

and she burned well over 6 million acres of land, land whose forests will now take decades and sometimes generations to restore or replace themselves.

First of all, we must permit active management of these forests. We must reduce forest fuels to restrict the size of the fires and cool their intensity. Some scratch their heads and say, "What are you talking about, Senator? Fires are hot."

That is right, but some fires are hotter than others. And when you have phenomenal fuel buildup of the kind we have seen because of the dead and dying trees on these forest floors, and ignored because of the absence of management, these fires are intensively hotter than the normal fires that oftentimes amble through a forest burning shrubbery but not destroying and killing the trees. Those normal fires are the fires of Mother Nature of decades ago, those are the fires that periodically cleansed our forests. But these cleansing fires were not the fires of the summer of 1996.

Would it not make more sense to take the preventive action that I am talking about? Of course, we could do that. First we must permit, as I have mentioned, the active management of our forests. We must reduce the fuels. One needed activity is salvage timber removal, and my guess is we will be back on this floor later this year, and probably the first of next year, asking for flexibility to do salvage on some of these 6 million burned acres. There will be Senators on this floor who will say, "But environmental groups do not want this; it would be destructive." And so we would let hundreds of millions of dollars in trees then rot and wash away, and we would not replenish our funds to replant and regenerate our forests. For the life of me, I cannot understand how that is good business, good environmental business, good economic business, for that matter, or just good management. It is, in fact, poor management, poor management at its very worst.

Let me close by asking the cooperation of the Senate, whether it is the passage of my forest health legislation or whether it is just the simple awakening to the situation that exists in the western forests of today, a situation that is largely our doing, largely our doing because we have been so good at putting out fires over the last 30 years that we have now created the circumstance which creates the extraordinary, the unusual, the dramatic fires that we saw in the West this summer.

So I hope that we recognize an emergency exists, and if we created it, we ought to be able to manage it. The science of forestry today argues that we can, but it is not a science of ignorance or a science of turning your back. It is a science that demands the kind of active management that the U.S. Forest Service and its professionals know how to use, if they would only be allowed to do so.

Frankly, it is not the science of this administration, which has passively ignored the problem because of the pressure placed upon them by certain environmental groups to do nothing and walk away. In Idaho and the rest of the Western States over the next decade, doing nothing and walking away will simply create another summer of 1996 over and over again. Millions of acres will be burned, houses and private property will be lost, and the debt will mount, a debt that the public owes for fighting these fires in an effort to save the resource and save private lands and private resources. We can avoid this. We can avoid this by wise and responsible management.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. 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. SIMPSON. Mr. President, what is the time situation and the procedure situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business right now is we are in morning business until 2 o'clock; between 12 and 1 it is under the control of Senator DASCHLE, and then, from 1 until 2 o'clock, morning business will be under the control of Republicans.

Mr. SIMPSON. With that, Mr. President, and a thank you to my friend from Montana, Senator BURNS, because I will take a few minutes, and then perhaps 5 minutes of the time under our administration will go to him. I will not take 15; I may take 7—maybe.

Mr. BURNS. You can take as much as you want.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, that was a noble comment from my friend from Montana. Absolutely the generosity matches only his magnanimous smile, and I love it. I will just continue now for an hour and 40—no, excuse me. That just slipped. It slipped away for a moment. That is the trouble with me, Mr. President. I take my work seriously but not myself. That can get you in a lot of difficulty in life, but that is still the best way to fly.

Mr. BURNS. I thank my colleague.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION REFORM AND IMMIGRANT RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I want to speak on the issue of illegal immigration. Not legal immigration; that issue is not before this body. I know how to legislate. It was very clear this body did not wish to deal with legal immigration. That will be for others who come after me, Democrats and Republicans alike, to deal with that very tough issue. But, on Wednesday of last

week, the House appointed conferees to the conference on the immigration bill, the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. That is legislation that passed both Houses of the Congress by overwhelming margins. There were only three votes against this very popular bill in the Senate. I think the vote was 97 to 3. The House version passed by a vote of 333 to 87.

