far exceeds the NCAA-wide average of 48 percent for the same period;

Whereas Joe Paterno and his wife, Sue, have personally donated over $4,000,000 to Penn State's student library and academic programs;

Whereas Joe Paterno has led Penn State teams to 5 undefeated seasons;

Whereas Joe Paterno has led Penn State teams to 20 bowl game victories in his career as head coach, more than any other coach in college football history;

Whereas Joe Paterno was the first college football coach to win all of the 4 major New Year's Day bowl games: the Rose, Sugar, Cotton, and Orange Bowls;

Whereas Joe Paterno led 2 teams to National Championship titles, in 1982 and 1986;

Whereas Joe Paterno's coaching efforts have yielded over 250 National Football League players;

Whereas Joe Paterno has been chosen an unprecedented 4 times as American Football Coaches Association Coach of the Year; and

Whereas Joe Paterno, on October 27, 2001, broke the longstanding record for NCAA Division I–A victories, reaching the 324-victory mark, by leading his team to a 29–27 win over Ohio State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. CONGRATULATION AND COMMENDATION.

The Senate recognizes and honors Joe Paterno—

(1) for his lifetime emphasis on academic achievement;

(2) for his constant integrity, professionalism, and strong focus on character building for amateur athletes;

(3) for the example he sets through philanthropic support for academic programs; and

(4) for becoming the first NCAA Division I–A football coach to achieve 324 career victories, on October 27, 2001.

SEC. 2. TRANSMITTAL OF RESOLUTION.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(1) Penn State Football Head Coach Joe Paterno; and

(2) Penn State University President Graham Spanier.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 2058

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I am happy to get back to the subject. I was of course happy to yield some time for the Senators from Pennsylvania, for those fine remarks to honor a person who certainly deserved that recognition.

I am offering this amendment today on this underlying bill in behalf of myself, Senator COCHRAN, the Senator from Mississippi, Senator DEWINE from Ohio, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator HATCH, Senator BENNETT, and Senator ENSIGN—all who have had a pivotal role and a leadership role in helping to bring this particular amendment to the floor at this time.

So because of the change in time this morning, and so many Senators are here wanting to speak on this amendment, let me yield at this time to my distinguished colleague from Ohio for his remarks on this amendment. Then I will speak following the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Louisiana for her nice comments. I appreciate the fact that she has yielded to me. I congratulate her for not only this amendment but for all the work she does for all children, and particularly poor children. There is no one in this Chamber more dedicated than is she to the children of this country.

I rise today to express my support for Senator LANDRIEU's amendment as well as for Senator GREGG's amendment. These amendments target our limited, finite Federal resources to the school districts and to the children most in need. I am cosponsoring both because each is an effort to get funding to those school districts with high concentrations of poor children. Each amendment will put at least $1 billion into the title I targeted grant formula so impoverished school districts, those children, get what they need, so the children in those school districts get the quality education they deserve.

A little history. This grant formula, this targeted grant formula, as it is called, was created in 1994. It recognized the great disparity in this country between poor school districts and rich school districts, the great disparity between children who are in poverty and children who are not in poverty.

However, unbelievably and tragically, since the creation of these grants in 1994, not a single Federal dollar, not one dollar, has been appropriated to fund this grant program—that is until now with these two amendments. These amendments would fundamentally begin fulfilling the promise and commitment the Federal Government made to the poor children of this country in 1994. This is unprecedented. It is historic. So I congratulate both of my colleagues for their amendments.

Under Senator GREGG's amendment, the districts most in need would not only receive the money they deserve but they also would have the flexibility to decide how best to use their title I funds, whether that is to hire more teachers, provide professional development, to put computers in classrooms, or purchase instructional material—whatever they wanted to do. The districts, the local communities, would be able to decide for themselves where and how those dollars would do the most good.

For example, one school may have a lot of students who are having problems in math. That school district could use their title I dollars on math instructional materials or to better train their math teachers. Another school might have a small group of students who would need more individualized instruction in reading and the language arts.

The point is this funding enables the local school to use this money to help the distinct needs of their own students. By funding these targeted grants, we are finally focusing on those kids truly in need. This gets us back to the original intent of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the title I program, which is to help address the needs of children in low-income areas where the districts simply cannot meet their basic needs on their own.

The problem has been that over the course of the last 3½ decades, the Federal Government really has strayed from this point, from its intent, with politics often driving education policy needs of these low-income students. As a result, the money intended to reach the most impoverished districts, and the most poor children, has simply not been getting there. These amendments go a long way to begin to rectify that.

Because the Federal role in education accounts for only a small percentage of school spending—about 8 percent—we must be especially prudent and wise in allocating those very limited, finite Federal resources. That means we should direct those dollars first and foremost to America's most needy children. That means we need to fund the targeted grant program.

The tragedy today is that not all children are getting the quality education they deserve because our society is divided along economic and educational lines. This division is nothing new. Scholars and sociologists warned us really for decades that this was where our Nation was heading, particularly if we did not properly educate our children.

Unfortunately, we did not heed the warnings and, as a result, our Nation today is a nation split really into two Americas, one where children get educated and one where, tragically, they do not.

This gap in educational knowledge and economic standing is entrenching thousands upon thousands of children into an underclass and into futures filled with poverty and little hope, little opportunity, and little room for advancement. That is exactly what is happening in my home State of Ohio and across the country.

Ohio generally is a microcosm of what we see in the country. When we look at this growing gap, when we see this development of the two Americas, what we see in Ohio is also what we see in our Nation. In Ohio, growing income and educational disparities are creating our own very permanent underclass.

