

our U.S. immigration laws would be to improve the effectiveness of the current law against the knowing employment of aliens not authorized to work or even to be present in this country. The passing of a bill such as S. 269 would be a monumental step toward making that contribution.

In the coming weeks, I will make additional statements to this body, describing other provisions of S. 269 and exactly why those provisions are important. Hearings will begin at the end of that period in the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration, which I chair. And a fine group of Members are on that subcommittee, Democrat and Republican alike. I look forward to working with my ranking member, Senator KENNEDY. He and I have worked together on immigration issues for 17 years.

Hearings will be held. We will consider all other immigration reform legislation from all of my colleagues, comprehensive, bipartisan, as well as specific proposals such as this one for the accuracy of a more fraud-resistant system for issuing these documents. We have to look into the one for issuing of birth certificates and matching records. Can Senators believe we do not even match birth and death records?

I sincerely look forward to hearing the ideas of my fine colleagues on these issues. Then we will be able to avoid things that are bringing down the system, things that give rise to the power of the force of proposition 187.

It reminded me of the story of the child who was at the graveyard in a jurisdiction noted for rather shabby election processes. Pick your own State, as you might imagine. The child was crying, and the person came up and said, "Son, why are you crying?" And he said, "I just learned that my dad came back to vote, and I never even saw him."

So we do want to try to avoid that in the future, because people use these cards to vote, to vote themselves largess from the Treasury, to then draw on our resources that we taxpayers—legal taxpayers—provide. That must stop. There is a way to stop it. We propose that. I would enjoy working and will enjoy, as I always have, working with all of my colleagues on this most serious issue. We are very dedicated to this process. I intend to spend a great deal of time and effort in these next months in doing responsible immigration reform—not only illegal immigration, but legal immigration.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may use

time from that under Senator DASCHLE's control.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, last year, Congress spent an enormous amount of time considering health care reform. After the debate came to a close, after all the posturing, speeches, and amendments, we failed to produce a health care bill. The greatest disappointment of the 103d Congress was our failure to enact health care reform. Millions of Americans are without health care, millions more are underinsured, and countless others are only a paycheck away from losing health care coverage. The crisis in our health care system will simply not go away.

Thirty-nine million Americans are uninsured. Last year, an additional 1 million Americans lost health insurance. If we don't enact legislation this Congress, the number of uninsured will continue to rise. I commend the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE for recognizing this dire need and for leading the U.S. Senate into the crafting of some form of health insurance for the people of America.

In Hawaii, we have solved the problems of affordability and access. Hawaii has achieved the American health care dream—near-universal health care coverage for its citizens at a cost that is 25–30 percent below the national average. For 20 years, Hawaii has maintained a model health care system. We have one of the healthiest populations in the Nation. A study by the Journal of the American Medical Association found that Hawaii has one of the lowest infant mortality rates. Deaths from chronic health problems such as cancer, heart disease, and lung disease are also among the lowest in the Nation.

Nearly everyone in Hawaii has some form of health insurance, so these life threatening conditions are detected earlier, which reduces premature death and shortens hospital visits. Because our population has ready access to a primary care physician, we use hospital emergency rooms only half as often as other States.

There is no reason why the rest of the Nation should settle for anything less than what Hawaii enjoys. Americans do not want a Band-Aid approach to health care reform. They do not want a medisave program or a savings account approach to health care. They want real, tangible health care that gives coverage when they need it. By developing a bipartisan consensus, we can take major steps to contain costs, expand choice, and increase access to care.

Hawaii has enjoyed its health care program, and we hope that we can extend this to the rest of the Nation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from New Jersey.

DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes this morning to review and comment on action taken this week by the House of Representatives during consideration of the defense supplemental.

I am deeply concerned by the legislation that the House is sending us. It is, in my view, deficient in at least three respects.

First, it spends too much money. The administration asked for a \$2.6 billion in emergency defense spending to pay for operations already undertaken in the past in Somalia, Rwanda, Bosnia, Southwest Asia, Haiti, and Cuba. The House approved that, but it also added an extra \$680 million that neither the administration nor the Pentagon requested.

Even Defense Secretary Perry has said the Pentagon, and I quote him, "has higher priority bills that should be funded first," and that the Pentagon would seek to reallocate money from existing defense funds in the spring to pay some of the \$680 million worth of bills that the House wants to fund immediately. Since there is no urgent need for these unrequested funds, I see no reason to provide them in a supplemental.

My first point then, Mr. President, is simply the additional \$680 million should be stricken out when the Appropriations Committee considers this legislation.

Second, I am not yet persuaded—and I sit on the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee—that all of the \$2.6 billion that the administration did ask for ought to be funded necessarily in the supplemental. A supplemental request is supposed to be reserved for unexpected and unanticipated exigencies. However, at least some of the administration's request appears to be for normal or routine or expected expenses, like the no-fly zone over Bosnia and Iraq, which has been underway for years. If we are to really reform the budget process, we have to prevent agencies from low-balling their initial requests because they believe they can always come back and ask for more later in a supplemental. It is kind of a habit that we have gotten into, and I do not think it is a particularly good one. We need to insist that the military, like every other agency, submit budget requests sufficient to cover predictable expenses.

And third, I am concerned about the offsets the House used to pay for this supplemental. Now, I agree that we should offset expenditures whenever

possible. Even though this request can be treated as an emergency, which would allow the spending to be added to the deficit, it makes sense to offset as much as we can. It makes sense to cancel or cut programs that are wasteful or lack merit, but I strongly object to some of the cuts that the House made.

