

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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

If we are willing to accept those large numbers, then we should be up front about that. But everyone who has supported the bill out of committee and opposed the Simpson amendment has inferred that we are really not going to increase numbers at all. The fact is, we would increase them.

Under both the Simpson and Feinstein amendment, we would have a cap. So that problem, the problem of, in effect, runaway numbers, is solved by this cap of 480,000. But at the same time, Senator FEINSTEIN is attempting to respond to the criticism that opponents of the Simpson amendment made, which is that all of the preference could be used up by the first category, theoretically, and you would never guarantee that some of the second, third and fourth preferences could be satisfied.

So what Senator FEINSTEIN has done is to say there will be certain slots left open for, for example, the grown children of citizens or siblings and, therefore, to the extent the 480,000 cap was not reached by the first preference, that the other preferences would each have a number—and it is not 7,000, the numbers would range between 35,000, 75,000, depending upon how many are available.

Just in conclusion, it seems to me this is a good-faith effort to deal with legitimate concerns that were raised, but, yes, it is also true that there is an absolute cap of 480,000, because the purpose here is twofold: to allow several different categories, each to have a number of slots to be made legal under our system, but at the same time draw an overall limit so that annually no more than 480,000 would be permitted to come in under this particular family category.

So I think the Feinstein amendment is a good compromise, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to respond, if I might, to the argument raised by the Senator from Massachusetts. Using an Immigration and Naturalization Service document entitled "Immigration and Backlog Reductions Under Current Law," and adding the three categories—spouses and children's space, spouses and children's change, an increase due to legalization through IRCA, here are the totals that we come up with: In fiscal year 1995, 206,000; in fiscal year 1996, 270,000; in fiscal year 1997, 370,000; in fiscal year 1998, 349,000. The highest year would be 1997, which leaves 110,000 even in 1997 to filter down through the categories.

I ask that the chart entitled "Immigration and Backlog Reductions Under Current Law"—these are assumptions, so I recognize that depending on the assumptions that one uses, you can get different figures. These are the ones that, again, are a little different from what Senator KENNEDY is working on

because they project this very large total at the bottom of 1 million in 1995, of 984,000 in 1996, of 600,000 in 1997. Those are the total numbers.

So I think if these come in to be the case, even in the most difficult year, there is 110,000 that would filter down through the remaining categories.

Mr. KENNEDY. If I could have a moment to respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. These various charts have been provided by the INS to me, as well as the other chart on which we have the numbers. I will put those that were provided by the INS in, and I refer the Senator, if she has these same charts—we do not have to take the time of the Senate. We will be glad to have a quorum or let others speak.

But it points out in 1997, there is 472,781. That is the immediate relative estimate, 472,000. If you have 472,000 and you have a cap at 480,000, it means you have 7,151 left over. The idea of representing to this body that we are going to spill some of those over into these categories is a stretch, I just say.

Those numbers, in fairness to the Senator, build over a period of time. There are still 40,000 in 1998; 86,000 in 1999. So those numbers still go up, but they still do not justify the kind of spilldown in the coverage that the Senator has explained.

It says 7,151 here, which was provided by the INS and 7,151. I will be glad to go into a quorum call to make sure we are not talking about different charts, but these were the ones provided by the INS. Whatever time—it is Senator ABRAHAM's time and Senator FEINGOLD's time.

Mr. ABRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I would appreciate being apprised of the circumstances with respect to time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time limit or time designated. It was an approximate time.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I was not sure whether that had actually been formulated in a unanimous-consent agreement. If not, let me make a couple of quick points.

I do not think we want to extend the debate unnecessarily here, because the issues on this amendment are virtually identical to the issues that were on the floor in the context of Senator SIMPSON's amendment.

The fact is that this is almost the same amendment as Senator SIMPSON's amendment. As we heard, modest efforts are being made to apply some of these visas to, as I understand it, some of the other categories besides the children and spouses of permanent residents, but it is going to work out, as Senator KENNEDY has said, to a very, very few, just because those categories will consume such a high percentage of the visas that are going to be available under this very substantial amendment.

Second, the priorities, as I see them, that were established in the previous amendment are in this amendment as well. Once again, we see an overwhelming percentage of the immigration that will be legal under this amendment going not to the children of citizens of the United States, adult children or married children, but rather to the children of noncitizens, many of whom are, in fact, individuals who were once illegal aliens. It seems to me those priorities are not the appropriate ones that we should establish.