Most of Ohio is still doing pretty well and doing pretty well educationally. Children in those areas have a great future. However, when we look across our State, when we look across the Nation, we see two areas where that is not taking place, areas where the children are not being educated as well as we would like and where the income level shows that disparity. One place is in rural Appalachia, our Appalachian counties, and the other is in our core cities or our inner cities. This is where we as a society, we as a people, face our greatest challenge.

The children living in these high-poverty areas are at risk, every single one of them. The structural conditions of poverty make it very difficult for these children to succeed in life and to move up and out of their impoverished circumstances.

The fact is that with poverty often come drugs, crime, broken homes, unemployment, violence, and lower educational levels. In fact, according to the National Center for Educational Statistics, in 1999, young adults living in families with incomes in the lowest 20 percent of all family incomes were five times as likely to drop out of high school as their peers with families in the top 20 percent of the income distribution.

The point is not that money solves all problems. The point is we have an obligation, with the finite dollars we have available to us, to spend them wisely and prudently. We need today to fulfill to what we have committed in the past and have not done; that is, help poor children of this country.

In conclusion, because of the cyclical nature of poverty and the systemic problems associated with it, I believe the best way we can get to these children before we lose them is through quality education. Education is the ticket out of poverty. It has been throughout the history of this country.

We need to provide all children, regardless of their economic circumstances or family backgrounds or how poor the school district in which they live, with the tools they need to make it as adults in our society, with the tools necessary to rise above individual situations in poverty and instability and individual situations of hopelessness and despair. When education is not working to give our kids the tools they need to move ahead in life, those children suffer.

We can't solve all the problems of this country. We can't fix all the broken homes. But we can use Federal dollars in ways that help close the educational gap in America.

That is exactly what we are doing with my colleague's amendment and with Senator GREGG's amendment. We are finally putting our money where our mouth is. No more lip service. This funding would go to enable schools to provide opportunities for low-income and low-achieving children to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in school and later in life.

In doing so, we will help education equalize the environment for our children. That is the right thing to do.

I thank the Chair. I thank my colleague, and I again congratulate her for the excellent amendment and for the work she does for children every day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for those remarks, and, of course, for his hard work on this amendment. I often say to our other colleagues that any Senator who is a father of eight children certainly is an expert when it comes to the matters of children and families. He has demonstrated that over and over again.

I see my colleague from Mississippi coming in to also speak on this amendment. I am mindful of the time and his patience because our amendment has been rescheduled so many times. I would be happy to yield to him at this time or in a few moments if he wants to speak on this particular amendment because he has most certainly been a leader in this regard.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will yield, I would be happy to speak in support of her amendment and acknowledge that I am a cosponsor of the amendment. I believe that it does redirect some of the funding allocated under the bill for title I programs so that it goes to the States with the highest percentage of poor students in their student population. These are students we decided needed special attention many years ago when the program was first authorized as title I under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Federal Government has the responsibility to address that program—not by supplanting the primary responsibility of the States to run their education programs and to provide the resources for teachers and school districts to educate those students in the States.

We have decided some States have such serious problems in this respect that the Federal Government ought to step in and provide some additional assistance. When the program was authorized, not all of the authorized activities were funded. This is one example of an unfunded but authorized activity and a program that was designed to help those States with very special needs. Obviously, my State is one of them.

Sixty-five percent of the student population in the State of Mississippi is classified as eligible for title I support. These are poor children. Most of those children reside in small towns and rural communities; some in urban settings, of course. But most of them are in areas with high rates of unemployment and low-wage rates where people do have jobs, and with real estate that doesn't generate the kind of taxes that are needed to operate top-of-the-line education programs. They start out with the deck stacked against them because of where they live and the fact that they are poor.

This is money that is now going to be targeted and redirected to those areas of special need. I think it is totally justified under the circumstances that we see in our country today, and also to be used in a program that has been tested and proven to be helpful.

We had hearings in our State earlier this year talking to administrators in school districts that are eligible for title I funding; talking to teachers and meeting with the State board of education members to try to assess how effective the program has been and what would happen if the funds were cut. For example, we were told if the funding under title I was reduced in our State, the effect would be devastating. We were also told the more money they could get into the program, the better job they could do in providing educational opportunities to those who are harder to teach and who need special assistance in many cases in order to achieve their goals and to be what they could be if they were given the right kinds of educational opportunities.

One of our witnesses turned out to be a school superintendent in Yazoo City, MS, who had been a title I student. He talked about his personal background and his history and the fact that there was no opportunity for him. But because of additional funds in the school that he attended that added some instructors, that added some teachers who concentrated on those students with special problems because they were poor, he benefitted from that. He talked about how he then ended up going to college. He is now a leader in our State in education, devoting his life to helping others who are in similar situations. He was a very impressive, and as you might understand, a very persuasive witness.

I am here today to speak for people like him and others in our State who because of their lives and experiences show that this program works. It has been of great benefit to him. We want it to benefit many more.

That is why I am cosponsoring the Landrieu amendment. I hope the Senate will vote for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the remarks of my colleague from Mississippi and my neighbor to the south right across the line because we share a lot of common challenges in Mississippi and Louisiana. The Senator spoke about the need for this amendment and called the attention of the Nation to the fact that about 60 percent of the students in Mississippi—that would be about the same for Louisiana, probably about 65 percent—live below the poverty line or are so close to it that opportunities are hard to come by. I think it is important for us to step back and take a moment to recognize that great inequity.

As I refer to my notes, I am reminded that in order for students to be eligible for title I, as the distinguished Senator from Mississippi knows, it means a family of four can make no more than $22,000. It is hard for an individual to live on $22,000, much less a family, whether they live in rural Mississippi or rural Louisiana or right here in Washington, DC. But there are many working families who have incomes at that level, and all they are asking is for their children to get a better education, so that instead of bringing in that $22,000, they could bring in $45,000 or $65,000 or $100,000, and not only help

themselves and their families, and the children they will ultimately have, but help this Nation to fulfill its economic promise.

