

over procurement protests. These provisions addressing Federal court jurisdiction over procurement protests would not affect in any way the authority of the Comptroller General to review procurement protests pursuant to chapter 35 of title 31, U.S. Code, and they would not affect the jurisdiction or standards applied by either the district courts or the Court of Federal Claims in any area of the law other than the procurement protests to which they are addressed.

Mr. President, I would like to thank Senator GRASSLEY, and in particular his staffer, Kolan Davis, for the hard work and leadership he has shown to renew and strengthen the ADR and negotiated rulemaking laws. I would also like to thank Senator GLENN, Senator COHEN, and Senator STEVENS, from the Governmental Affairs Committee for their continuing support. And this bill would not have had a chance without the hard work, persistence, and creative effort of three House Members and their outstanding staffs, and I would like to thank Congressmen JACK REED, George Gekas, and HENRY HYDE for getting this legislation to the floor despite a crowded calendar. This bill shows that bipartisanship is alive and functioning in this Congress.

Alternative dispute resolution methods and negotiated rulemaking provide new and better ways to conduct government business. They cost less, they're quicker, they're less adversarial, they develop sensible solutions to problems, and they free up courts for other business. They are two success stories in creating a government that works better and costs less.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the bill be deemed read for the third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 5421) was agreed to.

The bill (H.R. 4194), as amended, read the third time, and passed.

OMNIBUS CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS, 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to speak on the bill that is before us and just on a very small portion of it, the immigration bill. Obviously, the immigration bill is not just a small portion of the bill that is before us. It is perhaps one of the most important aspects of the bill before us. But what I meant was, I do not want to speak to the appropriations part of the bill.

I want to voice my strong support for the illegal immigration bill. This has been included, as everyone knows, as part of the continuing resolution. Senator SIMPSON, chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, has worked diligently to bring this bill forward.

I am very pleased to have worked with him in creating solutions to the immigration problems that our country is facing today and, also, to take time to compliment Senator SIMPSON for the hard work that he has given for the people of his State of Wyoming to the United States as a Member of the U.S. Senate. He is now retiring. Those of us who have served with him on the Judiciary Committee, and a considerable amount of time together with him on the Immigration Subcommittee, are surely going to miss his leadership in this area.

This bill that is before us even under these extraordinary circumstances of its being part of the omnibus bill, even under those circumstances, should not detract from the hard work that has gone on in this Congress on this legislation that Senator SIMPSON has put together. He has produced a very strong bipartisan bill that will help us make a huge impact on the problems of illegal immigration.

In the last 2 years, Senator SIMPSON has made a great effort to deal with illegal immigration. We have done it by providing over \$1 billion in new funding. But we all know that comprehensive legislation, like the bill before us, is necessary before we are ever going to be successful, or whether or not even that additional billion dollars in the war on illegal immigrants is going to be successfully spent.

Provisions of the bill provide for more effective deportation measures,

increased border and investigative staffing, and stricter employment and welfare standards. It is exactly measures such as these that are necessary to combat the growing problem of illegal immigration.

Illegal immigration is an issue that has been in the forefront of public debate for some time right now. It is a growing problem that affects even the smallest towns in the Midwest.

The problem became graphic to me in January 1995 when an Iowa college student named Justin Younie was murdered by an illegal alien who had been removed from the State of Iowa once before because of his illegal status. Unfortunately, this particular illegal alien came back to the United States and to my State of Iowa without any problems. That is the case with so many illegal aliens returning, only this time, this person, this illegal alien, ended up committing murder. This person has since been convicted of this horrible crime. That does not bring back the life of Mr. Younie. But it does set the stage for a very important provision that I have in this bill allowing local law enforcement people to be involved in the arrest of an illegal alien if the only thing they have done wrong is being in this country illegally. I know it is not understandable to people who for the last 20 years, there has been a regulation saying that local law enforcement people cannot arrest an illegal alien just because they are here illegally. But that is the situation.

We have another example beyond this murder of the reach of illegal immigration, and it was featured in the U.S. News & World Report of September 13, 1996, and on the cover story. It addressed illegal immigration and its effects on the small town of Storm Lake, IA. Specifically, the article focused on the meatpacking industry, which, since its opening in 1982, has experienced a large influx of illegal immigrants. The effects on the town of Storm Lake have been very significant. Along with a population increase has come increased crime rates, increased education expenditures, racial problems, and economic concerns causing great resentment within the community.

According to the article, the increase in illegal immigrants to the town can

be attributed to the job opportunities offered by this meatpacking industry. Apparently, workers are recruited by immigrants already working at the plant. Once these workers are recruited, they illegally cross the border, obtain a false identity, and begin work. As workers are injured, or the plant is raided by the INS, new workers are hired to fill the empty positions. This process ensures a continuous demand for workers which has been so steady that it has reportedly spawned a sort of underground railroad from Mexico to the town of Storm Lake, IA.

It is because of situations like these—the meatpacking story in Storm Lake and the murder of Justin Younise in Iowa—that the illegal immigration conference report is being discussed here today. Provisions in this act address illegal immigration problems at every level, from Border Patrol to deportation. The act takes direct steps to reduce crime associated with illegal immigration and provides States with incentives to do the same.

