

making it necessary for us to find a way to bring it to a conclusion, perhaps filing cloture, and get a cloture vote. I am satisfied we can win a cloture vote. There is overwhelming bipartisan support. This legislation has been developed very carefully from the Commerce Committee, with the aid and assistance of Senator STEVENS of Alaska, Senator FORD from Kentucky, Senator HOLLINGS has been involved, Senator MCCAIN managed the bill on the floor. It has passed the House, and now because of one provision that labor does not like, the Senator is prepared to take down the entire FAA reauthorization bill. I just do not understand that. We are willing to be reasonable and we are going to as far as we can.

Now because of our effort to advise Members that we would not have further recorded votes today, an effort is being made to take advantage of that, to block a cloture vote on Monday. I feel like that is not acting in good faith and we are not going to be able to accept that. We will force this to a vote. When a vote occurs, this legislation will pass because it does have bipartisan support.

I call on Senators that have reservations to give us an opportunity to at least get this to a vote without inconveniencing the entire Senate. We are willing to be reasonable in terms of time for discussion and a vote, but unless we get some cooperation, it appears that the entire Senate would be delayed in completing its work.

We also are continuing to hope we can find a way to move the so-called Presidio parks bill. The Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Washington have been very much involved in that. There have been good-faith efforts on that one, up and down the Hill, the whole package, a very small package of three or four items, maybe half that number, half the full omnibus bill. Surely there is a way we can get this major legislation completed in a fair way. It is not fair to have something agreed to that does include some very important items that the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the Senator from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, has a right to be consulted and involved in selecting the project. I know Senators and Congressmen from all over America have parks heritage trails, scenic areas, areas that need to be preserved, and yet we have continued to have an objection to moving this forward.

I hope the next time we make an effort to get a unanimous-consent request to move the omnibus parks bill, the Presidio bill, that there would not be objection to that, and the technical correction that needs to be made could be dealt with in conference, and we can move this legislation through, legislation that has been in the making for, actually, many years, to my own personal knowledge, at least 4 years. It will be a real sad thing if we leave the Senate on Monday for the year without completing the parks bill.

You have the Presidio that has bipartisan support. It is a Federal burden in terms of costs. This is a plan to make use of the Presidio and not have the Federal Government have to continue to bear these costs. It does have the Sterling Forest project in New Jersey and New York, and projects all over America. In short, we need to get this done. I hope we can get a correction here, when we move next to get unanimous consent to take that bill back to the conference and have the correction made or to pass something before we leave.

I want to read a letter I just received from the President of the United States, apparently he dictated this while in Providence, RI, with regard to the agreement that was worked out on the omnibus appropriations bill. The letter says:

Dear Mr. Leader:

I commend the leadership for their fine work in negotiating a workable Omnibus Appropriations Bill that demonstrates fiscal responsibility and preserves those investment priorities important to the American people.

I urge the Congress to expeditiously pass the Omnibus Appropriations Bill. I intend to sign it if presented to me in its current form.

This is signed by the President of the United States.

This has been a bipartisan effort, bicameral effort, an effort working between the Congress and the White House. I think it is a good product. There are a lot of Senators and House Members that are not totally happy with it, and there are some provisions in it that I am sure the White House is not totally happy with. But that is the art of legislating. It involves some bipartisan, commonsense compromise. I think that is what we have in this legislation.

We asked for the President to indicate his support. He has now done so. I think that is helpful, and I think the American people will appreciate the kind of cooperation we have had.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON
Providence, RI, September 28, 1996.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: I commend the Leadership for their fine work in negotiating a workable Omnibus Appropriations Bill that demonstrates fiscal responsibility and preserves those investment priorities important to the American people.

