

immigrate. That leaves only spouses and minor children, who could immigrate only if their sponsors meet new income requirements.

(2) Fiscal responsibility. "Controlling spending is the primary means to controlling the deficit," states the Contract, yet the House immigration bill carries several big ticket items. First, up to \$80 million would be needed to return fees paid by petitioners whose siblings or adult children have received permission to immigrate but who will be cut off the waiting list if the bill passes in its present form. Second, estimates by the Cato Institute, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Social Security Administration reveal that hundreds of millions of dollars would eventually be needed to pay new and current federal bureaucrats to staff, maintain and clean up the proposed computer verification system. The system is designed to check the legal status of new private and public sector hires via telephone or modem. Third, the federal government will assume the potentially quite large liability for compensating any individual who loses a job or wages from being wrongfully denied employment due to an error under the new employment verification system.

(3) Rolling back government regulations. The Contract notes, "To free Americans from bureaucratic red tape, we will require every new regulation to stand a new test: Does it provide benefits worth the cost? To help our cities and states, we will ban unfunded mandates." The bill's various new mandates on cities, counties and states, including requiring such entities to verify new hires through a federal computer system, violate the intent of the recently passed Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, which requires that new mandates be paid for.

According to the Justice Department report on the nine-company pilot project that the bill's new computer system is based upon, compliance cost for companies using the system has averaged \$5,000 annually. During the Judiciary Committee markup, Republicans defeated an amendment to stop the computer system if a GAO study found the new program cost small businesses more than \$5,000 a year to implement. However, even this figure understates the true cost to businesses, since the pilot project allowed companies to check the legal status of only self-identified immigrants, while the House bill requires companies to check citizens as well. As for the cost-benefit analysis for new regulations recommended in the Contract, any benefit from this new system is only hypothetical, since there is no evidence this new mandate on businesses will reduce illegal immigration.

(4) Individual liberty. The Contract criticized the "Clinton Congress" when it argued, "Big Brother is alive and well through myriad government programs." In committee, Ohio Republican Rep. Steve Chabot attempted to delete the computer system from the bill, calling it 1-800-BIG BROTHER, but his effort lost on a 17-15 vote. He promises to fight the measure on the House floor.

Advocates of individual liberty should at least question any program that would centralize data on all Americans in a place where future social engineers can wreak havoc on the citizenry. Senate legislation attempts to ensure that only Americans and legal residents are listed in the computer system by requiring that everyone be fingerprinted or provide other biometric data (such as a retina scan) to "personalize" birth certificates by age 16. The House bill moves in that direction by mandating a study of "counterfeit-resistant" birth certificates. Moreover, at least one computer system supporter in the House has said the

system will not work without some type of national ID card.

Supporters of smaller government and family values will find that the House immigration bill violates the spirit, indeed the essence, of the Contract. It also contradicts Majority Leader Dick Armey's vision of a freedom revolution and Speaker Newt Gingrich's desire to create a "Conservative Opportunity Society." The immigration bill's provisions against families, the mandates on businesses, cities and states, and the specter of creating yet another uncontrollable government program should give pause to reformers. These measures would represent business as usual, not the Republican Revolution promised by the "Contract With America."

[From the Alexis de Tocqueville Institution,
Arlington, VA]

BUSINESS: IMMIGRATION HELPS NOT HURTS

We are concerned that legislation on immigration before the Congress will significantly damage U.S. economic growth, jobs, and competitiveness. It seems to proceed from the assumption that immigration is a mild ill which can only be tolerated to a degree. Yet far from being a drain on U.S. society or the economy, immigrants are a vital engine.

Immigrants generally pay more to the U.S. government in taxes than they use in services, as a number of studies have shown. In fact, a sudden drop in immigration levels would sharply reduce Social Security revenues.

Immigrants play a key role in product and technological development, the cutting edge of U.S. industrial growth. Many of our fastest-growing firms, and largest exporters, employ a significant share of immigrants in research and overseas marketing. Most of them cannot be replaced, and their loss would mean the loss of thousands of other jobs for Americans. Each year, many immigrants, some of them at our firms, obtain patents for products and processes that generate jobs, growth, indeed entire industries.