But I have to say, Mr. President, already just in the discussion that has happened in the first few minutes of this amendment, it is quite clear—we just received this amendment late this afternoon—the projections that are being made are hypothetical projections. There is confusion with respect to this amendment.

It is unclear to me, after studying it for the last hour or so, exactly what its effects will be. At least we had a little bit of time to look at the effects of the previous amendment. But from what I can tell, it would definitely cut overall family preference immigration by roughly 60 percent. It would cap and slash the immigration of parents of U.S. citizens. It would cut the immigration of adult children of U.S. citizens by over 60 percent. It would eliminate all immigration of siblings, basically. These are dramatic changes in the legal immigration laws of this country.

As I said with some frequency during the debate on the last amendment, Mr. President, they should be dealt with separately from the debate on illegal immigration. These are two very distinct issues with a very powerful and important impact on citizens of this country and their families.

We should deal in this bill with illegal immigration. We should maintain the split which was put together in the Judiciary Committee that divided these two. We should follow the lead of the House keeping legal immigration separate from illegal immigration.

Even if we were to consider legal immigration, I once again argue it should not be done in this type of piecemeal fashion, such weighty, complicated amendments brought in this fashion. It is impossible to even determine the potential impact of this amendment.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I urge the Senate to once again follow the lead of the last amendment, keep these issues separate, keep legal immigration separate from illegal immigration, pursue ahead today, and let us get a good illegal immigration bill through the Senate. I think it will address many of these problems. Then let us take the legal immigration bill that is at the desk, and then let us deal with that in a deliberative fashion here on the floor of the Senate. I think that is the way we should go.

This amendment is hardly different from the last one. It has the same priorities, has the same dramatic changes. I strongly oppose it.

Mr. DEWINE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, for those Members in the Chamber or those Members watching back in their offices, this is really the same vote that we just had. It is not substantially changed. The issues are essentially the same. I am not going to take the time of my colleagues to wade through this again. We had about 6 or 7 hours already today on very, very similar issues. It is essentially the same vote.

This bill still, I say with all due respect, is antifamily, is antifamily reunification. It flies in the face of the best traditions of our country as far as immigration policy is concerned. It mixes, unfortunately, the legal immigration issue and the illegal immigration issue. This is the illegal immigration bill. We should continue the tradition, and we should continue what the Judiciary Committee did, and that is to not mix the two.

This is the sheet that has been passed out. When you go through it, what you really find is that it is very, very similar to the previous amendment, very, very similar to the previous issue. It is true that some of these slots have been sprinkled down into some of the family groups, but effectively—effectively—it is very, very little. The essence then is that it is pretty much the same vote that we had a few minutes ago. I urge my colleagues again to reject the amendment.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President. I agree with the comments of the Senators from Massachusetts, Michigan, and Ohio. We just had an overwhelming vote, that I think in large part reflected the will of this body, that the legal and illegal immigration issues have to be kept separate. I am sure there were a variety of concerns, as well, about the specifics of the previous amendment. But the overwhelming sentiment, I think, is that these issues have to be kept separate.

As indicated in the comments during that debate, that last vote was the vote on whether or not we should take up the legal immigration issues in this bill or not. The vote was very overwhelming.

The Senator from Massachusetts suggests that this amendment might be referred to as Simpson-like. I differ. I argue that it is more like perhaps "Simpson, the sequel," because in both amendments you have this absolute cap. The consequence of that, I think, is very real for families that want to be reunited. In fact, there is an element of the Feinstein amendment that is even harsher.

As I understand, the amendment provides for a 5-year moratorium on siblings being able to come into the country and be reunited in this way. At least the Simpson amendment provided for a category, although, practically

speaking, it was pretty clear we would never get to that.

I think anyone who thinks that this is somehow a major compromise or splitting the difference between current law and the Simpson amendment—I think that would be inaccurate. But the most important point is that because of this amendment, if we go this route, there will be families who are conducting themselves legally, who today could legally obtain a visa and will not obtain a visa. Those families will not be reunited. That is what will happen because of this amendment.

In the end, Mr. President, obviously, this is a legitimate debate. It is the kind of thing we should do out here, but we should do it at the right time. There is a legal immigration bill where this subject could be brought up and dealt with at the appropriate time to review this amendment.

