

in asking for documents and so on, and have no intention to discriminate, that they are not going to be heavily fined, or receive other penalties. That was a great advantage to the employer.

So I hope the staffs, if there are any watching this procedure, do not simply load the cannon for their principal, as we are called by our staff—and other things we are called by our staff—principals, that they load the cannon not to come over here and tell us what is going to happen to employers having to ask for identity, having to prove the person in front of them is a citizen or authorized to work, unless you want to get rid of employer sanctions and get rid of the I-9. Those things have been on the books for almost 10 years.

With that, I hope that is a starting point we take judicial notice thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, my friend and colleague has stated absolutely accurately what the current state of the law is. For those who have questions about it, all they have to do is look at the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 274, that spells out the requirements of employment in the United States. I will not take the time to go through that at this particular moment, but for those who doubt or question any of the points the Senator has made, it is spelled out very clearly in section 274(a).

That is why we have the I-9 list, which is the list, A, B, and C. This is the part of the problem which we hope will be remedied with the Simpson proposal, and that is there will be just the six cards. You have list A, you can show one of these items, because under the law you have to have identity and employment eligibility. You can have one of the 10 items on A. Or you can have an item listed on B and an item listed on C, in order to conform with the current law. As has been pointed out both in the hearings as well as in the consideration and the presentation of this legislation, and the consideration of the Judiciary Committee, the result is that there is so much mischief that is created with the reproduction and counterfeit of these particular cards that they have become almost meaningless as a standard by which an employer is able to make a judgment as to the legitimacy of the applicant in order to ensure that Americans are going to get the jobs. Also it makes complex the problems of discrimination, which we talked about yesterday.

It is to address this issue that other provisions in the Simpson proposal—the six cards have been developed as have other procedures which have been outlined. But if there is any question in the minds of any of our colleagues, there is the requirement at the present time, specified in law, to show various documents as a condition of employment. That exists, as the Senator said, today. And any representation that we are somehow, or this bill somehow is altering that or changing that or doing

anything else but improving that process in the system is really a distortion of what is in the bill and a distortion of what is intended by the proposal before the Senate. So I will welcome the opportunity to join with my colleague on this issue.

It has been mentioned, as we are awaiting our friend and colleague from Vermont, who is going to present an amendment, that what we have now is really the first important and significant effort to try to deal with these breeder documents, moving through the birth certificate, hopefully on tamper-proof paper. Hopefully that will begin a long process of helping and assisting develop a system that will move us as much as we possibly can toward a counterfeit-free system, not only in terms of the cards but also in terms of the information that is going to be put on those cards.

We hear many of our colleagues talk about: Let us just get the cards out there. But unless you are going to be serious about looking at the backup, you are not really going to be serious about developing a system. That is what this legislation does. It goes back to the roots, to try to develop the authoritative and definitive birth certificate and to ensure the paper and other possible opportunities for counterfeiting will be effectively eliminated, or reduced dramatically. Then the development of these tamperproof cards; then the other provisions which are included in here, and that is the pilot programs to try to find out how we can move toward greater truth in verification that the person who is presenting it is really the person it has been issued to, and other matters. But that is really the heart of this program.

Frankly, if we cut away at any of those, then I think we seriously undermine an important opportunity to make meaningful progress on the whole issue of limiting the illegal immigration flow. As we all know, the magnet is jobs. As long as that magnet is out there, there is going to be a very substantial flow, in spite of what I think are the beefed-up efforts of the border patrol and other steps which have been taken.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. 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. LEAHY. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has asked for time in morning business. I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, just briefly, before we go back on to the important business at hand, the immigration bill, I just want to call to the attention of the body an article today in the Washington Post entitled "Campaign Finance Proposal Drawing Opposition From Diverse Group." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 1, 1996]

CAMPAIGN FINANCE PROPOSAL DRAWING OPPOSITION FROM DIVERSE GROUP

(By Ruth Marcus)

An unusual alliance of unions, businesses, and liberal and conservative groups is trying to defeat campaign finance legislation that would abolish political action committees and impose other restrictions on election spending.

