

in. It is fundamentally important to America. I know we have people who stand up and say, well, we can't contract out maintenance for the F-16. You could not trust somebody who didn't work for the Federal Government to maintain the F-16. Our freedom depends on it. Well, who built the F-16? Private contractors. The plain truth is, if Government defense without the involvement of the private sector really worked, we would have lost the cold war.

My point is this: We ought to have it as a matter of policy, and since I am standing on our side of the aisle, let me speak as a Republican. If Republicans believe in anything, it is competition. If Republicans stand for anything, it is that when we are spending the taxpayers' money, we ought to do it as efficiently as possible. We ought not to be concerned about where somebody lives that can do the work cheaper. We ought not to be concerned about what their gender is or their ethnicity. We ought to be concerned about the work they can do, the quality they can provide, and what they are willing to charge.

I have tried to break this impasse. Let me explain what I have proposed and why I think it is more than reasonable, bending over backward, and then I will yield the floor. Obviously, if you wanted to be reasonable on this issue, you would simply say to the Defense Department, look, here are a set of criteria for looking at a fair competition with a level playing surface. Let me say, with all due respect, to the depot caucus in the House, the only fair competition to them is no competition. The last thing on Earth they want is competition. But we could set out simple criteria for a level playing surface to have competition between the public sector and the private sector to do this work. What we ought to do is to do that scrupulously and choose the low bidder for the highest quality and get the most defense we can for the money we have. That is logic.

To try to break this impasse, I have made the following proposal. Have competitive bidding after you first set out the criteria for competitive bidding. If you want to look at the cost of the facilities they are using, to make adjustments for it, then look at everything—look at retirement costs, look at every single cost, come up with a way of measuring it, and have a competition. And then, even if the depots lose the competition by less than 10 percent, give it to them anyway. In other words, let's say that we can maintain the C-5 through a Government depot for \$109 million, and let's say that a private contractor can do it for \$100 million. What I have said is, to try to break this impasse, cheat the taxpayer out of \$9 million. Give it to the depot. But if the private sector can do it for more than 10 percent less, give it to them.

Now, what that is saying is that the depots will win any close competition.

If they are no more than 9.99 percent higher, they win. But if the private sector can do it for 10 percent or more less, can it be prudent public policy, can it make any sense to deny them the right to do that work? I think the answer is no. That has been a proposal that I have made.

Some people have answered, well, you won't have a fair competition. The Air Force will cheat us. I am willing to try to set out criteria. I personally don't believe any of us are so important that the Air Force is out to cheat us. I have never believed in conspiracies. But the point is, all I am trying to do here is not keep a Texas base open. It is going to be closed. But what I want the workers there to have a chance to do is to go to work for private companies that might have a chance to compete for work. So I am not asking for anybody to give anything to San Antonio, TX. But I am demanding that we have an opportunity to compete. A problem we have here is we have a bill that bans that competition. And then we are going to conference with the House, which basically has the approach that whatever money there is belongs to us and we are not worried about how efficiently it is spent, and this is really defense welfare anyway.

So what I am trying to do, and what I would very much like to do to move ahead, is to try to work out an agreement on the principle of competition, something we believe in, something that clearly works, and I am willing to give an edge to the Government. But I think a 10-percent edge is more than generous. I don't think most Americans would agree with that, especially when many of the people competing are small, independent businesses. But, again, I mention this not because I think it is what we ought to do, but what I am willing to do to try to break this logjam. So I thought it was important, having run over here from the Finance Committee and objected and then run back without having a chance to say anything, to get an opportunity to explain why this is important.

This is a critically important issue. I feel like Senator HUTCHISON and I have not been treated fairly on this issue. I believe there is a fundamental national objective here, and I see it as the competition between special interests and the public interest and, in this case, the public interest is also the Texas interest. When you combine the two, I am getting paid twice to do the same work. So I want to be sure that I do it well. That is what this whole thing is about.

Again, I want to apologize to my colleagues for inconveniencing the process. I know they want to move ahead with their bill. But I know that each of them, from time to time, have found themselves in a similar position.