I urge the Congress to expeditiously pass the Omnibus Appropriations Bill. I intend to sign it if presented to me in its current form.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, while I am awaiting the return of the distinguished minority whip, I observe that one of the issues that I am fixing to bring up is the so-called Gallegly im-

migration bill. This had been a part of the illegal immigration bill that had been passed and was in conference between the House and the Senate. It was the provision that the President objected to strenuously. And the administration and the Democratic leadership indicated that they would never allow us to pass the conference report through the Senate that contained this Gallegly language.

This language would allow States, on a prospective basis, if I understand it, to not be required to have to provide free education for the children of illegal immigrants. There are many States now that have a financial burden of being told by the Federal Government, "We can't control our borders, we can't control illegal immigration into this country, but in spite of our failure, you have to provide free education."

In the State of California, I think we are talking about well over 300,000 children, at a cost to that State of \$2 billion for the education of the children of illegal immigrants. Should we not allow the States to have options here? As I understand it now, any children now in the schools could stay until they are through. But in the future, illegal aliens would be told they are not going to be able to get free education forever for their children in the school system. It is a magnet. It draws illegal immigrants into this country to get access to this free education system.

Somebody has to worry about the taxpayers in the State of California or Texas or Arizona, or in America. I thought that this was a very important part of the illegal immigration legislation. But it was so strenuously objected to, and a filibuster was threatened in the Senate. The President said he was going to veto it. So it was removed from the illegal immigration bill.

So then we find that the administration found new provisions to object to. They, for instance, said that they would take down the entire illegal immigration bill and maybe not agree to the omnibus appropriations conference report, unless the language in there that was removed, which said that we had to accept illegal immigrants, even though they were HIV positive, which leads to a cost of well over \$100,000 and maybe even more, for HIV-positive illegal immigrants. I find that inexplicable. Again, it is a magnet. You get an HIV-positive problem, what is your solution? Come into America illegally and your medical needs will be taken care of by the taxpayers of America. But it was so important to the administration, until it threatened to take down the entire effort of negotiations on illegal immigration and on the continuing resolution.

I think it is a terrible policy. But again, to try to get an agreement, that provision was removed. A lot of effort went into this legislation by Senator SIMPSON, Senator KENNEDY, Congressman BERMAN, Congressman LAMAR SMITH. They felt very strongly about

the importance of getting this work completed, including the so-called title V. The administration indicated they wanted title V taken completely out. But once they started reading it and seeing what was in it, they realized there were several provisions in there that, in fact, they liked or that made good common sense. So in the wee hours this morning—it must have been 3 or 4 o'clock—Senator SIMPSON and others were in a room working on this language. Finally, with great difficulty, they came to an agreement. Many portions of title V are still in there. We still have some very reasonable expectations regarding legal immigrants. But the big illegal immigration bill now is in the continuing resolution that we will be taking up in the next couple of days.

So the House of Representatives, not able to get the Gallegly language included in illegal immigration, have now moved it separately. They passed it through the House overwhelmingly, as I understand it. I don't recall the vote. So we have it here in the Senate. We ought to pass the Gallegly language. I will be asking unanimous consent that we proceed to its consideration momentarily.

I still don't see the Democratic whip back from the Cloakroom. Others may wish to speak. I have to wait for his return, so I will yield the floor and perhaps the Senator from South Dakota can speak and allow me to come back.

Mr. PRESSLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

COMMENDING LEADERSHIP FOR ITS HARD WORK

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I commend the majority leader and others on the difficulty in bringing the Congress to a close and concluding all ongoing negotiations. I am very proud of the efforts that are being made on the Federal Aviation Administration authorization bill to get that vitally important legislation before the Senate for consideration. I am also very proud of the efforts to bring the Coast Guard bill to closure as well as efforts to agree to a continuing resolution.

With so many constituent interests represented by Congress, sometimes it is quite difficult to reach consensus on legislation. I think this point is not well understood across the country. We have a vast country, and I know that Congress is much criticized for acting slowly or sometimes failing to act. On the other hand, what is the alternative to resolving disputes with such a huge country, with so many Members of Congress, so many citizens, so many different interests? All those come to a head, so-to-speak, at the close of a Congress, and it requires great compromise.

