

we get this bill completed, the sooner we can move ahead and try to get it conferenced and resolved.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a brief comment? I want to make sure everyone understands what the majority leader said. We are going to complete this bill and conference reports before we leave this week.

Also, if we complete work on the bill, we could move to the D.C. appropriations bill, but at the very least we are going to complete the conference reports and complete this bill before we leave, no matter how long it takes today or tomorrow.

Mr. SPECTER. Or Saturday.

Mr. REID. Or Saturday.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1601

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand S. 1601 is at the desk and is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1601) to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Clark County, NV, for use as a shooting range.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, S. 1601 having been read for a second time, then I object to any further proceedings at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 3061, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3061) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Daschle amendment No. 2044, to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

Gramm amendment No. 2055 (to amendment No. 2044), to preserve the freedom and constitutional rights of firefighters, law enforcement officers and public safety officers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from New Hampshire is recognized to offer an amendment, on which there shall be 60 minutes debate to be equally divided.

AMENDMENT NO. 2056

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the two managers of the bill in setting up a timeframe for this amendment.

We have discussed this issue innumerable times in this Chamber. This is the issue of whether or not we are going to fund, at the expense of low-income children, school construction. The amendment is very simple. It takes money which is not authorized—in fact, the dollars which are being spent under this school construction account, that authorization was rejected by this Congress, by this Senate on innumerable occasions—it takes the money which is being spent under this appropriations bill, which is therefore not authorized, and moves it into the authorized account of the title I targeted formula, the targeted formula being that formula which benefits low-income children in this country.

The purpose of funding under the Federal education initiatives has basically two goals. Our primary responsibility as a Federal Government involves two basic areas in elementary and secondary school education. The first is special education funding, IDEA funding.

I congratulate this committee and Senator HARKIN and Senator SPECTER for the tremendous job they have done in the area of funding special education. They have added over \$1 billion in the special education accounts. That is very appropriate.

The second primary purpose authorized by the Federal Government and chosen by us as a Congress as to where we were going to focus Federal attention is in helping low-income children be more competitive in their school systems and have an opportunity to succeed along with kids who do not come from low-income families. Thus, we have put an exceptional commitment of resources into those accounts.

Unfortunately, it is a formula which was put in place 6 years ago to target the Federal money for kids who come from low-income backgrounds. It has never been adequately funded—in fact, was never funded at all until this bill. Instead, we have peeled dollar after dollar off for other programmatic activity, which is not the primary thrust of the Federal effort.

Specifically, in the area of school construction, which we have rejected as a purpose of Federal responsibility, it being traditionally the responsibility of the States and the local communities to make the decisions as to what school construction should occur, we have now put in this bill \$925 million for this program of school construction which is not authorized. We have essentially taken that \$925 million away from the title I children—the low-income kids. We have taken it away from the targeted funding formula.

My amendment very simply takes the unauthorized construction money and moves it back to the authorized

new targeted title I formula so that low-income children will get the dollars and the support from the Federal Government.

The practical implications of this for each State are reflected in a chart which is going to be made available to every Member of the Senate, which I hope they will take the time to review. It shows that every State is essentially a winner under this amendment. The new targeted formula, when initially funded by the \$925 million, significantly increases the money under title I that flows to low-income kids for every State.

What is happening under the school construction money? It doesn't go to low-income children. It can go to rich districts. It can go to poor districts. It can go anywhere you want in the school system. It can also go, for example, for the purposes of school safety, which makes it not only unauthorized under this bill but duplicative of the money we already put into the system for school safety in the Commerce-State-Justice bill.

We are spending \$925 million for bricks and mortar. That was a program rejected by both the Senate and the House. It does not have any strong component of poverty in it. This basically can be a welfare-to-rich-district funding mechanism. It is being done at the expense of low-income kids.

We know for a fact that our low-income children simply aren't getting what they need out of the school system. We are about to reauthorize the ESEA bill in an attempt to do a better job with the dollars that are directed to low-income schools. But we know, regrettably, that 70 percent of the children in high-poverty schools score below the most basic levels in reading; that two out of three African-American and Hispanic fourth graders can barely read; in math in high-poverty schools, they remain two grade levels behind their peers; in reading, they are three to four grade levels behind their peers; that half the students in our urban school districts don't graduate at all.

It makes no sense, when we are supposed to be funding a formula targeted for low-income kids who obviously need more support as reflected by those statistics, that we end up instead funding a bricks-and-mortar program that can go to high-end school districts and which is not authorized and which is duplicative of at least three other major programs we have at the Federal level that are authorized and that are funded.

The result of my amendment is essentially this. A State such as Louisiana—I see the Senator from Louisiana in the Chamber—would receive a 21-percent increase as a result of this amendment in their title I count. It would be targeted. A State such as California would receive a 37-percent increase. It would be targeted to the low-income poverty districts and students.

When we pass the ESEA bill on which we reached agreement in conference,