One of the great effects of this amendment, as the Presiding Officer knows, because you yourself have been supportive and outspoken and effective in your advocacy as a former Governor of Delaware and now as a Senator who speaks so directly about this issue, is it helps us to begin. It is only a modest beginning to help solve a great inequity in this Nation. It is the inequity that the Senator from Mississippi brought up and the inequity that I want to spend a few minutes speaking about again this morning.

The fact is that among these 50 States there are some States and some communities and some districts and some counties and some parishes that simply do not have the resources to make the grade. They have the will. They have the skill. They have the desire. And the children, because of the way God created them, have the brains. They are not sitting down on the job. These are children who want to learn. These are parents who work very hard, who do not have flexible schedules, who wake up early in the morning before the Sun comes up, who stay at work until the Sun goes down.

These are the children title I tries to reach: first-generation immigrants, families that have been in this country for many years struggling to get ahead, families that work hard and save their hard-earned dollars. These are the children title I tries to reach. Yet when we do not provide the funds through the targeted grants, we often miss the opportunity to meet these families halfway.

I think we have an obligation, on the Federal level, because of the disparity, because of the great inequity, to do what we can to try to level this playing field.

Let me be the first to say, although I am a sponsor of this amendment, this amendment does not correct that inequity. We would need many billions of dollars more to correct that inequity. But this is a beginning. That is why it is so important for us to vote overwhelmingly for this particular amendment. It is a beginning. It will be the first time the targeted grant formula has ever been funded in the Senate. It will build on the work of the House. It will support what the President wants us to do.

As we push our schools to greater heights, as we expect higher standards from our students, from our educators, and from our parents, then we can help them by giving this additional funding, so that even schools in the places that are poor, such as Louisiana and Mississippi, and places in Delaware that may be disadvantaged, have a chance to meet these higher standards. That is what this amendment does.

I am proud of the bipartisan support we have received. And I know it is tough because there are some States where funding maybe goes up slightly and there are some States where funding decreases.

I do not see my partner, Senator LIEBERMAN, in this Chamber. He has been working for hours, for days, for months on this amendment. Senator LIEBERMAN is a cosponsor. Clearly, as the Senator from Mississippi said, Mississippi will benefit. He has more poor children in Mississippi per capita than any State in the Union. My State is a close second. So to Mississippi and Louisiana, this is serious business. This is about whether these children, in homes where parents are working, doing their best, have a chance or not. That is what this amendment means. It is literally a life-and-death opportunity.

There are some States that are wealthier, Connecticut being one of them. Senator LIEBERMAN supports this amendment. I tell you, he is a great inspirational leader to me. Just to give an example of how great his leadership has been, Connecticut will not benefit as much as Louisiana, but Senator LIEBERMAN knows, as do other Senators from wealthier States, that it is ultimately in the interest of all the businesspeople and families in Connecticut if every child in this great Nation has a chance for an excellent education. The benefits will come back to Connecticut in indirect ways, if not directly. That is the kind of long-term leadership, the kind of vision that we need more of in the Senate.

So while in some ways it is easier for Senator COCHRAN and I to stand in this Chamber and argue for it because our State will be a tremendous beneficiary, I recognize the sponsorship of Senators from States that do not immediately do better, but in the long run they know this is best for their State and for the Nation; to them goes tremendous credit.

Let me take a moment to speak about the underlying bill. Many of us, including the Presiding Officer, have been working for many months to try to put forward some of the new principles that are in this particular piece of legislation.

The appropriations bill that we are discussing today helps to frame or give substance to the authorization bill that is in committee. There are some principles that I think are important, and I will address those for a moment.

First of all, the underlying bill recognizes the importance of teachers. We always say teachers are important, but sometimes we do not put our money where our mouths are. The underlying bill gives $1 billion more to help improve the quality of teachers.

We know that a good teacher instructs but a great teacher inspires. We need to have more great teachers; we need to help them become great teachers, taking their great motivation and their enthusiasm, and helping them build their skills to inspire our children in every school, in every district, to become the very best citizens they can be for our Nation and to become the very best leaders in the world. This challenging time certainly calls on us to make those investments. That is one of the initiatives in this bill.

In addition, it has been important to work on this particular bill at this time because I think there is a sense that while we have a very good public school system, it works pretty well most of the time, and we can be proud of the work we do, I think the Landrieu-Cochran amendment, and the work that is being done in the underlying bill, to push forward on some of these points, demonstrates there is a sense of urgency to move our schools to a higher level, expecting performance and not concentrating on process, but expecting results, accountability, improvements, and working with the local people in a partnership to do that.

Why is that important? It has always been important. It has always been important, but I think since September 11 it has become even more obvious why it is important to have excellence in our schools and to give every child, regardless of whether they come from a wealthy district in Connecticut or the cotton fields of Mississippi and Louisiana, the chance to succeed, to carry the flag that we all share as Americans, and to do the very best we can to hold up that flag when our Nation calls upon us to do so.

I have been very impressed with the work of the Business Roundtable on education. They, along with many corporate executives, have supported some of the educational reform efforts that are being made in this Congress. I commend them for their focus.

