



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1995

No. 35

## Senate

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1995)

The Senate met at 9:45 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The prayer this morning will be offered by the Reverend Dr. Ernest R. Gibson, pastor of the First Rising Mount Zion Baptist Church, Washington, DC.

### PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Ernest R. Gibson, pastor of the First Rising Mount Zion Baptist Church, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

*When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; What is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet. \* \* \* O Lord our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth!—Psalm 8:3-6, 9.*

Lord, Thou hast given to us, Your human creatures, such awesome responsibilities. Be near unto Your servants here in the Senate when the burden is especially heavy. Lord, give peace in times of confusion, comfort in times of anxiety, and direction in times of doubt. May Thine own power and spirit be in Your servants so that as they exercise dominion over things Thou hast placed in their care, may "Thy will be done."

In the name of Him who taught us to pray, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.—Matthew 6:10. Amen.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for not to extend beyond the hour of 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

### RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

#### SCHEDULE

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, for the information for my colleagues, this morning the time for the two leaders has been reserved and there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until the hour of 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each, with the following Senators to speak for up to these designated times: Senator DASCHLE for 20 minutes; Senator SIMPSON, 20 minutes; Senator LAUTENBERG, 10 minutes; Senator BURNS, 15 minutes.

At the hour of 11 a.m., the Senate will resume consideration of House Joint Resolution 1, the constitutional balanced budget amendment. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, Senators will have until 3 o'clock today in order to offer their amendments to the resolution.

There will be no rollcall votes during today's session of the Senate. Senators should be on notice that any rollcall votes ordered on amendments today will be ordered to occur stacked in the sequence of votes beginning at 2:15 on Tuesday, February 28.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

### DEFENSE BUDGET AND BRAC

Mr. BURNS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise today not only in support of the balanced budget amendment, but also to bring the attention of this body to some activities and some events in this Government that I find very disconcerting.

As we look at the budgets of the different organizations and programs this Government sponsors, and is charged to do so, I am concerned about the defense budget. It has been cut far too deeply, far too soon, as we have put too much focus, maybe, on some of the domestic issues and are too hesitant to look at the future security of this country.

The defense budget is constantly being raided for unrelated purposes, research and development programs are shortchanged, and even the procurement of weapons has been neglected. The cost is a collapse of near-term readiness and, of course, what I fear probably we are moving toward is a hollow force. So far, the administration and the Congress have not been willing to spend enough to maintain a well-prepared military force.

Defense advisers to President Clinton acknowledge that the Pentagon is some \$49 billion short of the amount needed to fund their planned force for fiscal years 1996 through 2001. GAO, the General Accounting Office, determined the shortfall was actually \$150 billion over that same period.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3071

The numbers all point to the same thing—an ill-trained, underequipped, and demoralized U.S. military force.

It is time to restore America's military strength and readiness. Obviously, Congress needs to look at increased funding for the military. But it also has to take a look at U.S. defense policy and how those dollars are spent. Congress needs to look at priorities, on how it is spent, on what weapons, and where we want this country to be 20 years from now, and we need to force the administration to stick to those policies.

The administration needs to examine the number and level of military commitments that U.S. forces undertake. The U.S. Armed Forces right now must have the necessary funds to fulfill the missions that they have been given.

The problem is funds that should be used for readiness have been diverted. That GAO study cites that between fiscal 1990 and 1993, \$10.4 billion out of the defense budget was used for such activities as World Cup Soccer and the Summer Olympics. In the fiscal years 1990 to 1994, total defense spending fell 25 percent, while nondefense spending rose 361 percent. So it is time to put some of the priorities on how we spend those dollars back into the budget.

Just as alarming is the new trend of raiding the Defense Department's budget for "operations other than war." U.S. troops involvement in U.N. peacekeeping missions around the world put an immense strain on the already tight defense budget.

President Clinton proposed spending \$246 billion for defense for fiscal year 1996. It is now up to the Congress to take a serious look at the U.S. defense policy and come up with a realistic defense budget.

After years of cuts in the defense budget and a drawdown of forces, we have to look at where we are, where we should be, and where we want to be.

So the Defense Department budget has fallen steadily for 10 years since 1985. The procurement amount has fallen 65 percent over the same period. The reduction of U.S. Armed Forces generally has been too deep and, yes, too fast.

