about what a difference it would make, now the Congress is back on a scavenger hunt to try to come up with legislation that does what should have been done in the first bill.

The reality is we now have a second chance to do better. I am of the view that lives depend on the Congress doing better not just in homes where heat is going to be scarce this winter but for generations to come.

When I came to the Senate floor to speak in opposition to the Energy bill a few months ago, I was sorry because that legislation failed to reduce our Nation's dependence on foreign oil by one drop. It failed to reduce the prospects that America would again go to war in the Persian Gulf. After 9/11, it became clear that the energy policy was a national security issue and reducing our dependence on foreign oil had to be a national security priority.

I am of the view that the great tragedy in the 2005 Energy bill is that it essentially ratified pre-9/11 energy priorities. For the longer term, Congress should look at smart, probusiness, and proconsumer initiatives. I am willing, for example, to look at a limited antitrust exemption to let oil companies coordinate the refinery shutdowns expressly to keep supplies up and prices down. So there can be plenty of opportunities to put together a business and consumer coalition to meet the needs of our public.

I just suggested something that I suspect in the southern part of the United States, in the State of Louisiana, would be something that would be well received by oil refiners, but I am also saying that at a time when refiner profits are up more than 250 percent that we ought to be looking at other ideas that really help the consumer.

When gas prices are topping $3 a gallon and we are seeing these increases in home heating prices, we know the public is prepared for change. I have laid out a number of areas this morning where change would be in the interest of the consuming public and be smart probusiness policy, but I think there ought to be more to an energy policy than just ladling out tax subsidies. We have done that again and again. The Congress just poured on more subsidies in the 2005 bill and did absolutely nothing to deal with the crisis that we have seen in the last few months.

So at this crucial time, with the eyes of the country upon us, let us look at a fresh energy policy, one that will meet this country's national security needs, one that will meet the needs of our consumers this winter at a time when they are so vulnerable. And let us learn that just handing out subsidies willy-nilly is not going to make the real energy problems of this country go away.

It is no time to further sate the appetites of the entrenched energy interests. It is time, and there is a chance now, for a fresh start on energy policy. This time, with the next Energy bill, let us do right by the people of this country.

I yield the floor and 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. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield back the remaining time on this side in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3058, which the clerk will now report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3058) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Kyl amendment No. 2062, to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost-of-living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2006.

Kennedy amendment No. 2063, to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, the Transportation, Treasury, HUD, and related agencies bill is now back on the floor. At 11 o'clock it is my understanding that by previous order we will go to consideration of the DC appropriations bill, which will be included as a separate part of this legislation because the House has the two functions of DC and Treasury, Transportation, HUD as one bill. Those, it is my understanding, will be conferenced separately but at the same time so that the final conference report will bring back Treasury, Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and the District of Columbia appropriations.

The important thing to note is my partner and colleague in this effort, the ranking member, the Senator from Washington, Senator MURRAY and I, have asked our colleagues to bring to the floor the amendments they wish to offer for this T-T-H-U-D or TTHUD bill. We will be having a vote on the pending amendment, the Kyl amendment, at 10 minutes after 12. The amendment relates to the cost-of-living increase for Members of Congress.

It is important to note that both sides agree we want to move quickly. We want to know what amendments there are. We are seeking a time deadline for filing those amendments so our staff can go to work on them.

We believe there will be time this evening for staff to consider them. It is possible we will be able to take some of these amendments and conclude this bill sometime this week. It is very important we get this moving because we are now in the new fiscal year. We are operating on a continuing resolution and we have many important items in this bill and the DC bill that need to be put into law so we are operating on fiscal year 2006 appropriations for the year.

As my colleague was kind enough to mention yesterday, there was an athletic contest in Houston last night in which Albert Pujols managed to keep the St. Louis Cardinals alive. I am currently in a good mood and ready to accept as many amendments as possible. While I have great hopes for continued success, this is the best time to catch me in a good mood. And the Senator from Washington is in a good mood. This is the time to bring the amendments forward. We will be happy to work with our colleagues to try to find ways to accept as many amendments as possible.

In any event, I know there will be some amendments that will require votes. We would like to have them brought to our attention as soon as possible in order for us to set a schedule enabling us to finish this bill, we hope well before the end of this week. We have many other important measures to work on and we will have to have a number of votes. We look forward to having those amendments before us. This is an urgent request to my colleagues who have amendments to the TTHUD bill to bring them to the floor and to share them with the managers on both sides of the aisle.

With that, I thank my colleagues and ask that they bring those amendments down.

Seeing no other speakers wishing to take the floor, 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. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Kansas is recognized to offer an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2071

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] proposes an amendment numbered 2071.

Mr. BROWNBACK. 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 printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of amendments.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 40 minutes for debate equally divided.

The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, my colleague, Senator LANDRIEU of Louisiana, the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, will be here shortly to use the other 20 minutes of this presentation. This is the District of Columbia appropriations bill. It has been passed and reported by the full Appropriations Committee unanimously and contains some modifications within it. But we have strong agreement within the Appropriations Committee. We have gone through a number of hearings. I want to highlight several particular issues within it, what we are trying to do to encourage family formation, encourage marriage in the District of Columbia.

I want to talk about the school issues. We have had a voucher program for a short period of time. I want to report on how that is going and the problems and needs within that area.

I also want to talk a little bit about the problems we are having with the schools overall in the District of Columbia, which remains an ongoing, desperate problem. Kids that get into the District of Columbia Public School System get into a system that moves them more, unfortunately, in too many cases, toward failure rather than success. A system that does that is a system that needs changing.

I also want to talk about some needs in the future.