They issued a poem, written by one of their members, that I will ask to print in the RECORD. I want to share it with my colleagues this morning because it so clarifies where we are today in America and why the underlying bill is important, and why the targeting amendment is important.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. It is entitled ''Pretty Good.'' It reads as follows:

PRETTY GOOD

(By Charles Osgood)

There once was a pretty good student,
Who sat in a pretty good class
And was taught by a pretty good teacher,
Who always let pretty good pass.
He wasn't terrific at reading,
He wasn't a whiz-bang at math;
But for him education was leading
Straight down a pretty good path.
He didn't find school too exciting,
But he wanted to do pretty well,
And he did have some trouble with writing
And nobody taught him to spell.
When doing arithmetic problems
Pretty good was regarded as fine.
Five plus five needn't always add up to be ten,
A pretty good answer was nine.
The pretty good class that he sat in
Was part of a pretty good school,
And the student was not an exception,

On the contrary, he was the rule.
The pretty good school that he went to
Was in a pretty good town.
And nobody seemed to notice
He could not tell a verb from a noun.
The pretty good student in fact was
Part of a pretty good mob.
And the first time he knew what he lacked was
When he looked for a pretty good job.
It was then, when he sought a position,
He discovered that life could be tough,
And he soon had a sneaky suspicion
Pretty good might not be good enough.
The pretty good town in our story
Was part of a pretty good state,
Which had pretty good aspirations,
And prayed for a pretty good fate.
There once was a pretty good nation,
Pretty proud of the greatness it had,
Which learned much too late
If you want to be great,
Pretty good is, in fact, pretty bad.

We have some pretty good schools. We have some pretty good students. We have some pretty good teachers. We have to have great schools, great students, and great teachers. We need them in Mississippi. We need them in Louisiana. We need them in Connecticut. We need them in Pennsylvania. Our country depends on educated, well-skilled citizens to lift this democracy, to help lift this world, and to become a beacon of light. We can do that. It is not that complicated. It just takes some principles, some determination and some funding levels, partnerships with local governments, to make it happen.

The underlying bill, with this amendment, and the work that has been done in the authorizing committee will get us from pretty good to great. That is what our Nation needs at this time.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am delighted to support, enthusiastically, the Landrieu-Cochran amendment. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this amendment. I believe this is a balanced and bipartisan amendment. I am especially pleased that this amendment represents a change in the way the title I formula is funded. My State of Utah has been socked by this formula for years. Correcting the title I formula has long been a priority of mine and this amendment is a good step in the right direction.

This amendment would direct Federal funds to go out to States using the degree to which States equalize resources among their school districts as a proxy for their commitment to education.

This so-called ''equity provision'' of the Education Finance Incentive Grant section of the title I formula rewards states that have a policy of fairly distributing resources among school districts.

I have been beating a steady drum relative to this issue for years. As many of my colleagues know, wealthy school districts can afford to provide more resources to their schools than can poorer school districts. This sends an incredibly bad signal to students in so much as it can appear that wealthy students have access to scholastic resources such as computers and up-to-date science labs which may be unavailable to students from less affluent areas.

We should work to eliminate what has been called this ''Savage Inequality'' between more wealthy and less wealthy school districts. I believe that support for the equity provision of this formula sends a strong signal to these students that the Congress deems it a priority for States to find a way to eliminate this barrier to academic progress. I am very proud that my State of Utah has had a policy of equalizing resources among school districts for decades.

A majority of States have either been taken to court or been threatened with lawsuits over the issue of equalized resources among school districts. This amendment would assist States which currently are being compelled to address this issue.

As a conservative, I am pleased that the equity provision does not mandate to States how they should achieve a more equitable school funding strategy, it merely rewards them when they do achieve a more equitable school funding strategy.

I am also pleased that this amendment would establish an alternative proxy for determining a State's commitment to education. Currently, the only measure of a State's commitment to education has been its per-pupil expenditure. That measure unfairly evaluates a State like Utah's commitment to education. Utah has a relatively low tax-base and the highest percentage of school aged children.

This means that based on the per-pupil expenditure, Utah ranks relatively low. But the per-pupil expenditure is only one measure to judge a State's commitment to education. It makes sense as a matter of good policy to have a variety of measures to establish a State's commitment to education. This amendment moves us soundly in that direction.

Funding for the Education Finance Incentive Grant program is good policy. It just makes sense. I am pleased to support the Landrieu-Cochran amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana makes changes in the formula so that there are more funds targeted to poor areas, and States which have already targeted poor areas are going to receive more funding. Pennsylvania is a winner in this formula fight. I tend to support the amendment.

Nobody has appeared in opposition to the amendment, and there are a number of States which are adversely affected.

It is my hope that other Senators wishing to protect their interests will come to the floor to present their arguments.

Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. If we now go to a quorum call, the time can't be charged against the Senator from Louisiana because she has no time remaining. So is the time charged against the opponents of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I realize my time has expired. Since no one is here to speak against the amendment, would there be any objection to my taking an additional few minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SPECTER. Reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the Senator from Louisiana how much additional time she wants?

Ms. LANDRIEU. I would only need 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. I have no objection.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Then I would be happy to yield to Senator KENNEDY.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would the Senator be kind enough to yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts in opposition to the Gregg amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. I will accommodate the Senator from Massachusetts on that.

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

The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, to go into some more detail about the importance to Louisiana, Louisiana is slated to receive approximately $212 million in title I funding. Under this amendment, that will be $21 million more than we received last year. We spend about $600 per title I student. This amount will increase by almost a third for the students in Louisiana, increasing it by $200.

Caddo Parish may receive a 21 percent increase in title I funding. East Baton Rouge, the capital parish, will receive a 16 percent increase. Orleans parish could receive a 24 percent increase. These are several examples of how beneficial this will be to the parishes in Louisiana, and I am sure to counties in Mississippi as well as to the State of Delaware.

This is an amendment that will help all school districts by trying to target more of the resources to those school districts that have high concentrations of poor students and limited opportunities to raise their own funds locally. That, clearly, is a role the Federal Government should play.

I will submit for the RECORD a more comprehensive list of what it will mean to all of the States, as well as the State of Louisiana, in terms of percentages of increase.

Again, this is a beginning. I know Senator KENNEDY will join me in saying that $1 billion is not really enough. But given the other pulls on our budget, it is what we can do this year.

