

political life I said, "Ma'am, 'cause this is America."

If we ever get to the point where we do not have a few citizens who talk funny, if we ever get to the point where we do not have a new infusion of energy and a new spark to the American dream, then the American dream is going to start to fade and it is going the start to die. It is not going to fade and it is not going to die on my watch in the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DEWINE. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. GRAMM. I am glad to.

Mr. DEWINE. I just want to compliment my colleague from Texas for one of the most eloquent statements I have heard since I have been in the U.S. Senate, a little over a year. His story of his family, but frankly most particularly his story of Wendy Gramm's family, his lovely wife, is America's story. I have heard him, because he and I have been out campaigning before together, I have heard him tell that story I think eight or nine times. Each time I hear it, I am still touched by it because it is truly America's story.

I will also compliment him on his comments about chain migration. When you look at the chart of chain migration, that is America's story, too. Those are people who are trying to bring their families here. You see it—and, again, it is anecdotal—but you see it when you go into restaurants in Ohio or you go into dry cleaning stores or you go into any kind of establishments in Ohio, Washington, or Texas.

You see people in there who, you just assume they are all family. You do not know whether they are brothers or cousins or who. They are all working. They are working. That is what is the American dream. That is what has made this country great. I just want to compliment him on really, after kind of a long, difficult debate, coming over to the floor and really cutting through some of our rhetoric and just getting right down to it. I compliment him for that.

Mr. GRAMM. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. SIMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. I think we have had a good debate. I listened attentively to the remarks of my friend from Texas. I heard him speak of a woman who is remarkable, Wendy Gramm. I can only tell him that people have told me many times in the past years that anyone who knows Senator PHIL GRAMM and Senator AL SIMPSON and knows Wendy Gramm and Ann Simpson, knows that the two of us severely overmarried—severely. In fact, a lot of people do not vote for us; they vote for them. But that is just an experience that I share.

As we close the debate, I hope we can keep this in perspective. We will continue to have the most open door of any country in the world, regardless of

what we do here. The numbers in my amendment are higher than they have been for most of the last 50 years. We will continue to have the most generous immigration policy in the world. We take more immigrants than all the rest of the world combined. We take more refugees than all the rest of the countries in the world combined. That is our heritage. We have never turned back.

An interesting country, started by land gentries, highly educated people, sophisticates who came here for one reason—to have religious freedom. The only country on Earth founded in a belief in God. That is corny nowadays, but that is what we have in America. And it will always be so. People who came here were not exactly ragamuffins. They read Locke and Montesquieu and Shakespeare and the classics. Interesting country. No other country will ever have a jump-start like that in the history of the world, period. So it is unique, it is extraordinary.

AMENDMENT NO. 3737

Mr. SIMPSON. Let me have a call for the regular order. I alert my friend, Senator KENNEDY, that I call for the regular order with respect to the Coverdell amendment of last night. That was 3737. It was laid down. There was debate. It was held back, the Coverdell amendment.

Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The amendment is now before the Senate.

(The text of amendment No. 3737 was printed in the RECORD of April 24, 1996.)

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I know of no other speakers on that amendment. I believe the managers are prepared to accept that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3737) was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3739

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 3739.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second. There appears to be.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to amendment NO. 3739. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 80, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 83 Leg.]

YEAS—20

Baucus	Faircloth	Lott
Brown	Grassley	Reid
Bryan	Hollings	Roth
Burns	Jeffords	Shelby
Byrd	Johnston	Simpson
Cohen	Kassebaum	Thomas
Exon	Kyl	

NAYS—80

Abraham	Ford	McCain
Akaka	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Glenn	Mikulski
Bennett	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Graham	Moynihan
Bingaman	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Murray
Boxer	Gregg	Nickles
Bradley	Harkin	Nunn
Breaux	Hatch	Pell
Bumpers	Hatfield	Pressler
Campbell	Heflin	Pryor
Chafee	Helms	Robb
Coats	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Cochran	Inhofe	Santorum
Conrad	Inouye	Sarbanes
Coverdell	Kemphorne	Simon
Craig	Kennedy	Smith
D'Amato	Kerrey	Snowe
Daschle	Kerry	Specter
DeWine	Kohl	Stevens
Dodd	Lautenberg	Thompson
Dole	Leahy	Thurmond
Domenici	Levin	Warner
Dorgan	Lieberman	Wellstone
Feingold	Lugar	Wyden
Feinstein	Mack	

The amendment (No. 3739) was rejected.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRAMM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES— H.R. 3103

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate insist on its amendment to H.R. 3103, the Senate request a conference with the House, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on part of the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the request be modified to provide for the appointment of eight Republicans and six Democrats from the Committees on Labor and Human Resources and the Finance Committee instead of the 7 to 4 ratio proposed by the majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, let me clarify the situation. Let me ask for a clarification and the parliamentary situation.