To begin with, the House of Representatives got about half of its offsets from nondefense programs at a time when it is already moving to make deep cuts in domestic programs. We read about them every day now. The House intends to rescind about \$17 billion from nondefense spending in the next few weeks. The domestic side of the budget is getting slaughtered, and I cannot justify taking money from already depleted domestic accounts to pay for defense spending when the defense budget is the only one being protected.

We ought not cut domestic programs to provide funding for defense especially when we have not examined carefully every Pentagon program. We ought to, to the extent we can, fund this internally, find the offsets within the Pentagon's own budget.

Mr. President, for many years, the defense budget was protected by a wall that prevented the Congress from raiding defense to pay for underfunded domestic programs, and some of the strongest defenders of the so-called budget wall when it protected defense now want to rip it down rather than allow it to protect domestic programs. Members of Congress who supported such a wall must recognize that it works both ways. Just as it kept money from going out of defense to the domestic budget, it should keep funds from being transferred out of domestic and into the defense budget.

So I am profoundly bothered by the notion of paying for any of this defense supplemental with cuts in nondefense spending. If offsets are necessary, the Senate ought to examine the Pentagon's budget, make tough decisions and cut funding for lower priority defense programs.

Now, I think there are plenty of low-priority programs that exist there, but if the Pentagon does not agree then the threat of internal cuts might give it an incentive to explore other alternatives, and I will give you an example. One is to have our allies pay their fair share of our costs of being represented in those countries where we help provide a defense mechanism for them as well as for the world at large.

The bill already contains over \$300 million in such contributions. We can and we should get more. That is what happened in the Persian Gulf conflict, and that is what ought to happen here now as well.

But, Mr. President, if in the end we cannot find enough outside contributions or internal defense cuts to fully pay for this supplemental, then we ought to declare the remainder an emergency as the law allows.

Under the rules of the budget process and common sense, we can, if we must, say that emergency spending should be added to the deficit, and that is what the American public does when they face an emergency in their own lives; when a family member gets sick, they do not deny themselves medical care just because it has to go on a credit card. The same reasoning ought to apply to the Federal Government. And I see no reason to insist on fiscal purity in dealing with this supplemental especially when it is already mathematically unbalanced.

As Congressman OBEY, the ranking member on the House Appropriations Committee, pointed out, the supplemental the House passed is balanced only in terms of budget authority. Now, the distinguished occupant of the chair sits on the Budget Committee with me, and we clearly know the difference between outlays and budget authority.

In terms of outlays—the actual money that we spend—this supplemental adds \$282 million to the deficit this year and \$644 million to the deficit each year over 5 years. In terms of fiscal purity, this bill is already sullied, so that no ideological argument can be properly raised against overtly declaring some of this bill an emergency.

Mr. President, as the Senate considers the House-passed supplemental, I hope we are going to modify it in ways that I have suggested. I think it is important that the public be aware of what happens when we rely on domestic programs to fund some of the Defense Department's needs—not that each should not get its fair consideration. But too often the term “domestic programs” obscures the real mission that we undertake. When we see these days that child nutrition programs are being either cut or withdrawn, when we see programs for education in our country, a vital part of our development, our competitive opportunities in the future and to stabilize our society, are being cut, in many ways, Mr. President, I think the domestic programs offer us as much by way of defense of what we care about in our country as does the military budget.

So as we review this, I do not believe the argument that says we are going to weaken our defenses, we are going to reduce our strength applies. We need to build our strength in our domestic programs as well as our military programs.

Mr. President, I hope we will be able to look at this, modify our view on whether or not the House of Representatives supplemental as it is being offered is something that we should accept as is. We ought to make the changes we feel are necessary to provide for both major parts of our budget.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on leaders' time.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, my comments on health care begin with a thank you to the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, for insisting that health care reform top our legislative agenda in 1995. It would have been easy for Senator DASCHLE to ignore an issue that has obviously gone from very hot to very cold in the wink of a political eye.

In fact, Mr. President, as I was thinking about what it was I was going to say in response to Senator DASCHLE's invitation to come here this morning, I thought of a tune that I learned in my childhood. I was, unfortunately, unable to locate the junior Senator from New York, who I am sure would have come here and sung it for me here on the floor, so I will have to resort to reading it instead of singing it. But the song goes:

Where or where has my little dog gone
Oh where oh where can he be
With his tail cut short and his ears down
long
Oh where oh where can he be?

Where has the health care issue gone? Did all those uninsured Americans get coverage while I was out campaigning for reelection? Did the horror stories cure themselves? Did the market fix the whole darn thing? Or did we just grow weary of having to educate the American people on a subject too attractive for even the amateur demagogue to resist?

Last year, as we struggled against the odds, to hold together a group of Republican and Democratic Senators who saw health care reform as moral and economic imperative I said:

In our hearts, where we are able to understand the need for health care security, and in our heads, where the numbers are calculated, we know the status quo is not acceptable.

What was true last year is even more true this year. There are still tens of millions of Americans who work but who cannot afford to bury health insurance. There is still forecast a staggering and unaffordable increase in Federal health care spending over the next 10 years. The impressive and unprecedented change in the marketplace while giving us hope that costs can be controlled has not altered the need for reform. And, the horror of job lock, lack of portability, and fear of uninsurability are still tormenting millions of our citizens.

Unfortunately for these Americans they do not represent a majority, or even a powerful enough minority. The majority are comfortably and temporarily able bodied, fully insured, and employed. And, the majority has been led incorrectly to believe that the status quo is just fine.