Thank God the Founding Fathers set up the Senate where one Member does have power; where one person can stand in the face of large numbers of

others and say, "no." Ultimately, they can be run over, but they can't be run over for a long time. I think we all benefit from that.

So I am simply taking advantage of the rights I have as an individual Member, as any Member here would, I believe, under the circumstances.

I thank my colleagues for listening. I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, are we at the moment in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are on S. 4.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 4 be set aside and that I be permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes.

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

THE WAYNE, NJ INTERIM STORAGE SITE

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to express my objection to a provision in the defense authorization bill that is expected to shortly come before the full Senate.

The reason that I take this time now to bring this to the Senate is that it is a matter of great urgency. This is the kind of thing that I think citizens throughout the country will automatically rebel against. This is kind of a shock treatment that every now and then happens here that ought to come to the attention of the American public because it is such a flagrant example of the abuse of power, and the power belonging to a corporation with a good friend inside this body.

The provision I am objecting to is one of the most flagrant examples of special interest corporate subsidy that I have ever witnessed in my roughly 15 years in the U.S. Senate. This provision is section 3138 of the defense bill, will have the effect of exempting a company called W.R. Grace—a company that has contributed to a hazardous wastesite in my State of New Jersey—from any further liability at this site.

Mr. President, this provision was written to get W.R. Grace off the hook—out of any responsibility for pollution that they created, out of the obligation to pay for it, thus passing the buck to the American public. This company contributed to this hazardous wastesite in the State of New Jersey, and now the bill includes this reference that excuses them from any further liability for pollution that they created at this site.

The provision effectively grants a special exemption for this company from a law known as the Superfund law, the law which embodies the concepts that the polluter should pay for the pollution and contamination that they created. It is fundamental. The

Superfund law, which I am proud to have helped write, provides the Government with the tools to go after the polluters who are found to be responsible for the waste.

Mr. President, this provision was inserted in the dark of night without any consultation with this Senator who has worked for so many years to get this site cleaned up; and who has been chairman of the subcommittee on Superfund in the Environment and Public Works Committee and is now the ranking member. Though I am not involved directly with the Armed Services Committee, the fact of the matter is that everyone who is here knows that I have been very much involved in helping to create the Superfund law and making sure that we clean up contamination in our country. But here, even the professional staff, the Democratic staff of the committee, was unaware of this section's insertion and were not given any opportunity to review the provision.

This provision is a sneak attack on the environment, on the taxpayers, and on the legal process. This provision says to the taxpayer, "Too bad for you, taxpayer. We will let a corporate polluter off the hook because this polluter has some special friends in the U.S. Senate. Oh, and by the way, taxpayer, this dump has to be cleaned up. Somebody has to pay for it. So I guess it is going to be you. The most it can cost you, taxpayers, is \$120 million. But it saves Grace that money."

So that should make us all feel good, I guess.

I want to explain a little bit about the Wayne Superfund site.

From 1948 to 1971, thorium, a highly radioactive material, and other materials, were extracted at the site that was later owned by W.R. Grace & Co. in Wayne, NJ. The process of mining thorium resulted in contamination with radioactivity of numerous buildings. When the contamination was discovered these buildings were torn down. The resulting waste material was placed in an enormous dump site in Wayne Township, NJ. The Environmental Protection Agency placed this dump site on the Superfund National Priority List in 1984. They said it was one of the worst contaminated sites in the country because this site would potentially threaten the drinking water supply for 51,000 New Jersey residents. The Department of Energy, which oversees the cleanup of this fund under a program that they call FUSRAP, the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program, has spent over \$50 million so far cleaning up this site. The Department of Energy says that the ultimate cleanup may cost as much as \$120 million.

In 1984, W.R. Grace turned over the property and \$800,000 to the Federal Government. That year, W.R. Grace signed a legally binding agreement with the Federal Government which provided explicit assurances that the Government could still pursue the

company under any law, including the Superfund law. So when the Federal Government put down the \$800,000 deposit, that didn't permit them to escape any further liability. W.R. Grace signed the agreement to confirm that.