Is the Senator from Massachusetts asking for a modification of my unanimous-consent request that you have appointments to this conference as he outlined just from the Labor Committee and the Finance Committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's interpretation.

Mr. LOTT. I would be constrained to object to that modification of the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KENNEDY. Then I object to the proposal of the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the unanimous-consent request by the assistant majority leader.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, point of order: There is obviously a quorum here, Mr. President.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAIG). Objection has been heard. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of 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.

IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, we go on now to continue our work. I think most of us know the lay of the land and our colleagues listening would soon know.

I would withdraw my option to offer the next amendment, which is the pending business, with the understanding that Senator FEINSTEIN be recognized to offer an amendment regarding levels of immigration. And you might, I say to my colleagues, expect a motion to table on that particular amendment within the next 20 or 25 minutes.

I yield.

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. And that is with the understanding that the time would be equally divided. Is that correct?

Mr. SIMPSON. That would be correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time would be equally divided between—

Mr. SIMPSON. The time would be equally divided.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. How much time would we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is this a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, it is not a unanimous-consent request. It was felt that the parties had resolved this and so it was presented on that basis. There was to be little debate, as I understood it, and I was told that there would be a motion to table within 20 or 25 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Chair's understanding there is no time agreement.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, that is correct. I think we will see it take place in its ephemeral form, somewhat

obscure but nevertheless quite appropriate, I think.

AMENDMENT NO. 3740 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3725
(Purpose: To limit and improve the system for the admission of family-sponsored immigrants)

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we have 10 minutes on amendment 3740. I should like to take 5 minutes of that time and then have 5 minutes accorded to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send the amendment to the desk.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I call up the amendment. The amendment is at the desk. The amendment is No. 3740.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] proposes an amendment numbered 3740.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I will explain the amendment this way.

Essentially, the amendment is a compromise between the Simpson amendment and what is in the bill as a product of the Abraham-Kennedy amendment.

I believe we need to stop the pierceable cap, and my amendment would place a hard cap on family totals of 480,000, which is the current law, without the anticipated increase. It would stop the spillover from the unused employment visas, the loophole in the current system. And it would not close out the preference categories.

Under my family amendment, parents and adult children are guaranteed to receive visas every year, remaining consistent with the goal of family reunification. The amendment allocates visa numbers on a sliding scale basis for parents and adult children of citizens, allowing for increases in visas when the numbers fall within the unlimited immediate family category, always remaining within the hard cap of 480,000. It would allow a backlog clearance of spouse and minor children of permanent residents by allowing 75 percent of any visas left over within the family total to be allocated for this category's backlog clearance.

Now, to control chain migration, which Commissioner Doris Meissner told me is created by the Sibling of Citizens category, it places a moratorium on that category for 5 years, but if there are any visas left over with the hard cap of 480,000, the amendment would allow 25 percent of the leftover to be used for the backlog clearance of siblings, those who have been waiting for many, many years.

The point of this is that if we do not address this issue, the numbers swell 41 percent over what we were indicated they would be in committee to nearly a

million. This creates the hard total of 480,000. It permits the sliding scale down the family preference, and it eliminates what is the chain migration concern that had been raised by many in committee.

I believe it is a modest amendment to control overall numbers. Coming from the State with the largest numbers, with the absence of classes for youngsters, with the cutbacks in welfare money, with the absence of adequate housing for people, we cannot keep taking 40 percent of the Nation's total of legal immigrants, of refugees, of asylees, and therefore I think this is a prudent, modest, fair compromise.

So, again, we would place a hard cap at the current law level, 480,000. We would close a loophole where unused employment visas spill over into the family immigration numbers, and we would guarantee that close family members of citizens get visas each year with flexible limits allowing an increase in the allocation of visas with decreases in the immediate family categories.

I retain the remainder of my time and yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this is essentially the same amendment that we just disposed of. Once you maintain the cap that Senator FEINSTEIN does as well as Senator SIMPSON, you use up 472,000, which leaves 7,000 left over. Senator SIMPSON targeted those to the wives and children of permanent resident aliens. Senator FEINSTEIN spreads those out—adult unmarried citizens, adult children of citizens.

Quite frankly, I think we ought to be dealing with this in the legal immigration, but if you had to ask me I would rather put them in for the children and married members of permanent resident aliens. We are talking about 7,000 visas on this—7,000. That is the amount that will be available under this. So I really fail to see how this is very much more than sort of Simpson-like.

I reserve the remainder of the time.

Mr. KYL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the Senator from California. It is a good-faith effort to try to respond to the critics of the SIMPSON amendment, and I think it does a very good job of doing that.

As Senator KENNEDY pointed out just now, however, it does retain the cap of 480,000, and this is what we are trying to say here today. You really cannot have it both ways. You cannot say that we are not increasing illegal immigration and then not do anything to achieve that goal, because under the bill as written, immigration is going to skyrocket. That is what the INS figures and formally reported by the San Diego Union paper said: 40 percent next year; 41 percent the year after that.