I hope to work with the Presiding Officer and the chairman, the Senator from Massachusetts, and others to see that this money is increased next year so that it will be beneficial to all of our States.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the list to which I referred:

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

State	Fiscal year 2001	Landrieu/ Cochran	Committee	Increase over FY01	Percent increase
Alabama	$133,800,000	$154,808,000	$153,957,000	$21,008,000	16
Alaska	23,064,000	27,995,000	28,159,000	4,931,000	21
Arizona	137,446,000	169,204,000	170,954,000	31,758,000	23
Arkansas	83,258,000	95,772,000	96,280,000	12,514,000	15
California	1,155,139,000	1,417,777,000	1,432,338,000	262,638,000	23
Colorado	78,563,000	98,316,000	97,204,000	19,753,000	25
Connecticut	83,813,000	103,824,000	104,422,000	20,011,000	24
Delaware	22,221,000	26,731,000	25,879,000	4,510,000	20
District of Columbia	26,603,000	32,900,000	33,276,000	6,297,000	24
Florida	400,840,000	501,169,000	498,469,000	100,329,000	25
Georgia	250,856,000	304,676,000	314,986,000	53,820,000	21
Hawaii	25,773,000	33,025,000	32,461,000	7,252,000	28
Idaho	26,557,000	32,447,000	31,664,000	5,890,000	22
Illinois	357,248,000	430,003,000	432,244,000	72,755,000	20
Indiana	128,798,000	157,498,000	157,634,000	28,700,000	22
Iowa	55,103,000	65,450,000	62,033,000	10,347,000	19
Kansas	61,260,000	74,550,000	75,206,000	13,290,000	22
Kentucky	130,625,000	149,864,000	148,913,000	19,239,000	15
Louisiana	191,576,000	212,407,000	201,954,000	20,831,000	11
Maine	32,489,000	37,653,000	37,393,000	5,164,000	16
Maryland	124,098,000	154,435,000	152,827,000	30,337,000	24
Massachusetts	180,987,000	217,491,000	221,497,000	36,504,000	20
Michigan	349,306,000	407,508,000	407,952,000	58,202,000	17
Minnesota	95,313,000	117,407,000	115,332,000	22,094,000	23
Mississippi	124,800,000	133,668,000	124,752,000	8,868,000	7
Missouri	140,579,000	163,214,000	163,875,000	22,635,000	16
Montana	28,243,000	33,223,000	33,876,000	4,980,000	18
Nebraska	32,936,000	38,708,000	36,259,000	5,772,000	18
Nevada	32,382,000	42,083,000	40,750,000	9,701,000	30
New Hampshire	21,390,000	26,684,000	25,049,000	5,294,000	25
New Jersey	209,372,000	255,415,000	257,744,000	46,043,000	22
New Mexico	68,504,000	80,281,000	81,129,000	11,777,000	17
New York	822,655,000	989,767,000	1,008,629,000	167,112,000	20
North Carolina	172,307,000	212,181,000	214,399,000	39,874,000	23
North Dakota	21,081,000	25,247,000	24,639,000	4,166,000	20
Ohio	303,990,000	345,855,000	329,733,000	41,865,000	14
Oklahoma	101,344,000	119,647,000	121,149,000	18,303,000	18
Oregon	76,714,000	93,722,000	94,465,000	17,008,000	22
Pennsylvania	346,293,000	401,635,000	394,496,000	55,342,000	16
Puerto Rico	267,301,000	301,864,000	319,602,000	34,563,000	13
Rhode Island	27,057,000	33,129,000	33,875,000	6,072,000	22
South Carolina	112,033,000	135,117,000	137,578,000	23,084,000	21
South Dakota	21,251,000	25,465,000	25,248,000	4,214,000	20
Tennessee	137,351,000	156,990,000	149,399,000	19,639,000	14
Texas	692,899,000	819,583,000	817,235,000	126,684,000	18
Utah	37,418,000	46,924,000	43,580,000	9,506,000	25
Vermont	18,016,000	21,783,000	21,324,000	3,767,000	21
Virginia	138,409,000	170,508,000	172,966,000	32,099,000	23
Washington	118,080,000	145,491,000	144,721,000	27,411,000	23
West Virginia	73,751,000	81,121,000	79,001,000	7,370,000	10
Wisconsin	129,070,000	153,714,000	148,120,000	24,644,000	19
Wyoming	19,059,000	23,077,000	22,383,000	4,018,000	21

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields back the time. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2056

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for allowing me a minute. We have been in a markup. Everyone is pressed.

I rise in opposition to the Gregg amendment. The Gregg amendment deals with public school construction but doesn't cut out charter school construction resources. I appreciate the fact that Senator GREGG understands that we need additional resources in title I. We are only reaching about 35 percent of all of the children. Even with the increases that we anticipate this year, with the increasing challenges we are facing economically, we are still only going to reach a relatively small percentage of children that are needy.

We understand we need additional resources. The fact is, we shouldn't be robbing Peter to pay Paul. We need to invest in and increase title I. We need an effective program of construction, public school construction and charter school construction.

Every day, until relatively recently, in my own city of Boston, when the temperature went below 20 degrees, we had 15 schools that closed, where there are a number of title I children, because of the fact that they didn't have the heating and because of the construction lapses. We were denying these children the opportunities for learning.

This is a carefully targeted program that Senator HARKIN has directed. It is a necessary one for needy children. I hope the Gregg amendment will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, how much time remains on both sides on the Landrieu amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time on the side of the Senator from Louisiana. The opponents have 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. REID. Would the Senator from Pennsylvania be willing to yield back the time? Then we could go to the vote on the Gregg amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. I would. I think we should proceed with the business of the Senate. If I might ask my colleague from Nevada, what would happen then to those who want to make arguments in opposition to the Landrieu amendment?