The informal coalition, which met for the second time yesterday, includes groups that usually find themselves on opposite sides of legislative and ideological battles: unions including the AFL-CIO, National Education Association and National Association of Letter Carriers, and the National Association of Business Political Action Committees (NABPAC), which represents 120 business and trade association PACs.

Also among the 30 organizations at the meeting were conservative groups such as the Cato Institute, Conservative Caucus and Americans for Tax Reform; liberal groups such as EMILY's List, the women's political action committee; and others, including U.S. Term Limits, the National Women's Political Caucus, the National Association of Broadcasters and the American Dental Association.

Yesterday's meeting, at AFL-CIO headquarters here, was organized by Curtis Gans of the Committee for the Study of the American Electorate, a nonpartisan organization that studies voter turnout. Gans opposes the campaign finance proposal pending in Congress.

"The unifying principle is essentially that the approaches that have been pushed by Common Cause and Public Citizen are wrong . . . and their answers to the problems are wrong," Gans said, referring to two of the leading groups pushing the campaign finance legislation.

He said the groups that met yesterday were "unanimous" about the need to do "public education" activities to counter a debate that Gans said "has essentially been dominated by the Common Cause position." But the diverse assemblage was unable even to agree to Gans's draft joint statement about the issue.

Common Cause president Ann McBride said the meeting showed "labor and business . . . coming together and agreeing on the one thing that they can agree on, which is maintaining the status quo and their ability to use money to buy outcomes on Capitol Hill."

The meeting reflects a stepped-up effort by foes of the proposal. NABPAC has launched a print and radio advertising campaign here and in districts of members who support the bill. The ads target individual lawmakers by name.

"Legislation sponsored by Rep. David Minge . . . will make it harder for average

Americans to contribute to campaigns and to run for office," said a newspaper ad that ran in the Minnesota Democrat's district. "The next time you see Rep. David Minge ask him this simple question: Why do you want more millionaires in Congress?"

NABPAC also is encouraging its members to cut off contributions to lawmakers who support the bill, and last month sent a memorandum to members of Congress enclosing copies of its ads. "The plans are to aggressively market this in other appropriate areas of the country," NABPAC executive vice president Steven F. Stockmeyer said in the memo.

Three sponsors of the campaign finance bill in the House, Reps. Christopher Shays (R-Conn.), Martin T. Meehan (D-Mass.) and Linda A. Smith (R-Wash.), fired back at NABPAC in a letter to its members last week, calling the memorandum a "thinly veiled threat to keep members from co-sponsoring" the legislation.

"[I]ntimidating members into staying off of the bill by either subtly or blatantly threatening to withhold campaign contributions is disgraceful and justifies why our legislation is needed," they wrote. "Frankly, these efforts simply inspire us further to try to end the system of checkbook lobbying in Washington."

But Shays said yesterday that "some members are [scared] because they don't want to be the enemy of these groups." A Common Cause study released last week found that NABPAC members gave \$106 million to current members of Congress from 1985 to 1995.

In addition to abolishing PACs, the campaign finance bill, sponsored in the Senate by Sens. John McCain (R-Ariz.), Russell Feingold (D-Wis.) and Fred D. Thompson (R-Tenn.), would set voluntary state-by-state spending limits and, for those who agree to the limits, require television stations to offer 30 minutes of free time in evening hours and cut rates for other advertising before primary and general elections.

Critics contend that abolishing PACs would diminish the ability of average citizens to join together to have their voices heard and would increase the influence of wealthy citizens.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, what this article is about is a reaction to the effort that Senator MCCAIN and I and others have been preparing to try to change our Nation's campaign financing system. There are those who have indicated that the effort will go nowhere because it is already too late in the 104th Congress, and that it is just going to go the way of all other campaign finance reform efforts in the past.

Frankly, Mr. President, this article gives me heart. It is eloquent testimony to the reason why we have got to have campaign finance reform in this country and why we need it now. What happened yesterday was, according to the article, an unusual alliance of unions, businesses, and liberal-conservative groups trying to defeat campaign finance legislation that would abolish political action committees and other restrictions on election spending, got together, all together, to try to kill the McCain-Feingold bill. It included groups such as the AFL-CIO, the NEA, National Association of Letter Carriers, the National Association of Business Political Action Committees, Cato Institute, Conservative Caucus, Ameri-

cans for Tax Reform, EMILY's List—you name it—National Association of Broadcasters, the American Dental Association. This was a gathering of all the special interests in Washington, even before we have had the bill come up, saying, "Let's kill it before it has a chance to live."

The reason it gives me heart, Mr. President, really, there are two reasons. First of all, if this bill is not going anywhere, what are they worried about? Why are they coming together, as they so infrequently do, to kill a piece of legislation that is the first bipartisan effort in 10 years in this body to try to do something about the outrageous amount of money that is spent on campaigns and the outrageous influence that this community, Washington, has on the entire political process in this country?

I recall when I ran for the U.S. Senate, I might talk to somebody from the labor community or to an independent banker, and they would say, "Gee, we think you are a pretty good candidate, but first I have to check with Washington to see if I can support you." That is how the current system works. You have to check in with Washington first. I think that gives way too much power to this town and way too much power to these special interests that want to kill campaign finance reform in this Congress.

It gives me heart that there is concern. It also gives me heart that they are drawing attention to the fact. In fact, this article is eloquent testimony to what is really going on in this country. There is too much money in this town; there is too much money in these elections. What they are trying to do, Ann McBride of Common Cause pointed out, is to preserve the status quo, the meeting of labor and business coming together and agreeing on the one thing they can agree on, which is maintaining the status quo and their ability to use money to buy outcomes on Capitol Hill.

What our bipartisan effort is about is returning the power back to the people in their own home States, to let them have more influence over elections than the special interests that run this town. We will join this issue on the floor, and we will fight these special interests head on, regardless of their new coalitions.

Mr. President, I simply indicate we are prepared, as I did a couple of days ago along with other Senators, we are prepared to offer this as an amendment to a bill in the near future, or if the leadership sees it this way, to bring this up as separate legislation. The time is drawing near for campaign finance reform.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996

The Senate continued with consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3780 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3743

(Purpose: To provide minimum safeguards in expedited exclusion procedure to prevent returning bona fide refugees to their persecutors)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], for himself, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HATFIELD, and Mr. KERRY, proposes an amendment numbered 3780 to amendment No. 3743.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 131 and 132.

Strike section 141 and insert the following:

SEC. 141. SPECIAL EXCLUSION IN EXTRAORDINARY MIGRATION SITUATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding after section 236 (8 U.S.C. 1226) the following new section:

"SPECIAL EXCLUSION IN EXTRAORDINARY MIGRATION SITUATIONS

"SEC. 236A. (a) IN GENERAL.—

"(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 235(b) and 236, and subject to subsection (c), if the Attorney General determines that the numbers or circumstances of aliens en route to or arriving in the United States, by land, sea, or air, present an extraordinary migration situation, the Attorney General may, without referral to a special inquiry officer, order the exclusion and deportation of any alien who is found to be excludable under section 212(a) (6)(C) or (7).

"(2) As used in this section, the term 'extraordinary migration situation' means the arrival or imminent arrival in the United States or its territorial waters of aliens who by their numbers or circumstances substantially exceed the capacity of the inspection and examination of such aliens.

"(3) Subject to paragraph (4), the determination whether there exists an extraordinary migration situation within the meaning of paragraphs (1) and (2) is committed to the sole and exclusive discretion of the Attorney General.

"(4) The provisions of this subsection may be invoked under paragraph (1) for a period not to exceed 90 days, unless within such 90-day period or extension thereof, the Attorney General determines, after consultation with the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives, that an extraordinary migration situation continues to warrant such procedures remaining in effect for an additional 90-day period.

"(5) No alien may be ordered specially excluded under paragraph (1) if—

"(A) such alien is eligible to seek asylum under section 208; and

"(B) the Attorney General determines, in the procedure described in subsection (b), that such alien has a credible fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion in the country of such person's nationality, or in the case of a person having no nationality, the country in which such person last habitually resided.

"(6) A special exclusion order entered in accordance with the provisions of this section is not subject to administrative review other than as provided in this section, except that the Attorney General shall provide by