So in light of the last vote, in light of the fact that this will have a real harsh consequence on many families conducting themselves legally, in light of the fact that this body clearly has indicated a desire to keep these issues separate, I urge that the amendment be rejected. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been noted. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAMM. 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. GRAMM. Mr. President, I think we are ready to vote on this side. We thoroughly debated this issue. In fact, we debated it all day. This, in reality, is the same amendment we voted on before. It simply does the same thing in a different way. This amendment, in our opinion, is wrongheaded and wronghearted. It needs to be defeated. I hope we can maintain the 80 votes we had before. I hope everyone who voted against the previous amendment will vote exactly the same way they did for exactly the same reason. I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment of the Senator from California and 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 is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment No. 3740. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 84 Leg.]

YEAS—74

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

NAYS—26

Baucus	Exon	Kassebaum
Boxer	Faircloth	Kyl
Breaux	Feinstein	Nunn
Brown	Grassley	Reid
Bryan	Heflin	Roth
Burns	Helms	Shelby
Byrd	Hollings	Simpson
Cohen	Jeffords	Thomas
Dole	Johnston	

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 3740) was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

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

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia for a personal privilege.

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

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Senator.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I seek unanimous consent to change my vote on rollcall No. 82 from yesterday, April 24, 1996. At the time of the vote, I did not realize it was a tabling motion. Had I realized that, I would have voted "no", not to table it. This vote change, if I get unanimous consent, in no way would change the outcome of the vote.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be changed to reflect that I support the Dorgan amendment No. 3667 and that I oppose the motion to table the Dorgan amendment.

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

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, as the U.S. Senate continues to debate the illegal immigration reform legislation, I would like to make a brief statement on an issue of importance to the State of Hawaii and our Nation. Tourism is

the No. 1 industry in the State of Hawaii. The State has expressed an interest in extending the current Visa Waiver Pilot Program to other Asian countries, particularly the Republic of Korea. The current Visa Waiver Pilot Program covers only three countries in the Asia-Pacific region: Japan, New Zealand, and Brunei. New Zealand, Canada, and Guam all have visa waiver agreements with Korea. Since implementing visa waiver agreements with Korea, arrivals increased in the first year by 285 percent to New Zealand, 96 percent to Canada, and 147 percent to Guam. In 1995, the State of Hawaii welcomed over 120,000 visitors from Korea, and the State is anxious to see future growth in visitors from this important emerging market.

Travel and tourism also play a major role in reducing the United States unfavorable balance of trade. There is an increasing demand by citizens of the Republic of Korea to visit the United States. In fiscal year 1994, 320,747 non-immigrant visas were issued to Korean travelers. In fiscal year 1995, 394,044 nonimmigrants visas were issued to Korean travelers. Of this amount, 320,120 were tourist visas.

The Republic of Korea is not eligible to participate in the current Visa Waiver Pilot Program. On March 14, 1996, I, along with Senators MURKOWSKI, AKAKA, and STEVENS, introduced S. 1616, legislation that would establish a 3-year Visa Waiver Pilot Program for Korean nationals who are traveling in tour groups to the United States. Under the program, selected travel agencies in Korea would be allowed to issue temporary travel permits. The applicants would be required to meet the same prerequisites imposed by the U.S. Embassy.

The pilot legislation also includes additional restrictions to help deter the possibility of illegal immigration. These are:

The stay in the United States is no more than 15 days.

The visitor poses no threat to the welfare, health, and safety, or security of the United States.

The visitor possesses a round-trip ticket.

The visitor who is deemed inadmissible or deportable by an immigration officer would be returned to Korea by the transportation carrier.

Tour operators will be required to post a \$200,000 performance bond with the Secretary of State, and will be penalized if a visitor fails to return on schedule.

Tour operators will be required to provide written certification of the on-time return of each visitor within the tour group.

The Secretary of State and the Attorney General can terminate the pilot program should the overstay rate exceed 2 percent.

Accordingly, I urge Senators SIMPSON and KENNEDY to schedule a hearing on this proposal. I also encourage my colleagues to cosponsor S. 1616.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, during today's debate on S. 1664, I wanted to take the opportunity to speak on a bill I have cosponsored, the Korea visa waiver pilot project legislation, S. 1616. While this legislation is not being offered as an amendment to S. 1664, the subject of the bill is relevant to today's debate.

I would urge all Senators to consider cosponsoring this legislation, and I would hope that the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration of the Senate Judiciary Committee will hold hearings on the problems of visa issuance for Koreans, and the partial solution offered by S. 1616.