Mr. REID. They would not be able to make any argument.

Mr. SPECTER. Then it is the suggestion that we proceed to two votes now?

Mr. REID. That is right. The order that is now in place would be the Gregg amendment. As soon as that is completed, we would vote on the Landrieu amendment. For 3 days Senators have known what has been taking place on the floor. We announced this vote last night. We structured the debate so there is no reason in the world that someone who opposed the Landrieu amendment would not be here.

Mr. SPECTER. With the assistant majority leader's suggestion we proceed to two votes, I raise no objection.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the second vote be a 10-minute vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARNAHAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG.

The yeas and nays are ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 316 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Allard	Fitzgerald	Murkowski
Allen	Frist	Nickles
Bennett	Gramm	Roberts
Bond	Grassley	Santorum
Brownback	Gregg	Sessions
Bunning	Hagel	Shelby
Burns	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Helms	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Hutchinson	Stevens
Collins	Hutchison	Thomas
Craig	Inhofe	Thompson
Crapo	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Lott	Voinovich
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Ensign	McCain	
Enzi	McConnell	

NAYS—54

Akaka	Dodd	Lieberman
Baucus	Dorgan	Lincoln
Bayh	Durbin	Mikulski
Biden	Edwards	Miller
Bingaman	Feingold	Murray
Boxer	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Breaux	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Byrd	Harkin	Reed
Cantwell	Hollings	Reid
Carnahan	Inouye	Rockefeller
Carper	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Chafee	Johnson	Schumer
Cleland	Kennedy	Snowe
Clinton	Kerry	Specter
Conrad	Kohl	Stabenow
Corzine	Landrieu	Torricelli
Daschle	Leahy	Wellstone
Dayton	Levin	Wyden

The amendment (No. 2056) was rejected.

Mr. HARKIN. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2058

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are now 2 minutes for debate evenly divided prior to the vote on the Landrieu amendment No. 2058.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, we only have 1 minute. I yield 30 seconds to my colleague from Connecticut and 30 seconds to my colleague from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Landrieu-Cochran amendment. Frankly, I do not see why any Member would vote against this amendment. It is the most progressive advance in reform in title I since the founding of this program in 1965. It is a program that is not working now. Every State gets more money under this program. Within every State, poor children, who were the focus of ESEA when it was created in 1965, will get more support for their education.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah may proceed.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, as the Senator from Connecticut has said, title I is not working as well as we had anticipated. One of the rules of life is that if you want to keep getting the same results, you keep doing the same things.

This is the first significant change in title I in its philosophy and approach that we have had in many years. It rewards effort and it brings equity. If we want to have true education reform, we vote for the Cochran-Landrieu amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, is there time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute in opposition.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time in opposition be yielded back and we begin the vote.

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

Mr. REID. Members should be advised this is a 10-minute vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2058.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 317 Leg.]

YEAS—81

Akaka	Dorgan	Lincoln
Allard	Durbin	Lott
Baucus	Edwards	Lugar
Bayh	Ensign	McConnell
Bennett	Enzi	Mikulski
Biden	Feingold	Miller
Bingaman	Frist	Murray
Breaux	Graham	Nelson (FL)
Bunning	Gramm	Nelson (NE)
Burns	Grassley	Reed
Byrd	Gregg	Reid
Campbell	Hagel	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Harkin	Santorum
Carper	Hatch	Sarbanes
Chafee	Hollings	Sessions
Cleland	Hutchison	Shelby
Cochran	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Collins	Inouye	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Jeffords	Snowe
Corzine	Johnson	Specter
Craig	Kennedy	Stabenow
Crapo	Kerry	Thomas
Daschle	Kohl	Thompson
Dayton	Landrieu	Torricelli
DeWine	Leahy	Voinovich
Dodd	Levin	Wellstone
Domenici	Lieberman	Wyden

NAYS—19

Allen	Fitzgerald	Roberts
Bond	Helms	Schumer
Boxer	Hutchinson	Stevens
Brownback	Kyl	Thurmond
Carnahan	McCain	Warner
Clinton	Murkowski	
Feinstein	Nickles	

The amendment (No. 2058) was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, may we have order in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Order in the Senate.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. COCHRAN. 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 West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, may I say to Senators that the Chair has been trying to get order. The Chair has been trying to get order. The Chair has been trying to get order.

I think it is about time that Senators pay some respect, show some respect toward the Chair.

Madam President, I thank the Chair and I thank all Senators.

I have sought the floor at this time to urge that we get on with action on this bill. I believe today is the beginning of the period allotted by the fourth CR.

Mr. STEVENS. Right.

Mr. BYRD. Which extends from November 1 to the 16th. It is not a very pretty picture when we pause to reflect on the work that remains to be done—remains to be done on appropriations bills. Here we are on November 1. We have 2 months left in this year, in this calendar year, and we are far into the fiscal year: Two conference reports have passed the House and Senate and are pending at the White House, the Interior bill and the military construction bill.

Three conferences have been completed with floor action pending—the House will act on these three conference reports and may have already acted on them by this time; I am not sure—on Treasury, on energy and water development, and on legislative branch. The Senate could proceed quickly to finish those. If the Senate is able to finish those 3 conference reports by the end of the day, that will make a total of 5 out of 13.

There are five conferences that are expected to be completed by Tuesday, November 6. They are these: VA–HUD, foreign operations, Transportation, Agriculture, and Commerce-State-Justice. That will make a total of 10 if those conferences can be completed.

Senator STEVENS and I have talked with the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and urged that we get our conferees together and get these conferences going. So there is a lot of effort being expended. A lot of time is being expended that isn't seen on this floor.

