

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. VIANTE,
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

appreciate it if whoever has an anonymous hold on this bill would be willing to step forward. But I want to make it crystal clear to the minority leader, and other colleagues, that I have a hold on every piece of legislation from the other side of the aisle that is not emergency legislation. I have a standing hold on all of your legislation.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before I speak on another subject, I say to the Senator from Minnesota, I hope he knows my practice; when I put a hold on a piece of legislation or an individual, I put a statement in the RECORD as to why I have put on that hold, so you know that it is Senator GRASSLEY who has a hold on that item. I do not approve of Senators putting holds on legislation and not doing it that way. But, on the other hand, I am doing it for whoever that anonymous person is.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator for his courtesy. I know that about him. And I say to the Senator from Iowa, with a twinkle in my eye, I am not putting any anonymous holds on any other legislation he is trying to move. I made it clear on the floor of the Senate, I am putting a hold on all of it unless it is absolutely an emergency.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 1:30 p.m.

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

The Senator from Iowa.

RESPONSE TO ATTACKS ON THE SENATE REPUBLICAN CAUCUS STIMULUS PLAN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to this Chamber to address an issue that was discussed yesterday. I do it because I am the ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee. I want to respond to some Senators on the other side of the aisle—meaning the majority side of the aisle—who have raised concerns about legislation that I have put forth as part of a stimulus package. I put forth this legislation for our Republican caucus in my capacity as former chairman and now ranking member of the Finance Committee. So I want to respond, first, to the majority leader's and Budget Committee chairman's comments about the Senate Republican caucus proposal.

From my point of view, these comments were destructive of bipartisanship. The attacks came yesterday afternoon on the floor, following a news conference that was held on the Capitol grounds. In contrast, while these things were going on yesterday, I spent time working for an agreement that crossed party lines; in other words, for a bipartisan agreement.

In fact, for a number of weeks, the chairman of the Finance Committee,

Senator BAUCUS, and I have been meeting in an attempt to find an agreement on a stimulus package.

Last week, Senator DASCHLE and Senator BAUCUS released a stimulus proposal that, as they indicated, clearly reflected the more liberal part of the Democratic caucus. Senator BAUCUS made it clear that it was basically a negotiating position and that he would be willing to move to the center.

The proposal was released as a position for the Democratic caucus. It was made very clear in statements, well-intentioned on the part of Senator BAUCUS, that it was basically a negotiating position and that he would be willing to move to the center, or saw that as necessary as part of the process to get legislation through the Senate.

In general, Republicans such as myself reacted constructively to the proposal. I was quoted in the press accordingly. I disagreed with the proposal Senator BAUCUS put forward, but I recognized it as an essential part of a process of getting a bill through the Senate. I saw it as a positive step. Quite frankly, I viewed it as a response to the bill that passed the House of Representatives.

On Tuesday of this week, we Republicans responded to the Democratic caucus position with one from our own caucus. From our point of view, it mirrored the President's stimulus plan. What kind of a reception did we get after we released our plan? In this era of bipartisanship and collegiality, something bad happened. The attack dogs were unleashed and with a fury. The same day, Senator DASCHLE harshly attacked our proposal in an extremely partisan, stilted manner.

The next afternoon, which was yesterday, Senator CONRAD was on the floor with the usual props he has—he uses them well—ferociously denouncing the Senate Republican proposal. Rather than recognizing the proposal as part of the process, as we Republicans viewed the Democratic proposal, the Democrats instead have turned up the partisan heat and are trying to torch any real plan that will help our economy and our country.

One has to wonder why we have such a double standard. Why is it that one side obsessively attacks the other, that fault is not found on that side?

Senator DASCHLE, along with Senator LOTT, has exercised leadership since September 11. This had been a most important feature of doing business in Washington, DC, in these times of anxiety while we are trying to win the war on terrorism. The tone, as much as the substance, has been critical to the success of the process.

Senator DASCHLE himself said we should not be “strident” in these times of trying to win a war. So you can imagine my surprise, even anger, and surely disappointment, when I read the tone of Senator DASCHLE's attack on the plan and, frankly, on me in press reports. Basically, Senator DASCHLE accused me of unilaterally stopping the

stimulus process, particularly as it related to Republicans and Democrats working out a bipartisan agreement.

I will read the quote into the RECORD:

We've waited in an effort to try and find a way to work in a bipartisan manner. Unfortunately, as a result of Grassley's decision yesterday . . . that will not be possible, at least in the short run . . .

I focus on Senator DASCHLE's quote because it is a bit ironic. As he was criticizing me, I was preparing for a meeting with Senator BAUCUS on the stimulus package. I guess if you ignore the fact that Democrats put out a partisan package last week, then Senator DASCHLE's quote would make some sense. But, of course, that is not true. So Senator DASCHLE seems to be saying that it is fine for Democrats to put out a caucus position and Republicans to be constructive, but if Republicans respond with our own caucus position, then that is partisanship. The Republican response justifies ramping up the content and the tone of the partisan rhetoric.

The American people expect better. They know a double standard when they see it. Let's get back to the tone Senator DASCHLE set earlier. That is what I am asking for; that is a very good tone.

Let's not descend to name calling, destructive partisan comments, and double standards.

Now I move to Senator CONRAD's attacks which occurred yesterday afternoon. Let me say, this is a preliminary response to Senator CONRAD's attack on the Senate Republican caucus plan. I will have a lot more to say on that later, particularly after I get some figures back from the Joint Committee on Taxation.

Senator CONRAD spent a lot of time yesterday developing charts that were critical of Senate Republican caucus positions which he personalized by calling it the Grassley plan. He personalized his attacks, and that should be avoided. He decided to appoint himself as the teacher and accordingly grade everyone's economic stimulus proposal. That is fine. He has that right. I don't have a problem with that. If he is going to be the grader, though, I think he needs to be objective. He needs to treat those plans that he opposes the same way he treats those plans he supports. He does not do that.

The report card Senator CONRAD used yesterday is not the whole set of principles upon which the budgeteers agreed.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a copy of the budgeteers' documents.

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

PRINCIPLES FOR ECONOMIC STIMULUS

The Chairmen and Ranking Members of the House and Senate Budget Committees recognize the extraordinary circumstances resulting from the September 11, 2001 attacks on our country. These terrorist attacks have created a national emergency, instigated a war on terrorism, and exacerbated