Among the hundreds of provisions in this bill are a number of initiatives that I fought for as a member of the Judiciary Committee and, as well, as a conferee. For instance, this bill allows the Attorney General to enter into agreements with local law enforcement, permitting, as I said, for the first time since 1977 local authorities to apprehend, detain, and transport illegal aliens. This is an especially important step for the interior States, such as my State of Iowa, that are distant from the borders.

Just a few weeks ago local police had to release a truckload of illegal aliens because the INS wouldn't—or, as they might say, "couldn't"—respond just then. But they used the argument that there were less than 20 illegals in the group. So it was too small of a group for them to mess around with. Obviously, it is better from that judgment to wait until they find their way into a job and into the underground economy, get lost, and then spend thousands of dollars more to apprehend the very same people. But they were in the custody for a short period of time of these local law enforcement people.

So it is obvious that local law enforcement needs more tools like we are now providing to fight illegal immigrants.

In addition, because of my insistence, the conference included a guarantee that each State will have at least 10 agents. This will help States like Iowa that do not have any agents right now when illegal immigration is growing at a rapid pace.

The conference committee also included a provision of mine to exempt nonprofits and churches from the time-consuming and costly paperwork of verification and deeming. Unfortunately, the administration made the mistake of demanding the provision be changed in the last-minute negotiations last week on title V.

I might say at this point that my staff got a call about 1:30 Saturday

morning to discuss some changes in this language. That is not a very good way to write a piece of legislation. And we are going to pay the consequences for it on this because this resulting language is inferior to what I had agreed to in conference, and that was a bipartisan agreement.

At least on the face of it, nonprofits will be exempt from the new provision. But the question of when and how people can be served by nonprofits and any resulting paperwork requirement will unfortunately be left to regulations promulgated by the Attorney General. The former conference language that we had worked out provided protections from regulations. But the administration language does not. I think this will have to be remedied in legislation next year because we are going to have potential problems on this.

Nevertheless, I am satisfied with another provision concerning congressional participation.

This provision requires that when we proceed with the verification pilot projects for employers, Congress and the Federal Government will be a part of those projects. The only way that we are going to know if these really work or not is if we, in the Congress, are a part of them. That is a followup of my legislation, the first bill passed by a Republican Congress in 40 years, the first bill signed by President Clinton going way back to January of 1995, a bill where after 6 years we finally ended the exemption that Members of Congress as employers had from Federal law—civil rights, labor and safety legislation, among others, which we had exempted ourselves from that apply to the rest of the country.

That legislation has passed, so we are no longer exempt from those laws. There is no longer two sets of laws, one for Capitol Hill and one for the rest of the United States. There is one set of laws that applies equally.

When it comes to this verification pilot project for employers, it seems to me that we in the Federal Government ought to be participating in these projects and then we are going to know firsthand the redtape that small business or large business even has to go through to meet the requirements of our immigration law. Then in a few years when we go down the road to making a final decision whether or not this new verification procedure goes into place, we are going to do it not from the standpoint of just what our constituents are telling us, as so very important as that is, we are also going to know firsthand what is involved with this project and the impact it is going to have upon employers of America because we are employers in the sense that we, as Members of Congress, hire staff. And if the small business people ought to go through a certain process under this project, we ought to as well so we know firsthand what the situation is.

In conclusion, Mr. President, anyone who does not support this bill is just

not serious about dealing with illegal immigration. Although many of the provisions of this bill could have been tougher, there has been a strong effort to achieve bipartisan support. I look forward to this bill becoming law, and I commend Senator SIMPSON for the incredible job he has done with this legislation.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOND. 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. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes as if in morning business.

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

“CHOOSING GOOD GOVERNMENT”

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, as we have launched into the high-pitched rhetoric and the harsh charges and countercharges of the fall political campaign season, I found it very interesting when I heard a sermon preached by Dr. Craig Barnes, the pastor of the National Presbyterian Church, on Sunday. It so happens that his sermon topic was “Choosing Good Government.” I asked Dr. Barnes if he would mind if I shared this with my colleagues and with those who are interested, because I think Dr. Barnes laid down some very good principles for people of faith, people who contend they are religious believers, regardless of their particular sect or denomination or even their religion, to consider in choosing those who seek to represent us in November.

Dr. Barnes is not one to recommend one party or another or one candidate or another, nor have I heard him in his sermons attempting to influence the choices that those of us in the legislative bodies make when we deal with controversial issues, but I think he had a couple of very good points to consider and to apply based on our tenets, our beliefs and judgment as to how these standards should be applied. He gives us a framework for making the choices that are very important to all of us in this election year because, as he points out, we are subject to the rule of man by reason of the authorization from God for man to establish laws and rules over one another.

Dr. Barnes points out that we have to choose a system which is in conformity with God's will if we are to choose a government that is consistent with the principles that have been laid down by our God and by our faith.

The two main points that Dr. Barnes makes are, first, to choose God's leader is always to choose godly character. And he points out that we live in an