It has been my pleasure to chair the House-Senate conference committee working on the critically important Federal Aviation authorization bill.

The conference report accompanying that bill is ready for immediate consideration by this body. Unfortunately, several of my colleagues have objected to consideration of the conference report because they oppose a single section of that bill, an bipartisan amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS, in conference. Every Senate conferee voted in favor of the Hollings amendment which makes a technical correction to the Railway Labor Act. An excellent bill is being held up over a difference of opinion relating to 5 lines in a 189 pages aviation safety and security bill.

Mr. President, we cannot adjourn without passing the conference report to the Federal Aviation authorization bill. The House approved the conference report yesterday. If we do not approve the conference report, the Senate will have failed to meet its responsibility to the traveling public. Airports across the country will not receive much needed Airport Improvement Program [AIP] funds for safety-related repairs and other necessary improvements. Two years of tireless efforts to reach a compromise on FAA reform provisions will be lost. Vitally important aviation safety and security provisions will not be put in place. Family members of future aviation disaster victims would be denied the thoughtful, comprehensive protections this legislation would provide to them. Provisions to revitalize air service to small communities will not go into effect. It short, inaction by the Senate on this conference report would be a very serious mistake for which this body would be roundly criticized.

Let me also comment a little bit on agriculture, because I know that at this time of the year, the payments regarding the Freedom to Farm Act are going out to some farmers. That was a controversial bill that was worked out in this Chamber. Let me say that I am proud to have been a part of the leadership team and proud to have voted for freedom to farm. But we need to expand our agricultural markets abroad. We have done that for our commodities, and under NAFTA and GATT, we have exported more agricultural products than ever in our history. There has been some dispute on transshipment of cattle, in terms of Mexico and Canada, under NAFTA. We hope that those issues are resolved and NAFTA is better enforced.

Mr. President, I might also say that, in terms of our agriculture future, Alan Greenspan has said that one of the greatest agricultural farm bills is a balanced budget. I hope that we can continue to expand our agricultural exports, especially as they regard commodity prices.

I yield the floor. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask that I be permitted to speak as if in morning business for 5 minutes.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

STATUS OF CALIFORNIA LEGISLATION

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, as we come down to the final hours, there are so many pending matters that are important to my home State of California, and it would take far too long to go into all of them in detail. But I thought for purposes of the RECORD I would let my constituents know and my colleagues know where we stand on a number of these issues that are so important. I discuss them not in any order of priority but just as I put them forward.

First of all, I am distressed that we still have not confirmed a judge who is highly qualified to sit on the Federal bench in the Central District Court of California, Margaret Morrow. Republicans in this Congress said, "Look, when you send us a nominee, make sure that he or she has bipartisan support." Senator FEINSTEIN and I and the Senators on this side of the aisle have done that with our nominations, and yet, as my friend from Illinois knows, because he sits on that Judiciary Committee and expressed his great disappointment with the lack of action on these judges, we have not gotten our nominees confirmed. I think it is a great disservice to the people of this country who seek justice, who demand justice, who want swift justice. If you do not have the people on the bench to fulfill the responsibilities that we place upon the courts, we are not going to have justice in this Nation.

This particular nominee, Margaret Morrow, in the last month I asked her could she line up some Republican support, and everyone from the sheriff of Los Angeles to people in the private sector who are registered Republicans wrote magnificent letters about Margaret Morrow, thereby proving that she does have bipartisan, strong support.

It was an honor to recommend such a fine candidate to the President. Her name was submitted to me by my judicial advisory committee for the Central District of California. I did not personally know Ms. Morrow before I recommended her to the administration, but my committee enthusiastically found her to be a superior judicial candidate.

However, despite her strong bipartisan support and strong credentials, her nomination remains indefinitely stalled, with no Member coming forward to explain why she cannot be confirmed.

Margaret Morrow was nominated by the administration on May 10. She received her nominations hearing at the