I have worked closely with Senators INOUE, AKAKA, and STEVENS on this legislation. This bill addresses the problem of the slow issuance of United States tourist visas to Korean citizens, and their, too often, subsequent decision not to vacation in the United States, including Alaska even though there are direct flights available for tourists from Korea to Alaska. The United States Chamber of Commerce in Korea has made resolving this issue a top priority on their agenda.

The main problem is that Koreans typically wait 2 to 3 weeks to obtain visas from the United States Embassy in Seoul. As a result, these spontaneous travelers decide to go to one of the other 48 nations that allow them to travel to their country without a visa, including both Canada and New Zealand.

This bill provides the legal basis for a carefully controlled pilot program for visa free travel by Koreans to the United States. The program seeks to capture the Korean tourism market lost due to the cumbersome visa system. For example, in 1994, 296,706 non-immigrant United States visas were granted to Koreans of which 7,000 came to Alaska. It is predicted that there would be a 500- to 700-percent increase in Korean tourism to Alaska with the visa waiver pilot project. In New Zealand, for example, a 700-percent increase in tourism from Korea occurred after they dropped the visa requirement.

This pilot program allows visitors in a tour group from South Korea to travel to the United States without a visa. However, it does not compromise the security standards of the United States. The program would allow selected travel agencies in Korea to issue temporary travel permits based on applicants meeting the same preset standards used by the United States Embassy in Seoul. The travel permits could only be used for supervised group tours.

Many restrictions are included in the legislation for the pilot proposal.

The Attorney General and Secretary of State can terminate the program if the overstay rates in the program are 2 percent.

The stay of the visitors is less than or equal to 15 days.

The visitors have to have a round-trip ticket, in addition, the visitors

have to arrive by a carrier that agrees to take them back if they are deemed inadmissible.

We recommend to the Secretary of State to institute a bonding and licensing requirement that each participating travel agency post a substantial performance bond and pay a financial penalty if a tourist fails to return on schedule.

The on-time return of each tourist in the group would be certified after each tour.

Security checks are done to ensure that the visitor is not a safety threat to the United States.

This legislation's restrictions ensure that the pilot program will be a successful program. Again, I urge my colleagues to support and cosponsor this legislation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant 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 (Mr. BENNETT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I move to table the motion to recommit and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE THE MOTION TO RECOMMIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to recommit.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 85 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Brown	Grassley	Pressler
Burns	Gregg	Roth
Campbell	Hatch	Santorum
Chafee	Hatfield	Shelby
Coats	Helms	Simpson
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith
Cohen	Inhofe	Snowe
Coverdell	Jeffords	Specter
Craig	Kassebaum	Stevens
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thomas
DeWine	Kyl	Thompson
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Faircloth	Mack	

NAYS—47

Akaka	Breaux	Dodd
Baucus	Bryan	Dorgan
Biden	Bumpers	Exon
Bingaman	Byrd	Feingold
Boxer	Conrad	Feinstein
Bradley	Daschle	Ford

Glenn	Kohl	Pell
Graham	Lautenberg	Pryor
Harkin	Leahy	Reid
Heflin	Levin	Robb
Hollings	Lieberman	Rockefeller
Inouye	Mikulski	Sarbanes
Johnston	Moseley-Braun	Simon
Kennedy	Moynihan	Wellstone
Kerrey	Murray	Wyden
Kerry	Nunn	

So the motion to lay on the table the motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Let me indicate to my colleagues that it will probably be fairly late. We will have a series of votes here. I will try to reduce the votes from three to one. That may be objected to. If not, there will be three votes. That will be followed by the appropriations bill that is here from the House.

I am not certain how much debate we will have. It is a \$160 billion package. I assume there will be considerable debate. We are probably looking at 12 o'clock, somewhere in there.

Having said that, I now ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to move to table en bloc, which would save time, amendments numbered 3669, 3670, and 3671. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we inquire from the majority leader whether there is any willingness to set a time for the minimum wage debate so that we could have an up or down vote and the leader could have an up or down vote so we could avoid all of this parliamentary business.

Mr. DOLE. Let me indicate to my colleague from Massachusetts—and I have discussed this briefly with him and with the Democratic leader. I have asked Senator LOTT to discuss it further with the Democratic leader.

We made a proposal—as I understand, it has been objected to—that we would take it up not before June 4 but not later than June 28, and other provisions, but we understood that would not be agreed to. It is not that we have not tried. We will continue to work with the Democratic leader and the Senator from Massachusetts.

I would like to pass the immigration bill. It seems to me that immigration, particularly illegal immigration, is a very, very important issue in this country. It has broad bipartisan support. The minimum wage, whatever its merits may be, does not belong on this bill. We waited 3 years into the Clinton administration for anybody to even mention minimum wage. At least, the President never mentioned minimum wage.

Since the action on the Senate floor, the President has mentioned, I guess this year, minimum wage 50-some times—not once the previous 3 years. So, it is not too difficult to understand the motivation.

Having said that, we are prepared to try to work out some accommodation with my colleagues on the other side, and we hope that we can save some time. These are going to be party line votes. There will be three of them. We

could have three votes or we could have one vote, whatever my colleagues would like to have.

Mr. KENNEDY. Further reserving the right to object, it is my understanding the proposal that was made was not an up or down vote and clean vote on the issue of the minimum wage. That was not the proposal that was made. That is what we are asking for. That is what we are asking for. I would also say that we have had some 2½ hours of quorum calls today. All we are asking for is a short time period for an up-or-down vote and for the majority leader's proposal on this, and a reasonable timeframe. If we are not given that kind of an opportunity—we have gone, for three and a half or 4 days, through various gymnastics to try to avoid a vote on the minimum wage, and now we are asked to truncate what has been done in order to avoid the vote on the minimum wage. So I object.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3669

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I now move to table amendment No. 3669 and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. I will yield for a question. I do not want to frustrate the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not in order.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. I do not want to delay the vote. I know everybody wants to move on. This issue has two pieces to it. The first is the one the Senator from Massachusetts described, relating to our determination to get a vote on the minimum wage. The other is the opportunity we want to be able to offer amendments. A tree was constructed, parliamentarily, to deny Democrats the opportunity to offer these amendments. That is really what this whole arrangement has been all about—denying Democrats the opportunity to offer amendments. We hope that we can accommodate a way with which to deal with Democratic amendments, and it is only through this process that we are going to be able to do that.

So I am sorry that Senators are inconvenienced, but there is no other way, short of an agreement on amendments, that we are going to be able to resolve this matter.

Mr. McCAIN. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. Mr. PRYOR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

QUORUM CALL

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 1]

Abraham	Feingold	Lugar
Akaka	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Ford	McCain
Baucus	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Glenn	Mikulski
Biden	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Boxer	Grams	Murray
Bradley	Grassley	Nickles
Breaux	Gregg	Nunn
Brown	Harkin	Pell
Bryan	Hatch	Pressler
Bumpers	Hatfield	Pryor
Burns	Heflin	Reid
Byrd	Helms	Robb
Campbell	Hollings	Rockefeller
Chafee	Hutchison	Roth
Coats	Inhofe	Santorum
Cochran	Inouye	Sarbanes
Cohen	Jeffords	Shelby
Conrad	Johnston	Simon
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Simpson
Craig	Kempthorne	Smith
D'Amato	Kennedy	Snowe
Daschle	Kerrey	Specter
DeWine	Kerry	Stevens
Dodd	Kohl	Thomas
Dole	Kyl	Thompson
Domenici	Leahy	Thurmond
Dorgan	Levin	Warner
Exon	Lieberman	Wellstone
Faircloth	Lott	Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll-call has been completed and a quorum is present.

AMENDMENT NO. 3669

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll on the motion to table.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 86 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Brown	Grassley	Pressler
Burns	Gregg	Roth
Campbell	Hatch	Santorum
Chafee	Hatfield	Shelby
Coats	Helms	Simon
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith
Cohen	Inhofe	Snowe
Coverdell	Jeffords	Specter
Craig	Kassebaum	Stevens
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thomas
DeWine	Kyl	Thompson
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Faircloth	Mack	

NAYS—46

Akaka	Bryan	Exon
Baucus	Bumpers	Feingold
Biden	Byrd	Feinstein
Bingaman	Conrad	Ford
Boxer	Daschle	Glenn
Bradley	Dodd	Graham
Breaux	Dorgan	Harkin

Heflin
Hollings
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Kerrey
Kerry
Kohl
Leahy

Levin
Lieberman
Mikulski
Moseley-Braun
Moynihan
Murray
Nunn
Pell
Pryor

Reid
Robb
Rockefeller
Sarbanes
Simon
Wellstone
Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 3669) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I now ask it be in order for me to table en bloc amendments Nos. 3670 and 3671, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. We object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT NO. 3670

Mr. DOLE. I now move to table amendment No. 3670 and ask for yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the vote be limited to 10 minutes.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 87 Leg.)

YEAS—53

Abraham
Ashcroft
Bennett
Bond
Brown
Burns
Campbell
Chafee
Coats
Cochran
Cohen
Coverdell
Craig
D'Amato
DeWine
Dole
Domenici
Faircloth

Frist
Gorton
Gramm
Grams
Grassley
Gregg
Hatch
Hatfield
Helms
Hutchinson
Inhofe
Jeffords
Kassebaum
Kempthorne
Kyl
Lott
Lugar
Mack

McCain
McConnell
Mikowski
Nickles
Pressler
Roth
Santorum
Shelby
Simpson
Smith
Snowe
Specter
Stevens
Thomas
Thompson
Thurmond
Warner

NAYS—47

Akaka
Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boxer
Bradley
Breaux
Bryan
Bumpers
Byrd
Conrad
Daschle
Dodd
Dorgan
Exon
Feingold

Feinstein
Ford
Glenn
Graham
Harkin
Heflin
Hollings
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Kerrey
Kerry
Kohl
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin

Lieberman
Mikulski
Moseley-Braun
Moynihan
Murray
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Reid
Robb
Rockefeller
Sarbanes
Simon
Wellstone
Wyden

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 3670) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 3671

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to table amendment No. 3671 and ask for the yeas and nays. I ask unanimous consent that the vote be 10 minutes.

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

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3671

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

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 88 Leg.)

YEAS—53

Abraham
Ashcroft
Bennett
Bond
Brown
Burns
Campbell
Chafee
Coats
Cochran
Cohen
Coverdell
Craig
D'Amato
DeWine
Dole
Domenici
Exon

Faircloth
Frist
Gorton
Gramm
Grams
Grassley
Gregg
Hatch
Hatfield
Helms
Hutchinson
Inhofe
Jeffords
Kassebaum
Kempthorne
Kyl
Lott
Lugar

Mack
McConnell
Mikowski
Nickles
Pressler
Roth
Santorum
Shelby
Simpson
Smith
Snowe
Specter
Stevens
Thomas
Thompson
Thurmond
Warner

NAYS—46

Akaka
Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boxer
Bradley
Breaux
Bryan
Bumpers
Byrd
Conrad
Daschle
Dodd
Dorgan
Feingold
Feinstein

Ford
Glenn
Graham
Harkin
Heflin
Hollings
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Kerrey
Kerry
Kohl
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Lieberman

Mikulski
Moseley-Braun
Moynihan
Murray
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Reid
Robb
Rockefeller
Sarbanes
Simon
Wellstone
Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 3671) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we still have just a couple of items to do with reference to the pending legislation. But I have had a discussion with the distinguished Democratic leader. We would like to move now to the conference report, then following the vote on the conference report go back and complete action on the pending measure.

1996 BALANCED BUDGET DOWN-PAYMENT ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed

to the immediate consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3019, the omnibus appropriations bill, with the reading having been waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3019), a bill making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make a further downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of April 24, 1996.)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, maybe just for 1 minute the chairman and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia might give us a summary of the bill. This will be the last vote of the day.

There will be a vote on Monday, late Monday on cloture.

Mr. HATFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we make it 2 minutes for a brief outline.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, let me, first of all, assure the body that the leadership of this committee will be here on the floor following the vote to engage in any colloquy required or asked for or to answer any questions.

Basically, this is where we are. Seven months into the fiscal year we are completing 5 of the 13 appropriations bills, totalling \$162 billion in non-defense discretionary funds.

This covers the Labor-HHS, Commerce, State, Justice, HUD and related agencies, Interior, and the District of Columbia. I want to say that we have accomplished this by a very strong bipartisan effort on the part of both the House and the Senate and the White House.

Leon Panetta, representing the White House, and DAVID OBEY and Chairman LIVINGSTON from the House, Senator BYRD and myself from the Senate were the five principals, with staff assisting us, and we resolved seven riders relating to environmental issues and to the other riders that were very controversial: population control, HIV, repeal of the military, and the abortion package relating to certification.

We had the opportunity to engage in having the administration and executive branch help offset the add-backs