Our fine majority leader and the House majority leader have each stated that passing immigration reform legislation in this Congress is a priority. Senator Bob Dole, a man for whom I have the richest admiration and respect—I served as his assistant—was always a very strong supporter of responsible immigration reform issues, all such measures, and candidate Dole has always expressed his support for the present illegal immigration control bill.

The conference committee will meet this week, but already we are hearing about a plan now to filibuster the conference report here in the Senate. We all received a letter, of course, from the President, explicitly threatening a veto. That is common knowledge. His reason is clear to him and clear to many others, and that is the so-called Gallegly amendment.

But I would refresh and remind my colleagues why this legislation received such strong bipartisan support in both Houses.

This legislation is to strengthen the border enforcement by nearly doubling the size of the Border Patrol.

It will ensure that aliens who commit serious crimes are detained upon their release from prison until they can be deported, and then they will be deported under expedited procedures.

It will provide prompt decisions for those who apply for asylum and ensure that those who genuinely fear persecution at home can remain here.

It will create an expedited removal process, so that those who seek to enter the United States surreptitiously or with fraudulent documents can be promptly deported and not allowed to stay here for years while pursuing various frivolous appeals at all levels and in all forums, administrative and judicial.

It will ensure that the sponsor and not the U.S. taxpayer will be primarily responsible for providing financial support to new immigrants in need.

And it will provide for voluntary pilot programs on systems to enable employers and welfare providers more reliably to identify those who are eligible to work or to receive benefits in this country.

The most controversial portion of the bill, of course, the one that gave rise to the veto threat and the filibuster plan caper, is the so-called Gallegly amendment, which authorizes the States to decide whether or not to provide a free public education to illegal persons, illegal aliens—a proposal which in its

present form is presented to the conferees as including some rather extensive changes to that provision. Some say it does not matter what you do to that provision, it is not appropriate. That may assuredly be so, and yet that is called legislating and it is about discussing and amending.

So it is now worded so that at least those who are opposed to any form of illegal immigration reform are not now able to say that we are "kicking schoolchildren out into the streets." No one I know is interested in "kicking children out into the streets." I certainly am not, and I have always had some serious problems with regard to aspects of the Gallegly amendment, but if that is what is to be in this conference report in this form, in its amended form, then it is certainly acceptable to me.

The proposal contains generous "grandfathering" provisions for those students now in school. They will be permitted to continue their education in the elementary or secondary school in which they are now enrolled at no charge. If they wish to change school districts in the same State or advance from elementary to secondary school, they may do so upon paying tuition, or a fee equal to the actual cost that others who are citizens pay within that district for their education.

Furthermore, the proposed change will ensure that unless the Congress is given an opportunity to vote on repealing this provision in 30 months, the provision will sunset—be gone. At the end of the 60 months, if a bill to repeal the measures is introduced there must be a vote within 90 days or the provision will sunset—be gone.

Those changes to moderate the provision were negotiated by Senators HATCH and SPECTER. They represent, obviously, substantial modifications to the elements that were there originally that were apparently the most objectionable. I believe they might be sufficient to make the bill acceptable to those who truly want illegal immigration control legislation.

But there are some very disappointing signals, I share with my colleagues, some very disappointing signals from the Dole campaign. I think that my fine leader, who I served as assistant for those 10 years—a most wonderfully decent man—is being ill-served on this issue. If what I read in the papers and hear through the media is true, and those who know me please believe that it is, indeed, always taken with a huge grain of salt by me as to what is in the media—indeed, that will always be so, hopefully—but I am informed he is being advised by those who advise these people who choose to submit themselves to seek the role of the Office of Presidency—that he is being advised simply to let the bill die. And the reason for that, apparently, is so, as I gather it, that the President will not have a Rose Garden ceremony with regard to illegal immigration; that apparently because the President

had a Rose Garden ceremony with regard to welfare reform and with regard to health care and with regard to, I guess, anything else that he signs, that somehow this then cripples the effort of my friend, Bob Dole.