Immigrants own a significant share of small businesses. These small businesses are the engine of jobs growth in the U.S.: As a number of studies have shown, a large number of new jobs are generated by the smallest U.S. firms. Often these small operations become the driving force by which whole communities and cities are revived: Cuban renewal of Jersey City; the Vietnamese corridor of Arlington, Virginia; prosperous Asian communities throughout California.

On balance, a survey of Nobel economists released by the Alexis de Tocqueville Institution showed near-unanimous agreement immigration is a major economic plus.

Of course, we believe measures to increase the costs and complexity of hiring immigrants, and to reduce ceilings on such hirings, and other measures pose a special threat to American competitiveness. But we recognize that restrictions on family reunification, refugees, and other categories not labeled as economic are vitally important as well. Workers have husbands, wives and children. Many present employers came to this country not as major business executives, but as victims of persecution, famine or civil war. If these categories, or general immigration levels, are reduced, economic immigration will suffer, too.

U.S. immigration policy could certainly be improved, and illegal immigration brought under more reasonable control (without national databases and i.d. cards). But the core of any reform should involve extension and refinement of present immigration levels, not tighter restrictions. And it should be based on the understanding that high levels

of immigration are no liability; they are part of America's strength.

John Whitehead, former co-chairman, Goldman Sachs, former deputy secretary of state

George Soros, president, Soros Fund Management

Kenneth Tomlinson, editor-in-chief, Reader's Digest, former Director, Voice of America

Richard Gilder, Gilder, Gagnon and Howe
Lewis Eisenberg, co-chairman, Granite Capital International Group

Cliff Sobel, CEO, Bon Art International
Ed Zschau, International Business Machines

Donna Fitzpatrick, president and CEO, Radiance Services Company

Dr. J. Robert Beyster, chairman and CEO, Science Applications International Corporation

Lawrence Hunter, president, Business Leadership Council

Barton M. Biggs, chairman, Morgan Stanley

Jerry Junkins, chairman, President and CEO, Texas Instruments

T.J. Rodgers, president and CEO, Cypress Semiconductor

Felix Rohatyn, managing director, Lazard Freres & Co.

Mortimer Zuckerman, chairman and editor-in-chief, U.S. News and World Report

Lee Iacocca

Thomas Weisel, chairman, Montgomery Securities

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1995

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 noon, Wednesday, November 15; that following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask further that tomorrow, from 12 to 12:30, there be a period for morning business, with a 5-minute time limitation.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we hope to turn to S. 908 tomorrow, the State Department reorganization bill, under a 4-hour time limitation. It is also possible that the Senate may consider a continuing resolution or debt limit extension, if received from the House. The Senate may also turn to any available appropriations conference reports.

I hope that we can go to S. 908. Certainly, it has been controversial, and it has been discussed and discussed. I think now we have some agreement between the Senator from North Carolina, Senator HELMS, and the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY. If we can complete that, it might free up some of the nominations and also some

of the conferees that I understand are being held because this has not been disposed of. We can check on that tomorrow.

I also indicate that, as far as this Senator knows—we have checked on the House side—there will not be a reason to stay in this evening. So there will not be a CR coming to us from the House. There was an offer made by Senator DOMENICI and Congressman KASICH to members from the White House representing the President earlier today. I am not certain if that offer has been rejected.

In any event, we will be back tomorrow. It is my hope that we will continue to work, as we have today and yesterday and through the evening and past midnight last night, to come to some agreement and pass a continuing

resolution, which will avoid any longer shutdown of the Government.

I believe much of what transpired, of course, will be up to the President of the United States. If he is prepared to sign on to a 7-year balanced budget, then we can do business very quickly.

As I said earlier, in a brief 5-minute appearance at the White House, I think the President used the term “balanced budget” at least five, six, seven, eight times, about how strong he was for it, and that he wanted a balanced budget. Well, if he wants a balanced budget, then I see no reason he cannot accept our proposal, which would eliminate the Medicare provision and keep some of the spending restraints and also add balanced budget language.

I hope the President would look at it carefully. He has indicated in the past, in 1992, he was for a 5-year balanced

budget; since then, for 10 years, 9 years, 8 years, or 7 years, or maybe none of the above, but he has indicated flexibility.

If he is serious about a balanced budget amendment or getting a balanced budget by the year 2002, I see no reason we cannot only pass a continuing resolution, but the debt ceiling extension very quickly.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOLE. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order until 12 noon, Wednesday, November 15, 1995.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:37 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, November 15, 1995, at 12 noon.