As the Department of Energy began to clean up the site and to further study the extent of contamination, it soon realized that the cleanup costs were far beyond what they originally believed. In 1996, the Justice Department, acting on behalf of the Department of Energy, began serious discussions with W.R. Grace to determine the extent to which the company might be willing to contribute additional costs to pay for this massive cleanup.

I was assured that these discussions were proceeding in good faith and that progress was being made. But then I found out about this outrageous breach of the legal process to which I believe the company would be seriously committed either by negotiations or tested in the courts of our country.

Mr. President, the residents of Wayne Township are outraged. They feel betrayed by the democratic process, and I share their outrage and disappointment. I am going to be introducing an amendment to remove this provision from the bill and to defend the concept embodied in our law that says that you create the mess, you clean it up; you can't walk away, or, in this case, sneak away from your responsibilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD copies of letters from the Department of Energy written in 1995 which show DOE's efforts to get W.R. Grace to come to the table.

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

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,
Washington, DC, November 20, 1995.

Mr. JEFFREY M. POSNER
Corporate Risk Management Department, W.R.
Grace and Company, Boca Raton, Florida.

DEAR MR. POSNER: I am writing to determine the willingness of W.R. Grace and Company to contribute to the continued cleanup of the former Grace property located at 858 Black Oak Ridge Road, in Wayne, New Jersey. From 1957 to 1971, the facility was operated by the Davison Chemical Division of W.R. Grace. Grace continued to own the site until September 1984, when the U.S. Department of Energy acquired the property to facilitate a decontamination research and development project. Congress directed the Department's involvement in this project through the Conference Report accompanying the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act for Fiscal Year 1984.

The Office of Environmental Management of the U.S. Department of Energy is currently conducting the cleanup of the site, also known as the Wayne Interim Storage Site, under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). The total cost of the cleanup may exceed \$100 million, depending on the final remedy ultimately approved by the Environmental Protection Agency.

As you know, the owner of a site at the time of disposal of hazardous substances at the site is responsible under CERCLA for remedial action costs. Thus, Grace, a former owner of the Wayne property, has a legal

duty to pay for the site's cleanup. In addition, there has been continuing congressional and local interest in pursuing CERCLA cost-recovery actions against potentially responsible parties. Recently, the Department has received specific requests from elected officials, including Senator Lautenberg, Congressman Martini, and Wayne Township's Mayor Waks, that the Department review possible legal actions seeking appropriate cost recovery. We expect congressional and public interest in this issue to continue.

We believe that it is in the best interest of the local stakeholders and American taxpayers to discuss with your company appropriate ways to avoid litigation and ensure that resources are applied directly to the prompt cleanup of the site rather than to courtroom activities.

I will be calling you in the near future to discuss this matter further. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at 202-586-6331 or have a member of your staff contact Mr. Steven Miller, of the Department's Office of General Counsel, at 202-586-6947.

Sincerely,

James M. Owendoff,
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Environmental Restoration.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,
Washington, DC, November 24, 1995.

Hon. FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LAUTENBERG: In my September 29, 1995, letter, I advised you that the Department of Energy would look into the matter of seeking cost recovery against potentially responsible parties for cleanup of the Wayne, New Jersey, site.

After consulting with the Office of the General Counsel, my office has initiated discussion with W.R. Grace and Company to assess their willingness to contribute to the cleanup of the Wayne site. If these discussions are successful, W.R. Grace's cooperation could enable the Department to expedite the overall cleanup schedule for the site.

If possible, we would prefer to avoid time-consuming and costly litigation so that available resources are focused on cleaning up the site. If discussions with W.R. Grace are unsuccessful, we will consider other options including requesting the Department of Justice to initiate formal cost-recovery actions.

We share your goal of pursuing opportunities to expedite the cleanup activities at Wayne. As one example, the Department began removal of the contaminated material in the Wayne pile through an innovative total service contract with Envirocare of Utah. We want to thank you for the enormous support that you have provided over the years to bring this project to fruition.

If you have further questions, please contact me, or have a member of your staff contact Anita Gonzales, Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, at (202) 586-7946.