We are putting this forward as a part of the Transportation and HUD bill to mirror what is taking place in the House so that this will be amended into the Transportation-HUD bill and then conferenced together with the House of Representatives.

I thank the members of the Appropriations Committee, particularly my colleague, Senator LANDRIEU, the ranking member, for her work on this area. She has been the ranking member under both myself and Senator DEWINE. She does an outstanding job.

This bill provides $593 million in Federal funds for the District of Columbia and includes the city's own local budget of $6.2 billion.

The funds in the bill focus on three key Federal priorities for the District of Columbia.

First, improving educational opportunities for inner-city children; second, reducing and preventing crime; and, third, promoting and sustaining healthy marriages.

To address the first priority, the bill provides funds to improve traditional public schools, increase capacity at public charter schools, improve bilingual education for Latino students, and allow low-income students in failing public schools to attend private schools.

This is the second year of the District of Columbia Opportunity Scholarship Program.

I want to recognize my colleague, Senator DEWINE, for getting this started last year when he chaired this committee, and also my colleague, Senator JUDD GREGG from New Hampshire, for his strong input and push into this program. It was difficult to get started, but it has been quite a success thus far.

This is the first ever Federal program to provide scholarships to low-income, inner-city children so they can attend private schools.

I might note for my colleagues that several years ago, when I was the authorizing chairman of the District of Columbia authorization committee, we polled Members of Congress and then the President and the Vice President to see how many Members of Congress send their kids to DC public schools—either in the House or the Senate or the President or Vice President. I was actually shocked to find out that there were no Members—zero Members of Congress—who sent their children to the District of Columbia public schools—not one in all of the House, all of the Senate, the President and Vice President.

I thought that said a lot by the action that people were taking. They were not sending their kids to DC public schools, even though if you were a poor parent, you had no other choice. Now there is a bit of a different choice.

The demand for scholarships in this program, as far as allowing low-income, inner-city children to go to private school, has been overwhelming, with nearly two applications from eligible public school students for each scholarship available. The federally mandated evaluation of the program is up and running, with a robust number of scholarships and nonscholarship students participating. We are doing evaluations. Most importantly, the program is succeeding and serving the low-income children who truly need this educational opportunity the most. Most of these scholarship students came from failing DC schools, and now they are flourishing in the District's private schools that are participating in the program.

We have heard the story of a first grader who couldn't read at all when he received his scholarship. Yet within 2 months at his new school, he was already reading close to his grade level.

One scholarship mother tells us that her child used to complain about going to school every morning. Yet he is so excited about going to school now that he grumbles about having to stay home from school on a snow day.

Then there is the private school principal who marveled when she called a new scholarship student by his name, and the child said he didn't believe she was the principal because there is no way the principal would actually know a student's name.

These kind of stories are commonplace and indicate that the program is successful. However, I am concerned about the current and growing mismatch between the number of private high school spaces available in the District and the number of scholarship students seeking a space in a District of Columbia private high school. Because of this mismatch, many students who already have a scholarship will be forced to leave the program. Specifically, for the current school year, there are about 50 high school students with scholarships who could not attend the private school in the District because of a lack of capacity. Unfortunately, the problem will only worsen in each subsequent year as current middle school students graduate to high school. If the trend continues—and even if no new scholarships are offered beyond the fifth grade—nearly 75 percent of the students holding scholarships to attend high school will be unable to use them because of a lack of slots in private high schools in the District. This is a shame.

A number of Senators expressed objections to correcting this program at this early stage, so we have left the program unchanged. But I want to note for my colleagues the problems that we have.

The second priority funded by this bill is reducing and preventing crime in the District. The Federal Government entirely funds the District of Columbia courts and the DC Court Services and Supervision Agency. The committee is providing a total of $420 million for these agencies, which is $52 million more than the fiscal year enacted level. Most of these additional resources are for renovation and repairs to the city's fourth oldest building, the historic old courthouse. We need to continue this effort.

The third priority in this bill is promoting and sustaining healthy marriages. This is a new initiative, and I want to spend a little bit of time talking about this. I am hopeful this can be a model, particularly across the country in inner cities where we are having particular difficulty in forming, in many cases, healthy family units.

Every year, almost 57 percent of the babies born to residents of the District of Columbia—that is right, 57 percent—are born to single mothers. This is 40 percent higher than the national average. It is not to say you can't raise healthy children in a single-parent household. I want to go through some of the numbers to indicate the difficulty of raising a child in a single-parent household.

Statistics show that children born to single mothers are seven times more likely to be poor than those born to

married parents and that over 80 percent of long-term child poverty occurs in broken or never-married families. Marriage has an enormous potential to reduce poverty amongst couples who are unmarried at the time of their child's birth.

I want to point out this chart which shows that child poverty dramatically increases outside of intact marriages: Marriage impact within wedlock, 7 percent child poverty; never-married mother, 51 percent child poverty rate.

Children born and raised in households where their mother and father married tend to be more financially stable and more emotionally stable. Statistics tell a compelling story of the many positive benefits that accrue to children if they are raised by their married parents.

For example, children raised in married families are 3 times less likely to repeat a grade in school, 5 times less likely to have behavioral problems, half as likely to be depressed, 3 times less likely to use illicit drugs, half as likely to become sexually active as teenagers, and 14 times less likely to suffer abuse from their parents.

We had a hearing on this 2 weeks ago, where a couple talked about their interest in getting married after living together for 20 years and having four children. We have a proposal, which I will be putting forward in a minute. I want to note, before we get to that, that this couple said almost all of their friends came up to them and said: Are you crazy, getting married? The couple said: No. We want to get married. We want to provide a model for our children. Aren't you crazy doing this with all of the payments that you are going to lose under the public assistance system if you get married?

