are going to feel obliged to defend the status quo and the American public education system, which we know is not working for a lot of our children, or whether we will experiment, a very, very small amount of money compared to the billions spent on public education, to test what is going to happen to the kids, poor kids, whose parents decide they are trapped by their income in schools that are not educating them, schools in which they are terrorized very often, tragically, the ones who want to learn, by young hoodlums, stating it specifically. This program would allow them to break out of that. Let us see what effect it would have on those kids, and let us see what effect it would have on the public schools in the District.

My mind is open. I have been a supporter of this voucher or scholarship program, but if these cuts occur and they occur more broadly than contemplated in the bill Senator COATS and I introduced, and somehow we find they cripple the public school system, we will step back and decide maybe it was not a good idea, was not worth it.

I doubt that will happen. I think what is going to happen is we are going to create some opportunity for kids to break out of the cycle of poverty and maybe we are all going to learn a little bit, including the public schools, about how to better educate our children. There are tens of thousands of heroes working in our public school system. That is the heart of our hopes for the future of our children, the public school system. But it is just not working for a lot of our kids.

I really appeal to my friends in the teachers organizations: Do not be defensive about this. You are strong. The public education system gets so much of public investment. I so actively support all the efforts to reform our public schools. This is not an either/or. If you are for the scholarship bill, it does not mean you are against public education.

The fact is, what we have to focus on here is the kids. What is best for our children? Is there only one established way to educate them and brighten their future, or can we try another one, without doing damage to that?

I am not hopeful about the outcome of the vote, but I appeal to my colleagues here. Listen to Mayor Barry's appeal to pass this bill and give this alternative and these 11,000 poor kids in the District a chance for a better education and a better life.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, how much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains on the time of the Senator from Vermont, 5 minutes and 50 seconds. The opposition time is 3 minutes and 17 seconds.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I will proceed, then.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if the Senator wants to make a final remark, out of courtesy he is entitled to it. I would make just a brief response, but I intend to use the 3 or 4 minutes that remain. So, whatever is agreeable to the floor manager.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I would prefer—if the Senator would like to proceed at this point, I will allow him to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, just a final few facts. It has been the Republican Congress that cut back \$29 million last year from funding, public support for schools and schoolchildren in the District. They are cutting back \$15 million this year and giving the \$5 million as a bonus prize that if the school districts are going to use the voucher system, they can get it. If they do not, they will not. It is legislative blackmail, using the worst form of legislative blackmail by using the children of the District of Columbia as pawns.

There is not a person in this body who has not said they would vote for this D.C. appropriations bill, if these three amendments were removed, by voice vote. We can do it now. We can do it this afternoon.

This concept has been rejected about trying to jam vouchers down the throat of the District of Columbia. It has been rejected by them 8-to-1 previously. Why do we know better, we here? We could pass the D.C. appropriation this afternoon by voice vote in a matter of minutes. But, no. They say, even though we have had the vote in the U.S. Senate and even though their position has been rejected, we are still going to play the card of "we are on the side of the District of Columbia's children, and those that will not permit this to go through are not."

Mr. President, the parents of the District of Columbia ought to know who has been standing by them, not just on this legislation but historically—historically. We reject that. We believe the time for political blackmail is over. Let us drop these three provisions, voice vote that, get the money and the resources in the District and fight for them to try to get some additional resources to enhance educational achievement and accomplishment for the children of the District of Columbia.

I retain the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Massachusetts. All those comments and dire remarks he made would have been perfectly appropriate if we had been talking about the original

House provisions that were in the bill. But that was before the conference report. We are not dealing with the problems that have been referred to by my friend from Massachusetts.

Let me go through this. There is no jamming it down anybody's throat. That comment was made. The District council can refuse to spend a single penny on tuition scholarships—not a penny. If they do, the money may be lost if there is no agreement with the scholarship corporation, but there does not need to be a cent spent unless the city agrees to spend it.

There is a corporation set up which, must agree with the city council. The corporation will approve all applications for scholarships. In other words, it is not a helter-skelter, "Here is a tuition payment and you can go anywhere you want." It has to be approved by the scholarship corporation, which must also be reviewed by the District council.

Under the conference agreement, not the House version, schools enrolling scholarship students must conform to all of the constitutional protections. The disbursement of the funds must be balanced economically. The disbursement of the funds must be balanced educationally, so we do not get a disparate amount of money being spent towards those who are better off, even among those who are eligible for scholarships—it is all low income—just that they are the economically relatively well-situated.

Second, there are two sets of scholarships in the bill. All of the money can be spent on remedial scholarships, which everybody agrees to. The worst problem the city has right now is we have 20,000 or 30,000 young people going through the system who are going to either graduate functionally illiterate or drop out. Those are the ones we are focusing on in all of the educational reform. The city council priority, I am sure, and the pressure of the city, I am sure, will be to spend all of that money or almost all of it on the scholarships which are for remedial use, after-school use, or other programs so these kids can be brought up to the status where they can be functionally literate.

Also, we must consider what may happen, and I hope does not happen, on the House side. We have been told that if this loses here, this very scaled-down proposal that we are voting on here, not the one that has been described—if this fails, if this modicum of tuition scholarship fails, then we may lose the whole educational package. That would be a travesty; hopefully that will not be the case if we do fail here today.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield on my time for just a very brief question?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I will suspend at this point for the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Just on that reference, as I understand it, under the

conference committee it creates five new boards, five new boards, and defunds the elected school board of the District of Columbia. Am I correct?

Mr. JEFFORDS. No, the Senator is not correct. This was not the intention of the bill, and that will be rectified. But, because the District council reduced the budget for the board's staff and operations, after the conferees had agreed to this provision, that is the way it could be interpreted. We are willing to reprogram some of money in this bill for purposes of the board.

Mr. KENNEDY. But as it stands in this bill, you have funded five new boards and failed to fund the school board, as I understand it?

Mr. JEFFORDS. On Tuesday the Senator from Wisconsin and I had a colloquy to clarify the status of the board. Yes, there are other new boards that are created for the purposes of educational reform. That is correct.

May I inquire how much time I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a minute and 53 seconds remaining. Your opponents have 21 seconds remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield whatever time I have.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I want to close here. I hope this is very clear to my colleagues, and I will make sure they know what we are voting upon today. I hope you would concentrate on what the actual situation is as to the tuition scholarships. There may be not a single penny spent unless the city council agrees to it. Keep that in mind. It is all local control. The Mayor says it is fine with him because it is all local control. So I urge my colleagues to support cloture. I yield the remainder of my time.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair directs the clerk to read the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2546, the D.C. Appropriations bill.

Bob Dole, James M. Jeffords, Trent Lott, Rick Santorum, Alfonse D'Amato, Dan Coats, Mark Hatfield, Bill Frist, John McCain, Larry Pressler, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Olympia Snowe, Al Simpson, Conrad Burns, Spencer Abraham, Orrin G. Hatch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays have been ordered under rule XXII.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Kansas, Senator DOLE, who is necessarily occupied in campaigning in South Carolina, where