Over the last 10 years, infrastructure has only been cut 15 percent. That is compared to draconian cuts in weapons and equipment procurement, research and development, and force structure.

If the United States had maintained a realistic defense budget, we would not be looking at another round of base closings and realignments. We would have a fully ready and well-equipped military force ready to handle any eventuality.

The defense budget has been stretched too thin and now it is our bases that will pay the price. Bases around the country, bases instrumental to our national defense, will be scrutinized and possibly closed and given new missions.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, in my home State of Montana, is one of those

bases that will be looked at in this round of BRAC. Malmstrom is an important cog in the base structure and is an integral part of the city of Great Falls, MT, and to the rest of the State.

It is too bad that we get mixed up in our priorities regarding this defense budget, and bases such as Malmstrom could be lost in the shuffle.

Mr. President, with a great deal of concern that I ask my colleagues to look closely at our defense policy and where our priorities lie for the Defense Department and the U.S. Armed Forces in this coming fiscal year.

Yes, we sit here and debate a balanced budget amendment and we have heard all of the-sky-is-falling fears that has come out of this debate. It will still make us set our priorities and reevaluate the mission of government and what the role of government really should be, especially at the Federal level.

I happen to believe the protection of our shores and a strong national defense is very important to the security of this country and, yes, those children of the future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NICKLES). The Senator from Wyoming. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is recognized to speak for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Chair.

#### THE IMMIGRANT CONTROL AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1995

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I return here to a familiar refrain, a theme revisited, not, as has my good friend from Montana, with regard to the balanced budget amendment or base closing. Those are critical issues we will face in these next weeks. But there is one that we will face that is rather awesome in nature, too, and that is the issue of illegal immigration.

Mr. President, on January 24 I introduced S. 269, the Immigrant Control and Financial Responsibility Act of 1995. At that time I presented to my colleagues and to the American people a rather general overview of the bill.

Today I wish to describe in greater detail one particular part of this legislation—the requirement for a new system to verify eligibility to work in the United States and to receive benefits under certain government-funded programs of public assistance.

Let me speak first about the urgent need for effective enforcement of the current law against knowingly employing aliens in U.S. jobs for which they are not authorized, and about the simple fact that such law cannot ever effectively be enforced without a more reliable system to verify work authorization. After explaining clearly why a new system is needed, I will describe to you the provisions of S. 269 which will require—no, demand—the implementation of such a system.

#### NEED FOR EMPLOYER SANCTIONS

Mr. President, it has been recognized for so many years—I would hunch for as long as there has been interest in the issue, and that is quite a time—that the primary magnet for most illegal immigrants is the availability of jobs that pay so much better than what is available in their home countries. It is also widely recognized that satisfactory prevention of illegal border entry is most unlikely to be achieved solely by patrolling the very long U.S. border. That border of the United States is over 7,000 miles on land and 12,000 miles along what is technically called "coastline." Furthermore—and heed this or hear it—the real sea border consists of over 80,000 miles of what the experts at the Nautical Charting Division of the National Ocean Service call "shoreline," including the shoreline of the outer coast, offshore islands, sounds, bays, and other major inlets. And patrol of the border is, of course, totally inadequate to deal with foreign nationals who enter the United States legally—for example, as tourists or students—and then choose openly, blatantly to violate the terms of their visa, by not leaving when their visa expires or by working at jobs for which they are not authorized.

Therefore, every authoritative study I have seen has recommended a provision such as that in the 1986 immigration reform law, making it unlawful to employ illegal aliens—those who entered the United States illegally and those violating the terms of their visa. These studies include that of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy, on which I served over 10 years ago, and the Commission on Immigration Reform, now doing such fine and consistent work. They are doing beautiful work under the able chairman, former Congresswoman Barbara Jordan.

Such studies also recognize that an employer sanctions law cannot possibly be effective without a reliable and easy-to-use methods for employers to verify work authorization.

Accordingly, the 1986 law instituted an interim verification system. This system was designed to use documents which were then available, even though most of them were not resistant to tampering or counterfeiting. Not only that, but it is surprisingly easy and totally simple to obtain genuine documents, including a birth certificate. Thus, we believed then that the system would most likely need to be significantly improved. In fact, the law called for "studies" of telephone verification systems and counterfeit-resistant Social Security cards.

Unfortunately, the interim system is still in place today, over 8 years later. This is true even though—as many of us feared and which certainly came to pass—there is widespread fraud in its use.