We do a lot of work off this floor. We are here in the evenings. We are here when darkness has fallen over the city. It is not a safe city to be in. It has not been for a long time, for that matter. But that is an aside.

We need to get this work done on the floor. We have a bill here that we ought to move. I urge all Senators who have amendments not to put them off until next week thinking they can do better next week. They are not going to do as well next week. I urge Senators to call up their amendments and let the managers know. Both managers are here. They have been here. Let's get on with this business.

Let me remind Senators how important this bill is. If any Senators are here expecting to increase the amounts of money for anything in this bill, or to add moneys, let me tell you what you

are doing. If there is any effort here to alter the 302(b) allocation, you had better forget it because I am here ready, as one Senator, to move to table any such amendment. Just as quickly as I can get the floor, I will move to table it.

I have discussed this with my counterpart, my distinguished friend, Mr. STEVENS. He is here to speak for himself. But I can tell you one thing. You had better forget it if you are thinking about adding money to this bill.

Let me tell you what you will be doing. You will be creating problems for items that are vital to you and your constituents. You will be creating problems in the House if you do that because the House Appropriations Committee and subcommittees have the same allocation that we have over here in the Senate.

This bill includes $51 billion for the Department of Education, $4 billion above the President's request. I fought to get that additional $4 billion. We wrestled like Jacob with the angel overnight to get that additional $4 billion for education in this bill.

Let some Senator come on this floor and try to alter the allocation. They are going to have a fight. You might as well get ready when they come here. I fought to get that additional $4 billion for education. It wasn't easy. All of us agreed on it. The four appropriators—the chairman of the House committee, the chairman of the Senate committee, the ranking member of the House committee, and the ranking member of the Senate committee—agreed to the $4 billion.

I say to all Senators that I don't mean to be mean spirited, but I am trying to be realistic. We have to get this work done. If you are counting on coming here and adding moneys on this bill and calling the addition an emergency, forget it, because we included in that agreement among the four House and Senate chairmen and with the President that there would be $2.2 billion for emergencies. Please don't come on this Senate floor with the idea that you are going to add something and you are going to designate it as an emergency. We are going to fight you over that, if you do it, because we have fought over this and we have worked over there. There is no point in going through the motion just so you can get a headline in your papers.

It is $4 billion above the President's request and nearly $6.4 billion for education. That is an increase of 15 percent over last year.

Also in this bill is $1.549 billion, an increase of $136.4 million for dislocated worker programs. These funds are used by States for rapid response assistance to help workers affected by mass layoffs and plant closures. These fund are critical now more than ever with layoff figures increasing across the country. That is a very important item in this bill.

There is $1.343 billion for community, school, homeless, and migrant health centers, an increase of $175 million. That is doing pretty well. These centers provide primary health care to over 12 million Americans, the majority without health insurance. By providing access to basic health care, health centers save the health care system billions of dollars in reduced use of costly emergency room, specialty, and hospital inpatient care.

What an important bill this is. That is important.

Senators and staff should not contemplate coming here messing with this bill. If you can really improvement it, we will be for you. But we think this bill is the best that can be done with the limited resources we have. Of course, we would like to spend more money for all of these things—some of us would.

There is $4.419 billion for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. That is an increased of $300.6 million, including funds for childhood immunization, HIV prevention activities, epidemic services, funds to strengthen the ability of State and local health departments to respond to bioterrorism, and to maintain the pharmaceutical stockpile.

This deals with bioterrorism. What can be more important to the American people? The Centers for Disease Control has played a primary role in responding to the recent anthrax attacks in Washington, New York, and Florida.

In addition, there is $23.695 billion for the National Institutes of Health.

If Senators want to come in here and add moneys for something, what are they going to offset the addition with? Who wants to take moneys out of the National Institutes of Health?

That is an increase of $3.4 billion over last year. This increase is the fourth year of a 5-year effort to double the funding for NIH. Saved lives, new cures and treatments, and a thriving biomedical research industry are the result of substantial Federal investment in medical research.

Also in this bill is $2 billion for substance abuse treatment programs.

Who wants to take money out of that to offset something else?

That is an increase of $80 million. Studies have shown that substance abuse treatment is effective at reducing primary drug use by 50 percent, criminal activity by 80 percent, and drug- and alcohol-related medical visits by 50 percent.

There is $2 billion in here for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

Who wants to take money out that for an offset?

This program is more important than ever, given the weak economy and the shortfalls experienced by State programs last year.

There is $1.209 billion for aging programs, an increase of $107 million, including an increase of over $5.5 million for home-delivered and congregate meals. Last year, almost one out of every six Americans was over 60 years of age. While the total population of the US increased by 13 percent since 1990, those in the age category 75–84, increased at twice that rate.

There is $10.2 billion for Title I grants to local education agencies, an increase of $1.4 billion. These grants provide funds to schools, especially in high-poverty areas, to help low-income, low-achieving students learn to the same high standards as other students.

There is $3.039 billion for State grants to improve teacher quality, an increase of $440 million. States and local educational agencies use these funds to reduce class size, reform teacher certification requirements, recruit teachers, provide existing teachers with professional development opportunities, and implement teacher mentoring programs.

The Senate bill includes sufficient funds to increase the maximum Pell Grant to $4,000, the highest ever and an increase of $250 over last year. Pell Grants are the foundation of postsecondary student aid, allowing millions of low- and moderate-income students to attend college and other postsecondary educational programs.

That is all I have to say, except, please, let's get on with this bill. We are fast approaching Thanksgiving. We ought to be home with our families. Let's not be tied up here.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, this bill, in my judgment, is as important in this period of time with the war on terrorism as the Defense Department bill. It is a bill that must be finished as rapidly as possible. It contains money to assist all of the agencies dealing with the problems of chemical and biological warfare, as well as all of the items Senator BYRD has mentioned.