Thus it is rather extraordinary to me that those on my side of the aisle often accuse this administration of cynical politics and yet I can't imagine anything more cynical than not signing an illegal immigration bill or working for its passage—something that was passed by such overwhelming margins—on the basis that it is simply going to "help the incumbent" turning our backs on the singular issue that is reflected in polls across the country for years, and that is to "do something" about illegal immigration.

There is and always has been overwhelming public support for measures to reduce illegal immigration. Both candidate Dole and President Clinton have stated their support for illegal immigration control legislation. I say to my colleagues, it is in the national interest to achieve control over our borders, to achieve control over illegal immigration and the misuse of our most generous public support and welfare programs that so burden the taxpayers of this country.

When we have 60 percent of the live births in a certain hospital in California attributed to illegal undocumented mothers who then give birth to a U.S. citizen; when we have people who are minorities who go to seek public support because they need it and are then told that the cupboard is bare because it has all gone to illegal, undocumented persons, that stirs people up. They don't like it, and it really shouldn't be the guiding policy of anything we do here, but it is the way it is.

So I just say, apparently the scenario is this now. I gather in my wisdom: Pass the bill in the House with the Gallegly amendment, which will be adopted; send it over here, and then it will be filibustered by those who do not like the Gallegly amendment. I guess they think all of those people are Democrats. And then we will point our bony fingers at all the Democrats and say, "They brought down illegal immigration."

That is childish logic, because there are at least 10 to 12 Republicans in this body who do not like the Gallegly amendment in any form and who will assist in the filibuster. So if anybody thinks it is just going to be a wonderful roundelay over here of Democrats filibustering an illegal immigration bill and then we pointing the bony fickle finger of fate at those who destroyed the issue. No.

So, I guess that is where we are. We will pull the bill down and try to blame it on the Democrats and go home. Clever, not, because as I say, there are at least 10 to 12 Republicans who will join in that filibuster. Go home in October and tell voters a Republican Congress did nothing about illegal immigration in an election year.

Then we also heard, "Well, if we just send it to President Clinton and he vetoes it, we will win California." I never went for that scenario. I think that is about as boneheaded as you can get, too. But when they are telling us that my dear friend, Bob Dole, should do nothing and nothing should happen, and that is going to help Bob Dole, I must say I have purely missed out on most of the trickery and cynicism of the campaign, because there are many on our side who will have nothing to do with the Gallegly amendment. Not me, for I am ready to do the modified version.

So what the public will see is a distorted figure of my friend, Bob Dole. We have had enough of those. Ten years as his assistant, I know him well. He will win the Presidency of the United States if the people of the United States come to know him as well as I do and as well as we do here, as well as my friend from Montana knows him, and he surely does, as well as the occupant of the chair.

Each and every week for the past 2 years, Bob Dole has said to me, "When will we have an immigration bill, AL?" And now we have one. Now we have people pulling at Bob Dole, mewling, puling, mumbling issuing from staff and others. He is being ill-served if he is led to believe that it is not a priority issue. And if California is in the balance, as we say in politics, by doing nothing, someone will have cut the tightrope wire for one great and decent man, my friend Bob Dole.

So perhaps we can move on now with the national interest. There is no one who expresses it more in its most honest form than that most wonderfully decent and capable man, Bob Dole. We shall see how it plays out.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. It is my understanding that the hour from 1 to 2 p.m. is under my control and/or my designee; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is correct. We are in morning business until 2 o'clock, and from 1 to 2 o'clock is under the control of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Thank you, Mr. President.

CRIME IN AMERICA

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, as most people know now, over the weekend, our former Senate majority leader announced in very broad, very specific, very forceful terms his plan to come to grips with a surging, raging crime wave in the United States.

All the data that I have seen over the last several years have indicated that crime, drugs, and the related two, are at the top or near the top over and over of grave concern on the part of American citizens. And well they should be,