his designee; 11:30 to 12:30 under the control of Senator FRIST. I further ask consent that at the hour of 12:30 p.m., the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m. in order for the weekly party caucuses to meet.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes at 2:15 p.m., the Senate resume consideration of S. 280 for debate only, to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member, or his designee, until the hour of 4 p.m. I further ask that the cloture vote occur at 4 p.m. without the mandatory quorum under Rule XXII having been waived.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. JEFFORDS. For the information of all Senators, at 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, the Senate will resume consideration of the Ed-Flex legislation. Under the order, a cloture vote will occur at 4 p.m. on Tuesday, with second-degree amendments needed to be filed by 3 p.m. in order to qualify for post-cloture.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following my remarks and the remarks of Senators FEINGOLD, MURRAY and KENNEDY.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 564

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I understand that Senate bill 564, introduced earlier today by Senators MURRAY, KENNEDY and DASCHLE is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 564) to reduce class size, and for other purposes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask for its second reading.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. JEFFORDS. If the Senator from Wisconsin will yield, I have a couple of comments that I would like to make.

Mr. FEINGOLD. That's fine.

PROGRESS ON THE ED-FLEX BILL

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I want to follow up by saying I think it's important that all of my colleagues understand that, hopefully, what will happen tomorrow is we will be able to make some progress. I hope that my colleagues will read the amendment that we have offered and that we will hopefully have action tomorrow, which will give an opportunity for the schools themselves to make the choice as to whether or not they desire to either spend the money on new teachers or to spend it on special education.

It is a simple amendment, and I hope that the members will give it some consideration. We desire to move the process along. It is hard for me to understand how anyone could disagree with giving the local schools that option. The President had this bill put in and it had no hearings. It was put in in the final moments of the last session. I am sure that if we had an opportunity, we might have been able to get this amendment on. This will move the process along.

I point again to the chart behind me, which indicates that what we are trying to do is to relieve the incredible pressure that is placed on our local governments by having to fund special education themselves in the States—primarily all of it. We promised to fund 40 percent of it back in 1975 and 1976. We are now at around 11 percent. If we were to fully fund it, it would do more to allow the local communities and the States to be able to meet the educational needs of their people than any other act of this Congress. That is what we are pushing for. I think it is a reasonable thing to do. It would have no impact, of course, on the Elementary and Secondary Education reauthorization, except to give a tremendous opportunity for local governments to be freed up to work, and we could design programs to go along with those options.

With that, I hope tomorrow we will be able to move matters along with this amendment, which I think everybody ought to find desirable.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

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

NIGERIAN ELECTIONS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, just over a week ago we witnessed a seminal event in Nigeria, the West African country that could hold the key to stability and prosperity in the region. Millions of Nigerians participated in an election to select the first civilian president in almost two decades. Since gaining its independence in 1960, Nigeria has survived a number of military coups and has been under the military rule of one regime or another for most of that time. Last weekend's election was only the second democratic presidential election in Nigeria the last 39 years. According to the official results, former Gen. Olusegun Obasanjo won a majority of votes throughout the country, and will be inaugurated as a civilian president on May 29.

Yet, Mr. President, what could have, and should have, been a proud moment in Nigeria's history was marred by significant irregularities, fraud and low voter turnout.

Coincidentally, election weekend was also marked by two important announcements by President Clinton: his determinations pursuant to the drug certification law and the publication of the annual State Department Human Rights Report. Under the drug law, Nigeria was identified among those countries that failed to meet the test for cooperation on anti-narcotics efforts but were granted waivers exempting them from the economic penalties imposed by the law. The administration explained this decision with respect to Nigeria by expressing hope that it would be able to work more effectively after the ''nation's transition to democracy.'' At the same time, the human rights report noted significant progress in Nigeria's human rights record, although it still acknowledged that significant problems remain.

Now, as Nigeria plots its course through the next stage of its multiphase transition to civilian rule, Nigerians, and we in the international community, must figure out how to react to these concurrent, though sometimes contradictory, developments.

Let me elaborate. The February 27 presidential elections marked the last of a series of four types of elections—local council, gubernatorial, legislative and presidential, respectively—that have taken place over the past three months according to the transition program established by General Abdusalami Abubakar. Despite some disturbing irregularities, these elections, and the campaign period preceding them, were conducted in a calm and orderly fashion, and—with the exception of a few localized incidents—without violence or physical intimidation. This process has been marked throughout by a clear demonstration of Gen. Abubakar's commitment to the transition program, including the handover of power to elected civilian authorities on May 29, and the genuine efforts of the Independent National Electoral Commission charged with the responsibility for conducting the elections themselves.

Although the turnout was much lower than expected, particularly for the presidential election, millions of Nigerians opted to participate in the process, either through voting or civic work. According to reports from domestic and international observers, the conduct of the presidential election in many places was smooth, orderly and implemented according to the established procedures. Particularly noteworthy was that the head-of-state himself, General Abubakar, was denied the