I am told we are very near an agreement. That may mean we can finish this bill tonight. I encourage all parties to join in that effort because this bill is going to take a long time in conference. If I count correctly, we have but 8 days in which we can conference this bill within the timeframe of the next continuing resolution. We have a holiday on the 12th. I think it is imperative we get this bill to the President as rapidly as possible.

I also want to state to the Senate that I have agreed to join Senator BYRD on any effort to table an amendment that would violate the agreement we have with the House and with the President with regard to the limitation on expenditures and the allocations within that limitation of $686 billion. It is an agreement we made, and we hope the Senate will enable us to keep that agreement.

Madam President, I do not know where the people are who are going to enter into this agreement or take the steps that will be necessary to ensure we finish this bill today, but I very much hope the Senate will agree and follow the suggestion of the chairman of the committee and get the bill done as rapidly as possible.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I thank my distinguished friend, the former chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

I wonder if we might raise a question here concerning the DC appropriations bill. This is another bill that we could act upon, I would think, today. I wonder if we might be able to make some arrangement that will allow us to complete the DC appropriations bill today.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, if the Senator will yield, I understand the negotiations are underway to try to pursue the concept that we previously discussed. That would be a means of trying to report the bill from committee with an amendment. That has not been agreed to yet, but I hope it will be soon. I personally will support that concept. It would be a matter of putting one amendment on the bill as it comes out of committee; and that amendment would be in conference. It is not an amendment that is in the House bill.

So I would hope we would have an opportunity to take that path.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. REID. If the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee will yield, there have been conversations with the distinguished Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON. The only way out of the problem we have is what I talked about with the chairman. If the committee were limited to one amendment, that could happen very quickly. It could come to the floor, and we could finish the bill rapidly at that time.

I also say to my friend from West Virginia that during the votes, significant progress has been made on this bill. I think the light at the end of the tunnel will be able to be seen in a little while.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I thank all Senators who have spoken. I particularly thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS. And I thank the majority whip. I am available if I can be of assistance to him in pursuing this matter. I believe, as he says, we can see the light at the end of the tunnel. There seems to be a willingness on the part of Senators who have an interest in the DC appropriations bill to come to some agreement. As chairman of the committee, if I can be helpful in engineering a reporting from the committee of the House bill with an amendment, I will be happy to be of help.

I thank all Senators for listening. And I particularly thank the managers of the bill for the progress that has been made on the bill thus far.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Iowa, I will be just 2 or 3 minutes.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 739

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 191, S. 739, the Homeless Veterans Program Improvement Act; that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read three times, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I could not hear the request.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleague from West Virginia, I am trying to move matters along as well.

The VA reported that there were 345,000 homeless veterans in 1999. That was 34 percent higher than in 1998. The bill has been reported out of committee by Democrats and Republicans alike with unanimous support, I say to all my colleagues.

It is an annual authorization of $50 million for the Department of Labor program called HVRP, which does provide money to nonprofits to help train homeless veterans.

The second part supports community-based organizations which provide needed social service programs for veterans.

The last piece sets up comprehensive homeless centers in the country's major metropolitan areas. That can be substance abuse counseling, job counseling, and assisted housing.

This is the same bill that is moving in the House. This is my third or fourth time, colleagues, that I have come to this Chamber to ask unanimous consent to pass this bill.

Veterans Day is in the next week or so. We have men and women in harm's way. It is hardly any way to say thanks to veterans not to pass this piece of legislation.

My guess is that over a third of the adult males who are homeless in this country are veterans; many of them are Vietnam veterans. I do not know why in the world this bill is being blocked. I do not know who has put on an anonymous hold. This is my third or fourth time requesting that we pass this bill.

Therefore, one more time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 191, S. 739, the Homeless Veterans Program Improvement Act, with the support of Secretary Principi as well; that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read three times, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Minnesota is a good friend of mine, and I happen to be the only Republican in the Chamber. There is a Republican objection. I do not know who that Republican is, and I can maybe find out for the Senator. But I have to object for a Senator on my side, as long as I am in this position of being the only Republican Senator in this Chamber. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, just one more minute.

I say to my colleague from Iowa, I absolutely understand why he has to object. He is not speaking for himself. I know he is objecting on behalf of someone who is anonymous. I am positive the Senator from Iowa would be the first to support this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter, which is signed by AMVETS, the Disabled American Veterans, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, which basically was addressed to Senator LOTT, saying, move this bill, take objections off, be printed in the RECORD.

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

OCTOBER 25, 2001.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LOTT: On behalf of the co-authors of The Independent Budget, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, we are writing to you, as Minority Leader, to urge you to work with your colleagues to remove holds that have been placed on two pieces of legislation that are important to our Nation's veterans.

These two measures, S. 1188, the ''Department of Veterans Affairs Nurse Recruitment and Retention Enhancement Act of 2001'' and S. 739, the ''Heather French Henry Homeless Veterans Assistance Act,'' are vital pieces of legislation to the men and women who have served in our Armed Forces. With American servicemen and women on guard at home and abroad, we find it difficult to believe that some Senators are placing roadblocks and resorting to delaying tactics on passage of legislation of such great benefit to seriously disabled veterans who have also served their country with distinction. These measures have almost universal support. It is time that they be brought up, and voted upon.

We thank you, in advance, for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. VIOLANTE,
National Legislative Director, Disabled American Veterans.
RICHARD B. FULLER,
National Legislative Director, Paralyzed Veterans of America.
RICK JONES,
National Legislative Director, AMVETS.
DENNIS CULLINAN,
National Legislative Director, Veterans of Foreign War.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Let me also say to my colleague from Iowa—and this is not aimed at him—as I have said, this is the third or fourth time I have come to the floor asking unanimous consent that we pass this legislation. I would