DeWine	Jeffords	Pryor
Dodd	Johnson	Reed
Dole	Kennedy	Reid
Domenici	Kohl	Roberts
Dorgan	Kyl	Rockefeller
Durbin	Landrieu	Santorum
Ensign	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Enzi	Leahy	Schumer
Feingold	Levin	Sessions
Feinstein	Lincoln	Shelby
Fitzgerald	Lott	Smith
Frist	Lugar	Snowe
Graham (SC)	McCain	Specter
Grassley	McConnell	Stabenow
Hagel	Mikulski	Stevens
Harkin	Miller	Sununu
Hatch	Murkowski	Talent
Hollings	Murray	Thomas
Hutchison	Nelson (FL)	Voinovich
Inhofe	Nelson (NE)	Warner
Inouye	Nickles	Wyden

NOT VOTING —7

Bond	Graham (FL)	Lieberman
Bunning	Gregg	
Edwards	Kerry	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider has been laid upon the table. The President shall be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

The Senator from Ohio.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 1787, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, in regard to the Feinstein amendment, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

I ask unanimous consent that order be vitiated.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1787), as modified, was agreed to.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 69, the continuing resolution, which is at the desk; provided further that the resolution be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

Mr. REID. No objection.

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

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 69) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004—Continued

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank the leadership on both sides for allowing us the opportunity to get back to the DC appropriations bill, a bill Senator DEWINE and I have worked very hard on over the last, actually, several months. We are very proud of so many portions of this bill that do such good work for the District, and do so in conjunction with the leadership of the District and the residents of the District. So we are thankful that as it has worked out today, we can actually get back on this bill.

It is my hope, and I think the chairman of this committee shares this goal, since there are a couple of points in this bill that warrant further debate, the most obvious one being the issue of education improvement in the District of Columbia, it would be my idea, and I hope it is shared by my colleagues and even on the other side, that we give as much time to this debate as possible because it is a very important issue, not just for the District but for the whole Nation. As a public policy, we would be hard pressed to find a public policy that is more important right now, other than, of course, national defense and homeland security. I think we all agree the challenge to our public education system is one that continues to warrant our attention.

Tonight it is my intention, and Senator DEWINE understands, to speak for a minute about an amendment Senator CARPER and I want to lay down at some time, and to talk in detail about what that amendment is. He and I are prepared to talk for maybe an hour about the details of it.

I understand there are other Members who might want to speak tonight. We have no intention, obviously, of having the vote tonight or tomorrow, but we hope next week to proceed with some voting on this very important bill.

The way I would like to start, just for a few moments, though, is to say the reason our amendment would be necessary and other amendments would be warranted is because the debate will show the publicly stated goals, however laudable—and we have read those goals in the newspaper, we have read them in press releases, we have heard the goals stated by the voucher proponents, that the aim of this is to help children in failing schools, poor children in failing schools have options—this debate will show the bill itself does not actually do that. Even with the Feinstein amendment, the bill does not do that.

There is another really puzzling aspect to this. I want to submit something for the record to show why I will say it is puzzling. We received today the Statement of Administration Policy. I would like to read it for the record and then explain why it is confusing. This is the Statement of Administration Policy that was issued today on the DC bill. This policy, not from the House but from the White House, says this: We like the DC bill, basically. I am paraphrasing the first part. The administration looks forward to working with Congress to ensure its priorities and amounts of money are within the overall budget goal.

Additional Administration views regarding the Committee's version of the bill are, [No. 1], School Choice Incentive Fund.

The Administration is pleased the Committee bill included $13 million for the President's School Choice Incentive Fund. This innovative reform will increase the capacity of the District to provide parents—particularly low-income parents—with more options for obtaining a quality education for their children who are trapped in low-performing schools. The Administration appreciates the Committee's support for strengthening the District's school system and strongly urges the Senate to retain this initiative.

The puzzling thing about this is the White House has said they support the Mayor's position. The Mayor was on the floor today. Mayor Williams is one of the most honorable people I know. He is a reformer for public education. But I don't know if the White House realizes that is not the Mayor's position.

The Mayor's position is a three-pronged approach: A third for vouchers, a third for charter schools, and a third for improvements to public schools. That is because the Mayor has suggested that vouchers-only is insufficient, and the Mayor has also said some other things about the voucher-only proposal. So I just lay this down.

I ask the chairman if perhaps he could get to the bottom of this. I don't know why the White House wouldn't say we understand the Senate bill has three clear sections on this issue. We like all those sections. We ask you to keep them all in the bill. But it doesn't say that.

I am going to have this printed in the RECORD. That is why we are going to have a lot of debate on this, because we have to get clear what the administration is really asking for or advocating.

I ask unanimous consent to print the Statement of Administration Policy in the RECORD.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, September 24, 2003.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(This statement has been coordinated by OMB with the concerned agencies.)

S. 1583—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 2004

(Sponsors: Stevens (R), Alaska; Byrd (D), West Virginia)

The Administration supports Senate passage of the FY 2004 District of Columbia Appropriations Bill, as reported by the Appropriations Committee.

While this bill exceeds the President's request by $145 million, the Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to ensure that the FY 2004 appropriations bills ultimately fit within the top line funding level agreed to by both the Administration and the Congress. The President supports a discretionary spending total of $785.6