I said at that point in time that we need to look at the disincentives we put in Federal programs for people getting married, particularly low-income households because we shouldn't be sending this kind of signal, given the benefit overall to children of having intact, married families.

Currently, there are many single mothers who are heroically and successfully raising children on their own. They deserve our respect and support. But it is an indisputable fact that the best environment in which to raise a child is in a healthy, two-parent family.

In addition, the growth of single-parent families has had an enormous financial impact on our society at large. The welfare system for children is overwhelmingly a subsidy system for single-parent families. Some three-quarters of the aid to children—given through programs such as food stamps, Medicaid, public housing, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, and the Earned Income Tax Credit—goes to single-parent households.

The Federal Government annually spends over $150 billion in means-tested welfare aid for single parents. I believe that improving a couple's financial stability can help sustain a healthy marriage.

As a way to assist low-income, married couples to gain appreciable assets, the subcommittee has introduced legislation which has broad bipartisan support. It is supported by Eleanor Holmes Norton. It will establish Marriage Development Accounts in the District of Columbia. The MDAs will be available to low-income, married couples who are citizens or legal residents of the District and who have very low net worth. Couples may save money to buy a home, pay for job training or education or start their own businesses. Couples will have a high incentive to save because their contributions will be matched at a ratio of 3 to 1 by the Federal Government and partnering private institutions. In other words, the Federal Government will put in $1, there will be $2 of private money raised, and low-income couples who receive marriage counseling, or as they get married, will be matched 3 to 1 for every dollar of savings they put in—$3 from the Federal Government and private sector. It is to encourage marriage and also to encourage savings for this couple. As a requirement of participation, couples will receive training that helps them repair their credit, set a budget, set savings schedules, and manage their money. Couples will also receive bonuses in the MDA accounts for receiving marriage counseling.

Recognizing the importance of grassroots support to ensure the success of these efforts, this subcommittee is directing grantees to expand their network of service providers by partnering with local churches, faith-based organizations, and nonprofit organizations, providing mentoring, couple's counseling, and community outreach.

It has been an interesting coming together of people from all parts of the political spectrum, left and right, to support this creation—we believe the first ever in the country—of marriage development accounts to encourage savings and marriage of low-income couples.

A senior fellow with the Brookings Institute testified at a recent hearing I held on MDAs that many researchers and practitioners who work with poor couples believe that a major barrier to healthy marriages is economic uncertainty. For example, Kathy Edin of the University of Pennsylvania has concluded from her interviews with young, unmarried mothers that there are plenty of issues such as empathy and trust that interfere with continuing the couple's relationships, but Edin and other researchers have come to regard poverty, unemployment, and income as serious barriers to healthy marriage.

Young, low-income couples often tell interviewers they are thinking about marriage, but they want to save enough money to make a downpayment on a house before they actually get married. Thus, MDAs are responsive to what the couples say they need before they become serious about marriage.

Beyond what the researchers are saying, we hear from real couples in the District who have been living together, who have children, now plan to marry and open an MDA.

We must act quickly to stop the erosion of marriage in our Nation and particularly in our Nation's Capital. We cannot just watch and wring our hands. We must act aggressively in employing as many innovative approaches as possible, test the results, and do a heavy monitoring. That is what we have in the bill itself—a monitoring to see if this is working. Our future and our children's future truly are at stake. I believe MDAs can be an important tool in helping to stabilize, strengthen, and foster healthy marriages.

I again thank my colleague, Senator LANDRIEU, as the ranking member. She and I share the same concerns for the children and residents who live in the District of Columbia. She is a strong supporter, particularly of the school system needs in this district. We both have concerns regarding the public and the charter school system that are not reflected in this bill. If changes are not made in DC public and charter schools, we will be back next year with a bill that has more aggressive statements and a more aggressive position from this Senate on the public and charter school system. It is not serving the children's needs. We did not take that on this year. We met multiple times with the superintendent of the DC Public Schools and others and noted the problems, but they said: Give us a little more time. The problem is, time dooms our children if no successful changes are made. So next year, we could be back with substantial changes.

I thank the staff for working with us. I know her staff, including Kate Eltrich, has worked hard. Mary Dietrich went so far as to break her arm to get this bill to the Senate in a timely fashion—she actually was bike riding—but that did not stop her. She is here to get this done. I hope we can pass this bill.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague from Kansas, Senator BROWNBACK, to present to our colleagues of the Senate this DC appropriations bill. It has been a joy and a privilege to work with the Senator from Kansas. Prior to the Senator's service, as chair I had the great opportunity to work with the Senator from Ohio, MIKE DEWINE, who is, indeed, a pleasure to work with and a great partner.

This is a very important bill for our Nation. Not only does it matter, of course, directly to the 500,000-plus residents of the District, but the life and the quality of life in the District has a tremendous impact on this whole region, which is made up of millions of people, as the District was actually

carved out of Virginia and Maryland and serves as a hub of this region.

As the Presiding Officer knows, in his home State as well as my home State of Louisiana, people all over the Nation feel very warmly attached to their Nation's Capital, what happens in neighborhoods, in schools, downtown, on the riverfronts, our monuments as a tourist mecca. For people to seek inspiration, this is very important. This bill, while it is one of the smallest in terms of dollar amounts, has a great deal of interest from people all over the Nation.

I have been pleased to be the appropriator, and I am particularly happy all of our colleagues have worked in such a cooperative manner that we can bring this bill to the Senate and handle it with great dispatch, with very little controversy, if any at all. From my perspective, since I have had my time taken helping Louisiana and the gulf coast recover from two major storms, Rita and Katrina, and then the subsequent massive levee breaks that have left the gulf coast region in a great challenging state, I thank our colleagues for letting us take this bill up and move it forward so I personally can get back to the issues in front of the State of Louisiana at this moment.

I will be relatively brief, but I follow up Senator BROWNBACK's statements with just a few comments. I thank Senator COCHRAN and Senator BYRD, the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, who made it possible in their decision as to how to organize and to reorganize the Committee on Appropriations, saw fit to keep some independence for the District of Columbia. That is extremely important. The outcome is something I supported, as well as others, but without Senator COCHRAN and Senator BYRD's support, it would not have been possible.

Our House colleagues have merged DC into a bigger committee. I think some of the focus gets lost. The Nation's Capital deserves appropriate focus and support from all, and our focus has not been lost. We in the Senate continue to help strengthen and develop our Nation's Capital appropriately as reliable partners for their progress.

I thank Senator COCHRAN and Senator BYRD.

In addition, I note that the large majority of the money in this bill is not national taxpayer money. It is local money, levied, raised, and appropriated to the tune of $7.3 billion of local money. The Federal money in this bill for which we have responsibility to be accountable is $593 million. It is a lot of money but a small percentage of the $7 billion total levied and raised by the residents and citizens of the District of Columbia. Our focus is on that $600 million portion we allocate in trying to be partners with city officials.

Because of Mayor Williams' outstanding leadership, in my view—and I think it is shared by Senator BROWNBACK and many Senators—his outstanding leadership as a good steward of taxpayer money, as a good manager for reform, as a great salesperson, an advocate for this great city, nationally and internationally, our confidence in his leadership, and the confidence in the management of the city, has increased substantially. So we are pleased to invest in its continued growth.

One major investment this Congress has made is in the establishment of a family court structure. I wish we could have family courts all over the United States. It is not an inexpensive operation. In many States, the last courts to be funded are those that need the most help. The courts that regulate or try to work out situations of marriage and personal lives so important to people, that settle disputes about marriages, wills, and estates, and most importantly, settle the issues of divorces or reconciliations, child custody, child abuse, and spousal abuse, unfortunately those courts throughout our land are the last funded, the least resourced, and the most overly taxed in terms of responsibility.

Over the course of the last few years, we have stood up, Democrats and Republicans, and said it is time to help our Nation's Capital create a model in the Nation, a family court that puts families first, that understands that these decisions of child custody, of separation, of protecting women from abuse and children from abuse, are truly life-and-death matters and are truly important decisions to keep the fabric of society together. So we have invested in this family court, one family, one judge, so children are no longer lost in the bureaucracy, lost in the file rooms, their lives are meaningful, and they are treated with dignity and respect. It has been an expensive project but one well worth investing in the families of the District of Columbia and particularly the children.

We march on to improve child welfare in the District, to work with the city to strengthen and improve the quality of our foster families and, most importantly from my perspective, promote adoption, believing that every child in the District, in America, and, in fact, in the world, deserves a family to call their own.

Governments, as I have said, do a lot of things well. Raising children is not one of them. Parents—a parent, a responsible adult—raise children. And we as a Nation need to do a much better job of connecting these needy children of all ages—infants, toddlers, young children, teenagers, young adults—with parents wanting to give them the benefit of a stable home and family. I am very proud of the District's performance and improvement in that area.

Finally, one more point before I speak about education which is going to be the focus today. I encourage the continuing development of good land use in the District of Columbia. We have planned the revitalization and cleaning up of the Anacostia River to be a balance with the beautiful Potomac on one side, to bring the Anacostia back to be a place where people can recreate—citizens and tourists alike—where there could potentially be exciting new developments of multiuse housing, wonderful commercial waterfront developments that contribute to recreational opportunities and sporting opportunities for children.

The city has a tremendous vision. The Nation should be excited. Although we are able to offer a just small amount, our committee wants to be supportive of that effort in any way we can. That is reflected in this bill.

Let me speak for a moment on the main subject of this, which is education reform. Every city in the country and every county in the country is struggling with the challenge of providing quality education for our Nation's children. We decided as a Nation many years ago to do that through a public system. It has worked in large measure extraordinarily well over the long term.

There are clearly signs in America—whether urban areas, rural areas, or poor areas; sometimes we even find crises in wealthy areas that are growing too fast or there is too much strain in an area—that school systems are really struggling. Either they do not have enough space and too many students, too many students and not enough teachers, not enough quality classroom space, or there is no tax base to pay for quality teachers, so students are failing. There are all sorts of challenges to our public school system. This Congress has been spending a lot of time—from No Child Left Behind to accountability to strategic investments—to try to fix this. Although there have been some setbacks and it is not perfect, from my perspective, we are moving in generally the right direction with the exception that our investments have not matched the rhetoric from the Federal level. But should we ever be able to fix that, I believe we will see increased student performance, increased parental satisfaction, more choice in the public school system, and excellence across the board.

Why do I say this is so important? Because in this Senator's view, the only way to have great cities is to have great schools. The only way to have great communities is to have great schools. If you do not have great cities and great communities, you cannot long have a great nation.

Our forefathers said to us when we created this democracy that one of the fastest ways to end it is to stop educating ourselves to the responsibilities of being citizens of the Nation and the world. That education, yes, begins at home, where children are educated primarily by their parents, their guardians, people who brought them into the world. But we supplement that education of parents by offering, in America, an education to any child wanting

to take the chance to walk through that kindergarten door. We do not limit it only to the wealthy. We do not limit it only to those who can afford it. We provide universal public education. It has been the cornerstone of this democracy, and it should remain that way.

But we have some problems because some of our schools are failing our children. Some of our systems are failing our children and the employees who work in the system. So we have to change. I am very proud that in this DC bill, the Members of the Senate and the House—Republicans and Democrats—have come together to negotiate, to reason together, to try to see what could we do in this city to show a model for some things that can work.

We had a very fierce negotiation and debate 2 years ago about this and have settled, if you will, on three approaches. One is what Senator BROWNBACK spoke about, a scholarship-voucher approach that some people believe will work. A large number of us settled on negotiating for investments in charter schools, keeping the money in the public system, not taking it out but providing more independence, more choice, more exciting options to create new models of ''coopertition,'' if you will, in the public system. I happen to be a very strong advocate of that approach to changing and reforming public education in America.

Then there was another group of us who negotiated for more help to traditional public schools, more investments, more help, and reforming in a more traditional way.

This great experiment is underway. It is going to be a 5-year experiment. We are committing $40 million a year, which is a lot of money. There will be $200 million going to this effort. That $200 million, while it sounds like a lot, is a small percentage of what the District residents pay to support their system. But it is an important investment.

I want to say how proud I am of the efforts being made to expand opportunities for public charters, for two reasons. One, it provides choice to parents. There is not one cookie-cutter approach. Some parents want their children in schools that have strong academics and athletics. Other parents like choices that stress the arts. Some parents like to see that their children may be in a school that may give them a pre-med education and direct them more to medicine or science or research.

I believe all parents should have more choices, that one size does not fit all, that we need to get away from this industrial model. We moved away from it in our economy. Why can't we move away from it in our school system and move to a more decentralized, more independent, more entrepreneurial, more choice-driven, more consumer-directed approach to schools? Just because we have not done that for 200 years in this country does not mean we can't.

So that is what we are undertaking: creating opportunities for quality, independent public charters so the money stays in the public system. But it basically acts almost as if it were private in the sense that it is independent but meeting all high standards.

Twenty-five percent of the public school population in the District is in public charter schools. That is one of the highest percentages of school populations in the Nation. So this is really a laboratory to see what is working, what is not. I am proud to say we are making progress not only in the increased number of charter schools but, most importantly, in the quality of charter schools. It is not just quantity but quality.

There are actions being taken now by the certification boards that if a charter school is failing, those schools can be closed and reorganized and supported so that quality education is being provided. That is one of the focuses of this bill. We want to not stress just the increase in quantity but quality. We want to ensure accountability, and we want to make sure, just as in traditional public schools, that any child who walks through the door of a public charter—whether it be a bilingual opportunity, which has been so successful; whether it is a residential Monday-through-Friday school, which has been tremendously successful in giving people hope and raising grade levels—whatever the model, when they walk through that door, they can get a quality education. That is one of our goals.

So we have continued to press for that $13 million piece. The charter school community has come together in unison to lay out how that $13 million should be directed to this movement, a great movement for quality, for opportunity.

I will submit a summary of that for the RECORD.

One of the exciting components, from my perspective—and I will close with a comment about this—is part of our charter school movement has been a new initiative called the Citybuild initiative. It is part of the charter school idea that says that in many cities, including the District of Columbia, there are certain neighborhoods that are revitalizing, I would say on their own, but nothing happens on your own.

It is a combination of some public investments that are occurring, a change in housing patterns, young couples, Black and White and Hispanic, moving into a neighborhood with young children. They like the housing. They like the location to their work. The only problem is, they move into a neighborhood that has affordable housing, restaurants, theaters, but there are no ''good'' schools or ''quality'' schools.

So what happens is, in 3 years or 4 years these children move, the families put their houses up for sale and move to either another part of the city where they can find the quality education they are looking for, or, worse, they move out of the city. That is what has happened in the District of Columbia. It is what happened in New Orleans. It is what happens in Cleveland. It is what happens in Detroit. It is what happens in Atlanta. It is what happens even in Houston.

So we have to think about a new way to encourage the development of quality, independent, entrepreneurial public schools, placing them in neighborhoods that can easily be identified as up and coming, with near-term improvements, where parents, if they had a good public school choice, would not leave.

That is what the Citybuild charter program is. So I am excited that this is part of our charter school effort. We are now in the second year. There have been five Citybuild charters designated by the city through a process that is open and competitive. There will be, hopefully, two or three more new schools placed in these neighborhoods that will anchor families with small children so we can grow the population of this city and cities all over America.

Mayor Williams, when he came in as mayor, stated his goal that he wants 100,000 new residents. So we have joined him in that challenge to provide more safety in the city, better transportation, better economic opportunity. But what most families need to stay are good schools for their children to attend. That is why we spend so much time working on education reform and promoting, from my perspective, this exciting new opportunity for charter schools, public charters, and particularly Citybuild charters.

I thank, in closing, Deputy Mayor Robert Bobb, Council Chairperson Linda Cropp, DC Delegate to Congress ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, and Shadow Senator Paul Strauss, who is in the Gallery today. Specifically, I also thank Council Member Kathy Patterson, Superintendent of Schools Clifford Janey, and School Board President Peggy Cooper Cafritz, and our staffs who are here, both Kate Eltrich and Mary Dietrich, who were mentioned. Without their support we could not do this bill and present it in a way with such limited controversy and such maximum benefit to the people of the District and the people of our Nation.

So, again, I thank the mayor for his leadership. He makes it easy to work with him. I wish him the best of luck in his future, as he, Mr. President, as you know, said he will not be running for reelection. I suggested he come down South and help us. We need some help in New Orleans, and in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, and a good manager like that could be a great help to us. We appreciate his support, and we wish him the best in the future.

Mr. President, I would like to submit for the RECORD a summary of the $13 million investment in public charter schools in the District of Columbia appropriations bill.

The bill directs funding to specific initiatives which will strengthen

schools, enhance capacity, improve academic quality, and create a network of integrated services. The committee recommended the following initiatives within the amount provided for charter schools: $4 million for the Direct Loan Fund for Charter Schools; $2,000,000 for Credit Enhancement; $2 million for continuation of the Citybuild Charter School Program; $1,500,000 for flexible grants; $2 million for grants for public charter schools for improvement of public school facilities which are leased or owned by public charter schools; $400,000 for college access programming; $300,000 to create a truancy center; $250,000 for administration of Federal entitlement funding; $300,000 for data collection and analysis; and $250,000 for administration within the State Education Office.

The committee report also included language to pursue access to facilities for charter schools and support ongoing efforts to make space available. A significant initiative of this committee, continuing on the work started by the Congressional Control Board, was to make surplus school property accessible to other educational opportunities. We have required an accounting of surplus school property, encouraging schools to be leased or sold to charter schools, and recommend a dedicated account for any proceeds. I look forward to working with the Mayor and Council to finally open these sometimes vacant, but assuredly underutilized in their capacity as a schoolhouse, these surplus public school buildings.

In addition, I would like to submit for the RECORD several highlights from a recent report on the impact of public charter schools on providing quality public education for children across the country, as well as providing healthy competition to the entire public education system.

The following are excerpts from the ''State of the Charter Movement 2005, Trends, Issues, and Indicators,'' by the Charter School Leadership Council.

The Charter School Leadership Council found that:

> demand for charter schools is clearly outstripping the supply. The charter sector would be much bigger in the absence of charter caps and if it could accommodate the throngs of students on waiting lists. Charter schools are concentrated in certain States and cities, though less so than five years ago. Public charter schools are serving a disproportionate share of minority and low-income school children, and this has been the case since the beginning of the charter movement. Charter schools are significantly smaller than district public schools. The charter movement is producing a wide array of instructional and organizational models, providing lots of choices for families.

In relation to public opinion on charter schools, the Council found that:

> charter schools remain a mystery to much of the general public. Misinformation abounds, but attitudes become more favorable as knowledge grows. Twice as many registered voters favor charter schools as oppose them.

By the numbers, there are 3,400 public charter schools operating nationwide educating one million students. That represents 2 percent of all students nationwide. Forty States have public charter school laws on the books and 42 percent of charter schools are concentrated in three of those States, Arizona, California, and Florida. The Council report states:

> The average number of charter schools per State has been increasing steadily each year, from 25 in 1995, to 59 in 2000, to nearly 90 today. On average, over 250 charter schools have been added each year for the past 12 years.

Of all the public charter schools in the country, 16 percent converted from a traditional public school, 7 percent were created by a private entity, and 77 percent are newly created.

Dr. Brian Hassel conducted a meta-analysis of major studies and concluded the following:

> The existence of high quality charter schools and high growth rates for charter schools, at least in many States and studies, suggests that chartering holds promise as an approach to getting better schools. What we have is an experiment worth continuing and refining.
>
> One missing element in nearly all charter studies is the question of productivity: how much learning gain is produced per dollar spent? A Rand study in California found that ''Charter schools, particularly start-up schools, reported using fewer resources per student than do conventional schools . . . Most noteworthy, charter schools are achieving comparable test scores despite a lower reported level of revenue.'' (Ron Zimmer et al., Charter School Operations and Performance: Evidence from California, Rand, 2003). According to a 2004 study of ten Dayton charter schools, average per-pupil funding was $7,510 vs. $10,802 for district public schools, yet on average Dayton charter students outperformed Dayton public school students on all portions of the 2004 fourth and sixth grade State proficiency tests—in some subjects by a significant margin—indicating higher productivity from charters. (Alexander Russo, A Tough Nut to Crack in Ohio: Charter Schooling in the Buckeye State, Progressive Policy Institute, February 2005, 24).

The Council report suggests that we should be asking the right questions:

> Is it working? How do we know? At the moment the country is not thinking clearly about these questions . . . Chartering is an institutional innovation . . . With chartering we want to know which pedagogical, governance, and management practices succeed—and what provisions of law are responsible—so policy can do more of what works better. (Bryan Hassel, Studying Achievement in Charter Schools, Charter School Leadership Council, January 31, 2005, 8.)

Caroline Hoxby, a professor of economics at Harvard University stated in her studies that:

> The goal of charter reforms is not creating good charter schools in the midst of mediocre public schools. The goal is boosting the performance of all schools by fostering competition and innovation.

In conclusion, I found this observation to be fitting to the current status of charter schools in the country. The Council report examined the potential for impact and noted that Nelson Smith stated in a 2003 Progressive Policy Institute report, ''Catching the Wave: Lessons from California,'' ''Charter leaders are often asked to document the ripple effects of their work. But it is hard to have ripples when the lake is frozen.''

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time for debate having expired, under the previous order, the Brownback amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2071) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:10 p.m. shall be equally divided between the majority leader or his designee and the Democratic leader or his designee.

Mr. BROWNBACK. 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. INHOFE. 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. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time under the quorum calls be counted equally on both sides.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2062

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the amendment the Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL, has offered. It is straightforward. It would eliminate the roughly $3,100 pay raise for Members of Congress that is currently scheduled to go into effect next January. That increase would follow on a $4,000 pay raise this year, a $3,400 pay raise in 2004, a $4,700 pay raise in 2003, a $4,900 pay raise in 2002, a $3,800 pay raise in 2001, and a $4,600 pay raise in 2000.

There are a number of arguments against this scheduled pay raise. The war in Iraq continues to drain our Treasury at a rate of over $1 billion every week. In the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, we face a massively expensive relief effort. And on top of those enormous fiscal challenges, we are up to our necks in deficit spending. We are piling up billions more in debt that our children and grandchildren will have to pay. At such a time, it would seem hard to justify a scheduled pay raise for Members of Congress. Nonetheless, I recognize that some do justify it. In the end, though, the most important reason I joined Senator KYL in offering this amendment is that doing so is the only way to put this

body on record with respect to our pay raise. And we should go on record on this issue.

Under current law, many Americans do not realize that under current law Members of Congress can get an automatic pay raise every year without lifting a finger, unless we act to stop it. It is automatic. There is no requirement for a vote. All that is required is that we show up to cash the check. As I have noted before in discussing this matter, it is a pretty unusual thing to have the power to raise your own pay. Few people have that ability. Most of our constituents do not have that power. That this power is so unusual is a good reason for the Congress to exercise that power openly and to exercise it subject to regular procedures that include a vote on the record. That is why this process of automatic, stealth pay raises without accountability is so questionable. It is offensive. It is wrong. I believe it also may be unconstitutional.

The 27th amendment to the Constitution states:

No law, varying the compensation for the services of the senators and representatives, shall take effect, until an election of representatives shall have intervened.

That is what it says in the 27th amendment to the Constitution. I have actually introduced legislation to end this automatic pay raise system, and I hope this body will pass it at some point.

But as the Senator from Arizona has made very clear, this amendment does not go that far. It simply stops the $3,100 pay raise that is scheduled for next January. I fully accept that many—even a majority—of my colleagues may want a pay raise. But those who want a pay raise should support an open and public vote on the increase. Certainly having a vote on the record for a pay hike is better than a stealth pay raise that takes place with no action. Standing up and making the case before the voters is far better than quietly letting the pay raise take effect.

I urge my colleagues to stop this backdoor pay raise and then take the next step by enacting legislation to end this practice once and for all.

I thank my colleague from Arizona for joining us in this cause that I have sought to proceed with almost every year in the hopes that Congress and the Senate in particular will vote on the automatic pay raise.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Wisconsin. Senator INHOFE from Oklahoma wishes to speak in a moment. When he arrives, I will call upon him to speak.

Let me make a couple of comments about the reasons for this amendment at this time. There have been times in the past when Members have allowed the cost-of-living adjustment to proceed. It is not technically a pay raise but rather a cost-of-living adjustment. That cost-of-living adjustment is provided for all Federal employees, including Members of Congress, although it is lower for Members of Congress than it is for other Federal employees by about half a percent. In the past, when we have been in good economic times and we have had either lowered deficits or even surplus conditions, Congress has allowed, most of the time, though not every year, that cost-of-living adjustment to go into effect.

This year is a special circumstance. Especially since we are going to be asking our colleagues and people who are recipients of Federal program benefits potentially to make a sacrifice in order to help offset the spending that the Federal Government is going to commit to the rebuilding of the gulf coast area following Hurricane Katrina, it seemed to me and those of us who have cosponsored the amendment that if we are going to ask others to make a sacrifice so that not all of the spending for Katrina recovery is added to the Federal deficit and therefore the Federal debt but, rather, some of it is offset from programs that we have already decided to fund, that we could start by demonstrating a willingness to sacrifice a small measure ourselves.

It is true the $2 million that this saves is hardly noticeable in the overall tens of billions of dollars that are going to be spent on the Katrina recovery. It is symbolic. I recognize that. But sometimes symbolism is important. For Members of Congress to be able to justify reductions in spending in other programs, where some of our constituents will push back and say, Wait a minute, why should I make a sacrifice to rebuild after Katrina, at least we have the ability to say: We all have to make a little sacrifice. Members of Congress are willing to make a sacrifice as well. While it is not much money to the overall Federal budget, some of our families certainly recognize it as being substantially helpful to offset the cost of inflation for families.

It is important for us to do this. It won't always be appropriate, but it is clearly appropriate this year to make the point that we are ready to sacrifice, and clearly it is not something that we cannot afford. In areas that we are going to ask for reductions in spending, we will make the point that these are not areas that simply can't stand any kind of reduction. We are going to try to put forth maybe $50 billion in spending reductions from programs that can afford to be cut or spending deferred for a short period of time. That is a way to at least offset some of the spending that we are going to be doing for Katrina and yet not add further to the deficit or ultimately to our Federal debt. That is the reason for the amendment. I hope my colleagues will support it.

If the Senator from Oklahoma is prepared, I certainly yield to him at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I thank my dear friend from Arizona.

Because of the unique circumstances that exist today, I am going to be doing something that is totally different than I normally do on this the annual hypocrisy day in the Senate. I am actually going to vote for this. Normally, I vote the other way. The reason I am is because—the Senator from Arizona and I both came here in the same year; we have been here 19 years—I have never seen a situation like there is today. We have a President who inherited a military that needed to be built up again. At the same time, we go into a war, and then Katrina happens. I think everywhere we can we need to tighten belts. For that reason, I will go ahead and support it this time, which normally I don't.

I say this in almost a humorous way. It is the annual hypocrisy day. Everyone is always down here so they can go home and say: Look what I have done. I have stopped us from having a pay raise. Aren't I wonderful? I need to be reelected.

There are several dynasties in the Senate. They have been here for many years. We have the ROCKEFELLER dynasty, the KENNEDY dynasty. I love the people. I disagree politically with them most of the time, but we have these. It is a fact. But the question I would ask is, Should you have to be a KENNEDY or a ROCKEFELLER to join the Senate? I don't have this problem. I have other sources of income. I am very thankful for that. I have other things I put this money into, other than salary.

