

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 disbursal of the funds must be balanced economically. The disbursal 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

he should be. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 21 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Abraham	Frist	Mack
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Breaux	Grassley	Pressler
Brown	Gregg	Roth
Burns	Hatch	Santorum
Byrd	Hatfield	Shelby
Campbell	Helms	Simpson
Coats	Hutchison	Smith
Cochran	Inhofe	Snowe
Cohen	Jeffords	Stevens
Coverdell	Johnston	Thomas
Craig	Kassebaum	Thompson
D'Amato	Kemphorne	Thurmond
DeWine	Kyl	Warner
Domenici	Lieberman	
Faircloth	Lott	

NAYS—42

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Glenn	Moynihan
Bingaman	Graham	Murray
Boxer	Harkin	Nunn
Bryan	Heflin	Pell
Bumpers	Hollings	Pryor
Chafee	Kennedy	Reid
Conrad	Kerrey	Robb
Daschle	Kerry	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kohl	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Simon
Exon	Leahy	Wellstone
Feingold	Levin	Wyden

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS—
1

Specter, against

NOT VOTING—5

Bradley	Inouye	McCain
Dole	Lugar	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 52, the nays are 42. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I know some of my colleagues here wish to make a few remarks. I hope that everyone over the coming days, before we face this issue again, whether it is on another vote to invoke cloture or whether it is on another vote—I think it is wise for all of us to take a look at what must be done if we are going to reach a consensus on many issues in this body.

As I have tried to let my colleagues know, we worked long and hard, 90 days, on reaching a compromise with the House. The House is very dug in on this issue. We had to make incredibly difficult changes that they would agree to to bring us to a position where I thought we had a bill that could pass the Congress and win support in a highly Democratic city, a highly unionized city, with a very Democratic mayor. I thought that they would agree with the compromise that we reached.

It seems difficult for me to perceive or understand as to why this body would disagree with that compromise. If we cannot find a consensus on this issue, what is going to happen when we get to the three major appropriations bills that we still have not dealt with? Are we somehow going to be able to reach a consensus among the House and this body and the White House? We also have other issues with respect to welfare, Medicaid, and all the other issues that are in addition to the appropriations bills, which to me are so much more difficult. If we cannot reach a consensus on this bill, I do not know what the hope is for the future.

I have been in the Congress now for 22 years. During that length of time, I have been on many committees under many different circumstances with respect to which party controls the committees. Many, many difficult issues have been faced during that period of time, and just by virtue of the committees I have been on, I have been in the center of those.

I mentioned "in the center", for instance, because if one takes a look at the recent ratings, I am the most liberal Republican Senator but I am more conservative than many Democratic Senators. So where does that put me? It puts me right in the middle. Over the course of time I have found myself in that position and have been able to assist in working out the compromises by my ability to see both sides of the issue.

In fact, Mr. President, I will reminisce for just a moment. I remember at a critical moment during the Reagan administration we were dealing with a controversial bill, an employment training bill. I was serving in the House, and I got a call from one of the Members of this body who said, "Jim, we know how hard you worked on this bill, but when we go to the White House, would you tell them how bad it is, because if you tell them how bad it is, I think they will accept it?"

So I went down to the White House and I made a pitch by saying, "Oh, my God, it goes too far this way and goes too far that way." I got a phone call back from that Senator commanding me and offering me an Academy Award for my performance. And we reached a consensus. That is how far I would go. Yes, I would have liked to have seen it different, but I was willing to make the compromises that were important to get that bill through.

We have to learn how to do that here. I hope in the interim, before we take

another vote, that everyone will take a look at what the real issues are here.

So many of the statements that were made would be true if this was a national proposal to deal with vouchers or even if it was a D.C. proposal to have a mandated voucher program for the city. But it is not that.

So I urge my colleagues in this interim time, if we cannot reach consensus here, where will we ever do it? If we do not do it with the House, which has come a long way, in my mind, in reaching consensus here—they had dug their heels in—we run the risk of losing all the educational reform that is in the bill, all of which is incredibly necessary for the District. We may even lose the ability to provide them with the \$254 million in additional Federal funds which they are entitled to under this agreement.

So I urge my colleagues to take a close look before we vote again, whenever that may be.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAMPBELL). The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] is recognized.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill 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:

Trent Lott, Jim Jeffords, Dan Coats, Larry E. Craig, Paul D. Coverdell, Conrad Burns, Pete V. Domenici, Jon Kyl, John Ashcroft, Slade Gorton, Spencer Abraham, Craig Thomas, Mark O. Hatfield, C.S. Bond, P. Gramm, Don Nickles.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I wish to inform all Members that there will be a vote on this cloture motion next Tuesday. No exact time has been agreed to yet, but I expect it will fall sometime shortly after the vote, I believe at 2:15, on the Cuba legislation on Tuesday. But it will occur sometime Tuesday afternoon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. LOTT. 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. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate