

resolve that issue on the side of American taxpayers, who work hard to earn their money and then give it to the Government and find that, in turn, there is such dramatic abuses of our welfare assistance to those in need, perhaps by aliens who seem almost to be brought here in contemplation of taking advantage of all of this. It seems that simply making the support affidavit legally enforceable is a legislative wish.

Once again, in testimony in front of the Budget Committee, where we were concerned about the skyrocketing costs, there was an analogy drawn between a sponsor's affidavit of enforcement and child support enforcement. I only raise that because child support enforcement is almost one of these things that bear the wrong name because you cannot enforce it. You do not have enough bureaucracy or computers to enforce it. I think when we are finished, we may find ourselves in the same place again because the enforceability of these affidavits is going to be such a monster job that I am not sure it is going to work. But at least we are on record saying it is to be enforced, and we have set the rules in this bill to make this a better opportunity on behalf of our taxpayers.

A panelist asked, How can we expect to make enforcement of affidavits work? Then they said the 20 years of experience in the child support program would indicate it may not work.

Does the Immigration Service, or any other entity charged with implementing this bill, have the resources to effectively administer the deeming requirement and enforce the affidavit? I am not sure. Perhaps the sponsors can address that in due course.

Do we think that there are other steps that should be taken, perhaps along the lines of immigrant restrictions that are in the welfare bill—a 5-year ban on receipts, all noncitizens ineligible for SSI and food stamps?

Could these steps be an interim solution until we have an effective screening mechanism for public charges, enforcement of support orders and deeming requirements?

Mr. President, I did not come to the floor to criticize the bill because, in fact, it makes a dramatic change in the direction of seeing to it that the public charge is minimized when indeed it should be minimal, not played upon, abused in some instances, and even planned abuse to see to it that aliens come and when they get old enough, they go on the public welfare rolls, even though that was never contemplated by our laws—either immigration or welfare.

Mr. President, I thank Senator SIMPSON for yielding the floor so I could use part of my time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I hope every one of our colleagues have heard the remarks of the senior Senator from New Mexico. They were powerful, startling, and here is the man whom we en-

trust with handling our budget activities. And who does it with greater skill and dogged determination than this man? He is citing what has happened to the things that we believe in and that we try to support. I know they have been so seriously disrupted and distorted. They could not have been made more clear. I thank the Senator. With a few words, and with a graph or two, he placed it in better perspective than I possibly could. The present situation is simply unsustainable, and it is going to become ever more so.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

I will add one further comment. I am firmly convinced—and I think the Senator from Wyoming is—that if the American people understood this problem they would be on his side on this bill. I do not believe with the budget constraints—and having to look at the many programs affecting American citizens and immigrants who become citizens who are working and moving America ahead—that we have this kind of situation involved with reference to in the broadest sense our welfare programs. That does not mean in every single sense I agree with the Senator's approach in this bill. Maybe lunches for school kids may be an exception. It is a bit burdensome. But essentially we have to know what we are giving these people, and decide what we can afford. I think that is to be the prevailing test. And, frankly, we cannot afford a lot. We just cannot. We cannot take care of American citizens in this country.

I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

I have toyed with the issue of doing something with regard to legal immigration, and that was a rather less effective exercise. Somebody else can deal with that one in the years to come because this is all a part of that.

AMENDMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED EN BLOC—NOS. 3855 AND 3857 THROUGH 3862; AND 3853 AND 3854

Mr. SIMPSON. I have two unanimous-consent requests.

I ask unanimous consent that amendments 3855 and 3857 through 3862 be considered en bloc, and I also ask unanimous consent that amendments 3853 and 3854 be considered en bloc.

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

MAKING CORRECTIONS TO PUBLIC LAW 104-134

Mr. SIMPSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar item No. 387, Senate Joint Resolution 53.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 53) making corrections to Public Law 104-134.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, this resolution makes several adjustments to the Omnibus appropriations bill which the President has signed. I would like to take this unexpected opportunity to express my disappointment, and some astonishment, at the way the funding issue on international voluntary family planning found its conclusion.

Though I wrote the language on family planning that this resolution repeals, despite what misgivings I and others may have about this action, we made a deal in conference and will stick to it.

Since we are all a little battle-weary from consideration of the omnibus bill, I will forego a reiteration of the history of the family planning provision, or a reassertion of what has already been stated on the merits of the issue. A few points that were lost in the din of debate, however, deserve a brief note.

It is axiomatic that reducing the number of unintended pregnancies in the world will reduce the number of abortions. Conversely, where there is no access to family planning, and this will be the case in more regions of the world now, the number of abortions and maternal deaths will quickly rise.

Through the 85-percent cut in AID's voluntary family planning program which regrettably is now in the law, we are going to find this out the hard way. Of the many ironies which have dogged this matter from the outset, among the most painful is that hundreds of thousands of women and children are going to die because prolife Members of Congress, many of whom understand basic biology, failed to apply their understanding to this issue.

A related irony is that voluntary family planning has become hostage to the politics of abortion. Though AID is prohibited by law from using any U.S. money for abortion, the fungibility argument, a slim reed at best, is being used to deny family planning services to millions of poor couples overseas. While prolife Members continue to engage in fungibility discussions, millions more abortions will occur. This offends both decency and common sense, but for now it appears that we can do no better.

We all care about vulnerable families, particularly women and children. I will remind my colleagues, especially those who would fund child survival programs but cut family planning, that UNICEF's "State of the World's Children" report states that "Family planning could bring more benefits to more people at less cost than any other single 'technology' now available to the human race."

I assure my colleagues that this matter will not go away. It is my hope that Members on both sides of this issue will avoid the temptation to let rigid

ideology stand in the way of compassion and common sense in the next round of debate, which will surely occur on the fiscal year 1997 foreign operations appropriations bill.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly on the technical correction bill to the continuing resolution which the Senate is about to consider.

It is my understanding that the legislation passed last week inadvertently included the text of the Hatfield amendment, which provided that the harsh restrictions on the operations of the international family planning program could be waived if the President determined that they would interfere with the delivery of such services and result in a significant increase in abortions than would otherwise be the case in the absence of such restrictions. That amendment had been adopted by the Senate by a vote of 52 to 43, but the conferees nevertheless evidently decided to abandon the Senate position. That was a very unfortunate decision, in my view, that will have an adverse impact worldwide on efforts to provide family planning services to individuals in developing countries.

It is not my intent, nevertheless, to take advantage of what was a clerical error in the actual text of the continuing resolution. I recognize that the comity of the Senate requires that both sides of the aisle work in good faith in these areas.

However, I do want to note for the record, that this courtesy was not extended by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee majority to the minority when a somewhat similar drafting error occurred during consideration in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the international family planning authorization legislation on the foreign aid authorization bill. At that time, we were advised that although the intent of our amendment was clear, a drafting error occurred which did not reflect the intent of the Committee in adopting, by a vote of 11 to 5, an amendment relating to the international family planning program, and that a technical correction would not be permitted without the entire committee revisiting the issue. My staff was advised that this comity, which is routinely provided when committee staff are authorized to make technical and conforming amendments, would not be extended in this case because the issue involved family planning and abortion which were important to the chairman. Unfortunately, there were other incidents involving population issues during the Foreign Relations Committee's deliberations that also damaged the sense of comity that has traditionally characterized the Senate.

Mr. President, these issues are very important to me and to many Members of the Senate. Indeed, a majority of the Senate repeatedly voted in favor of the international family planning program in a number of votes taken on the for-

eign operations appropriations bill. The position taken by the conferees on the continuing resolution does not reflect the Senate's position on this issue and I very much regret that the Senate conferees did not uphold the Senate's position. I must say I am confounded why the anti-abortion movement would try to dismantle the very program that does more to prevent abortions than any other campaign.

However, I do not believe that it is appropriate to take advantage of a clerical error to regain our position. I hope that in the future similar courtesy will be extended when the shoe is on the other foot—even when the issue is of great importance to individual Members or is as sensitive as population policy is.

I also hope that now that the population program is resolved for this year, that the program—however small it is—be allowed to go forward. There are currently over 50 population program actions that the administration has notified the Congress of, but which cannot proceed since the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee routinely puts a hold on all population programs. Even those of us who fervently oppose these reductions accept we need to live with them; I wish that opponents of the program would also try to abide by this compromise, and allow what is left of the program to proceed.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, once again I come to the floor about an issue of vital importance—international family planning funding.

In the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations appropriations bill, a draconian provision was enacted that is decimating our family planning programs worldwide. Under that provision, no new funding can be used for population assistance until July 1, 1996—a full 9 months into the current fiscal year. Beginning in July, the program will be funded at a level reduced 35 percent from the 1995 funding level, to be allocated on a month-by-month basis for the next 15 months.

Mr. President, in dollar figures, the effect of this provision is catastrophic. The net result is to cut funding for family planning programs from \$547 million in fiscal year 1995 to \$72 million for this fiscal year. This is an 86-percent cut in just 1 year. This is indefensible. This is foolish. This is wrong.

Recognizing the damage being done by these restrictions, Senator HATFIELD sponsored an amendment to the last continuing resolution [CR] which would have allowed funding for these programs to resume. Senators DOLE and MCCONNELL tried to defeat that amendment but their effort was overwhelmingly rebuffed by a bipartisan majority in the Senate. Unfortunately, the Hatfield language did not survive in conference. Once again, the Republican majority in the House, which opposes these family planning programs, refused to accept the Hatfield amendment, or in fact any other compromise

language offered by the Senate conferees to deal with this issue responsibly.

In a strange twist of fate, however, the conferees left in Senator HATFIELD's language by mistake. The final bill that was passed by the House and the Senate would, in other words, remove these intolerable and destructive limitations on family planning programs.

Now we are being asked to correct that mistake—in effect, to put back into place those very restrictions that a majority of us voted against and which we have worked so hard to overturn. I understand that this is merely the correction of an unintentional mistake. However, I would ask: Would the other side do the same for us if they were in our shoes? Would they agree to help us eliminate language they strongly supported? And sadly, the one recent instance I can remember of a case like this in the Foreign Relations Committee is that they did not accommodate us. So I think the Senate should be reminded of how far out on a limb we are going.

I will not object to this unanimous-consent request. However, should the situation be reversed, and we err at some time in the future, I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will extend the same courtesy to us.

I want to express my strong conviction that international family planning programs are in America's best interest. Funding for these programs is an investment that will save the lives of thousands of women and prevent millions of unplanned births and abortions in the future. These programs will help to ensure that newborn babies will be more healthy and to avert the problem of overpopulation.

I joined Senator SIMPSON in representing the United States at the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo, where the United States played a leadership role in galvanizing the international community to action. The conference called for a global effort to address overpopulation and to work together to promote maternal and child health care, educational opportunities for women and girls, and, most importantly, family planning programs. After pledging to provide world leadership in the area of international family planning, we cannot abandon our global partners at this juncture.

Mr. President, let me take a moment to address what I believe is clouding the debate about family planning programs. There are some who want to equate family planning with abortion. Let me make clear: Family planning does not mean abortion.

In fact, statistics prove that when women have access to voluntary family planning programs, the incidence of abortion decreases. Through education and contraception, family planning programs help women and families living in impoverished countries to begin childbearing later in life and to space their children. The issue of helping

families better plan for children is in the interest of all those involved.

In addition, Federal law prohibits the United States from funding abortions abroad. The U.S. Agency for International Development has strictly abided by that law. Those who argue that international family planning programs fund abortions abroad are simply wrong.

Mr. President, by denying people access to the family planning programs worldwide by slashing their funding, there will be an estimated 4 million more unintended pregnancies every year, close to a million infant deaths, tens of thousands of deaths among women and—let me emphasize to my colleagues who oppose permitting women to choose abortions in the case of unwanted pregnancies—1.6 million more abortions.

These programs provide 17 million families worldwide the opportunity to responsibly plan their families and space their children. They offer a greater chance for safe childbirth and healthy children, and avoid adding to the population problem that hurts all of us and hurts the unborn generations even more severely.

In order to spend the population money the administration will have to send the required notifications to the appropriate congressional committees. When that process begins, I hope that those on the other side of the aisle who oppose family planning programs will remember that supporters of family planning programs, on both sides of the aisle, allowed this technical correction to be made and that they will not use the notification process to prevent the funds from flowing.

The Senate has voted time and time again in favor of international family planning programs. Soon we will begin consideration of the fiscal year 1997 budget. Make no mistake about it. Family planning will be an issue and the Senate will continue to fight for its position on this issue. The time is long overdue for the House majority to start acting responsibly on an issue that will affect generations to come.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered read for a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

So the joint resolution was considered, deemed read for a third time, and passed; as follows:

S.J. RES. 53

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That:

(a) In Public Law 104-134, insert after the enacting clause:

“TITLE I—OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS”.

(b) The two penultimate undesignated paragraphs under the subheading “ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE” under

the heading “TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE” of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, as contained in section 101(c) of Public Law 104-134, are repealed.

(c) Section 520 under the heading “TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS” of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, as contained in section 101(e) of Public Law 104-134, is repealed.

(d) Strike out section 337 under the heading “TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS” of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, as contained in section 101(c) of Public Law 104-134, and insert in lieu thereof:

“SEC. 337. The Secretary of the Interior shall promptly convey to the Daughters of the American Colonists, without reimbursement, all right, title and interest in the plaque that in 1933 was placed on the Great Southern Hotel in Saint Louis, Missouri by the Daughters of the American Colonists to mark the site of Fort San Carlos.”

(e) Section 21104 of Public Law 104-134 is repealed.

IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a vote occur on or in relation to the Graham amendment No. 3760 at 2:15 today, and immediately following that vote there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form to be followed by a vote on or in relation to the Graham amendment No. 3803 with the clarification that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided on each of those amendments, and that the debate begin at 2:15.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

Mr. President, I will submit the amendment in a moment. As we prepare to do that, let me say that I will proceed to an amendment. Senator KENNEDY has certainly accelerated the process. I am very appreciative. He and I intend to deal with the hot button items, and certainly the one with regard to deeming and public assistance and welfare is one of those. Anything to do with verification is one of those.

So now I do not think this one will be exceedingly controversial because it will deal with the issue of the birth certificate, and the birth certificate is the most abused document. It is the breeder document of most falsification. I have tried to accommodate the interests of Senator DEWINE.

I may not have met that test. But I certainly have tried. I have tried to meet the recommendations of Senator LEAHY, and certainly we have met the test of the issue of cost. Because we have it now so provided that I think we have met those conditions.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3853 AND 3854, EN BLOC

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I call up amendments at this time 3853 and

3854 and ask that they be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the pending amendments are set aside, and without objection it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON) proposes amendments numbered 3853 and 3854 en bloc.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I believe that those relate to verification. I am not prepared to bring those up at this time, and I ask unanimous consent that that request be withdrawn.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3855 AND 3857 THROUGH 3862, EN BLOC

Mr. SIMPSON. I call up amendments 3855 and 3857 through 3862, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments are set aside, and the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON) proposes amendments numbered 3855 and 3857 through 3862, en bloc.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The text of the amendments follow:

AMENDMENT NO. 3855

(Purpose: To amend sec. 118 by phasing-in over 6 years the requirements for improved driver's licenses and State-issued I.D. documents)

In sec. 118(b), on page 42 delete lines 18 through 19 and insert the following:

“(5) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

“(A) Except as otherwise provided in subparagraphs (B) or (C), this subsection shall take effect on October 1, 2000.

“(B)(i) With respect to driver's licenses or identification documents issued by States that issue such licenses or documents for a period of validity of six years or less, Paragraphs (1) and (3) shall apply beginning on October 1, 2000, but only to licenses or documents issued to an individual for the first time and to replacement or renewal licenses issued according to State law.

“(ii) With respect to driver's licenses or identification documents issued in States that issue such licenses or documents for a period of validity of more than six years, Paragraphs (1) and (3) shall apply—

“(I), during the period of October 1, 2000 through September 30, 2006, only to licenses or documents issued to an individual for the first time and to replacement or renewal licenses issued according to State law, and

“(II), beginning on October 1, 2006, to all driver's licenses or identification documents issued by such States.

“(C) Paragraph (4) shall take effect on October 1, 2006.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3857

Amend section 118(a)(3) to read as follows:

(B) The conditions described in this subparagraph include—

(i) the presence on the original birth certificate of a notation that the individual is deceased, or

(ii) actual knowledge by the issuing agency that the individual is deceased obtained through information provided by the Social Security Administration, by an interstate