But I would say this: We have had a lot of colleagues, top-notch people. I remember Dan Coats. He was a Senator from Indiana. Democrats and Republicans alike would say that he made some of the greatest contributions to this body that anyone has ever made. Senator Dan Coats was limited in his income. He found that each year that went by, they would stop a cost-of-living increase. With his kids going to college, he resigned. He had to retire from the Senate because of that. Do we want the Dan Coatses here, or do we want just people who are wealthy in their own right?

I say this in a friendly way. I love everybody who is going to vote for or against this thing. But in the future, we are going to change it. I came down last night. I was looking at my monitor in my office. I saw that this amendment was coming up. I ran down to put in a second-degree amendment. That second-degree amendment would have read, because this is the last free ride a lot of these people are going to get around here, we are going to make it out in the open so everybody knows what is really going on. This idea of saying ''no but take the dough'' is going to be a thing of the past.

My amendment read:

To provide that any Member of Congress who votes for any amendment (or against

the tabling of any amendment) that prevents a cost of living adjustment for Members of Congress shall not receive the amount of that adjustment.

That is a very logical and responsible thing to do. I am looking for something else to put this on so that next year, when the annual hypocrisy day comes, we will be able to be a little bit more responsible.

I yield the floor.

• Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I want to voice my support for amendment No. 2062 offered by my good friend JON KYL, to revoke the scheduled 1.9 percent salary increase for Members of Congress. As a cosponsor of this amendment, I believe that at this point in time it is not fiscally responsible or appropriate for Members of Congress to increase our pay. The Federal Government is currently running a $7.9 trillion budget deficit. I do not believe that it is in the best interest of the United States or the American taxpayers for Members of Congress to vote in favor of a congressional pay raise.

The annual cost of living adjustment for Members of Congress is determined by a formula which automatically takes effect unless Congress prohibits or revises it, which is what I hope my colleagues and I will accomplish today. Under the annual Member pay adjustment procedure, Members are scheduled to receive a 1.9-percent increase in January 2006. With the growing national debt, skyrocketing budget deficit, and increased Federal expenditures expected as a result of the hurricanes this year, it is essential that we exercise fiscal restraint and avoid unnecessary and wasteful spending. We should first start with ourselves and set an example for others to follow. I have been and remain a strong a proponent of smaller government, a balanced Federal budget, and lower taxes.

Today, I am in my home State of Georgia with the Secretary of Agriculture, Mike Johanns, working to develop and promote new technologies which will increase agricultural production and expand job growth. For this reason, I am unable to be present for the vote. I encourage my colleagues to seize this opportunity and demonstrate personal leadership in bringing the Federal budget deficit and spending back under control by supporting this amendment. I have consistently opposed a pay raise for Members of Congress throughout my tenure in Congress and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.•

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague Senator KYL in sponsoring the pending amendment. This week the Senate begins the difficult but necessary process of budget reconciliation. When we passed the budget resolution on April 28, 2005, we all knew that tough votes were ahead as we set the Federal priorities for spending. However, none of us anticipated the devastation that would be caused by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita hitting the gulf coast. The tremendous toll caused by those natural disasters has forced us again to reevaluate our priorities.

This amendment is something we all should support. At a time when we are asking the American people to tighten their belts, it is not the time for members of Congress to increase our salary. We should be mindful of our actions and take this opportunity to do our part by removing this pay increase. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that this amendment will achieve a savings of $2 million in both budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2006.

I intend to do my part and vote for the Kyl amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator CHAMBLISS as an original cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, if there is no one else who desires to speak at this time, 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. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I would ask to be recognized for 12 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator will note that under the previous order, a vote is scheduled to occur at 12:10 p.m.

Mr. GRASSLEY. OK. I will quit then. Is that OK?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. LEAHY. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. What was the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa wishes to be recognized as if in morning business until 12:10 p.m.

Mr. LEAHY. I have no objection. Some of us have a luncheon to go to. I don't want to go beyond 12:30. Of course, I will not object to the request of my friend from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Iowa is recognized until 12:10.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

Mr. GRASSLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). Will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:10 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will proceed to a vote in relation to amendment No. 2062 offered by Senator KYL.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 256 Leg.]

YEAS—92

Akaka	Domenici	McConnell
Alexander	Dorgan	Mikulski
Allard	Durbin	Murkowski
Allen	Ensign	Murray
Baucus	Enzi	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Feingold	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Feinstein	Obama
Biden	Frist	Pryor
Boxer	Graham	Reed
Brownback	Grassley	Reid
Bunning	Gregg	Roberts
Burns	Hagel	Rockefeller
Burr	Harkin	Salazar
Byrd	Hatch	Santorum
Cantwell	Hutchison	Schumer
Carper	Inhofe	Sessions
Chafee	Isakson	Shelby
Clinton	Johnson	Smith
Coburn	Kennedy	Snowe
Cochran	Kerry	Specter
Coleman	Kohl	Stabenow
Collins	Kyl	Stevens
Conrad	Landrieu	Sununu
Cornyn	Lautenberg	Talent
Craig	Leahy	Thomas
Crapo	Levin	Thune
Dayton	Lieberman	Vitter
DeMint	Lincoln	Voinovich
DeWine	Lott	Warner
Dodd	Martinez	Wyden
Dole	McCain	

NAYS—6

Bingaman	Inouye	Lugar
Bond	Jeffords	Sarbanes

NOT VOTING—2

Chambliss	Corzine

The amendment (No. 2062) was agreed to.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, upon the disposition of amendment No. 2062, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:38 p.m., recessed until 2:18 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SUNUNU).