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. GRUMBLY,
Assistant Secretary for
Environmental Management.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, it is a strange anomaly that the name of this company, W.R. Grace, is the name of—I am not sure whether it was the founder—but the name of someone who helped build this big company. It is also the name of someone who wrote a report that was officially called "The Report of the Grace Commission" in which they talked about how you reduce Government inefficiency, reduce

costs, and cut down the size of Government and get those bureaucrats off our backs—all of those words. But now this company said there is one way to resolve problems, and that is to hide behind a good friend's efforts, whoever that friend may be, and get it off the hook for possibly—\$120 million.

We can't find enough money around here at times to take care of essential programs. We are cutting back Government as much as we can. We are trying to arrive at a balanced budget in the year 2002. And we struggled here not too long ago to try to get disaster relief money into the hands of people whose homes were torn apart, whose families' histories wiped out, with many left penniless and nowhere to turn. We had a heck of a time getting those funds to those people.

Here we have \$120 million that this Government is liable to have to spend to clean up this site. And what do we do? We let the company duck its responsibilities.

Well, Mr. President, I don't intend to threaten at all. But I will say this: If this section stays in the bill and lets W.R. Grace off the hook, and maybe some other companies, we will have to study it a little more thoroughly. I will stand here, and I will talk. I will read, I will lecture, and I will do anything I can to keep this from becoming law because it is an outright misuse of taxpayers' funds. I am not going to let that happen, Mr. President—not this Senator. And I am sure other Senators will agree with me.

With that, I yield the floor. I thank you. I note the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that I be shown as an original cosponsor of S. 923.

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

DEPOT MAINTENANCE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would like to just take a couple of minutes to respond to the best of my memory to some of the things that were stated by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM].

First of all, he mentioned that personalty should not enter into this. I certainly hope that will be the case. Unfortunately, Mr. President, all too often in both bodies if we get wrapped up in things we honestly believe in, it becomes personal. I do not think this will be the case, certainly in the case of Senator GRAMM. He is a man I have respected for many, many years even before I served in the other body or this body. In fact, I was one of the individuals who strongly supported him in his bid for President of the United

States because I thought he was the best choice. And it was not an easy thing for me to do because, unfortunately, our majority leader in the Senate was running.

However, I think some things need to be brought out and some things I have access to because of the fact that I serve on the Senate Armed Services Committee and chair the readiness subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

First of all, on this issue of the depot caucus we hear so much about in the other body, I hear some statements attributed to them that sound a little bit extreme from time to time, but I have to say also that that is a group of people with a genuine concern over how depot business should be handled.

All too often we start thinking of parochial concerns, about what is the effect of a certain action going to be on the population of my State, and forget about the fact that there is a reason for a depot and there is a reason for core functions to be performed in a depot. All too long we have gone without a definition of core, and core, Mr. President, as you well know, is those functions that have to be performed to enable us to defend the lives of Americans.

That is what it is all about. When you talk about the depot caucus over on the other side, I did some things in this bill, and, of course, the Chair is fully aware of it because he was there at the time, made some compromises that the so-called depot caucus found very offensive. I agreed to change the 60-40 formula to 50-50. Also, I did something else that not many people really are aware of because it gets a little bit technical but provided for allowing teaming to be done by a public depot. This is extremely significant and it shows that I of all people am not against private sector competition.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] talked about this as one of the backbones of the philosophy of the Republican Party and the conservative movement. Certainly no one can do more than I have done in the effort for privatization. The difference that has to be distinguished in this case is you can't privatize business, you can't privatize functions that are necessary for the survival of this country.

Let us just say, for example, that in the F-100 engines which are used in some of our combat machines that are necessary to defend America and we saw performing so well in the Persian Gulf war, that has to be done, we have decided, as a policy for America in public depots. And the reason is even if it costs more money—I do not think it does. I think I can come up with an argument that will say that we can do things more efficiently in some of those functions in the public depots; we are set up to do that. But even if we were not able to do that, there is another reason why they have to be done in the public sector, and that is the strategic interests of the United States, the defense issues.

We have all agreed as the policy of this country that core activities, core functions, must be done by the public sector. And so we established this somewhat arbitrary, which it is arbitrary, 60-40, and I was willing to accommodate one of the very prominent Senators from Arizona on the committee, Senator MCCAIN, and Senator MCCAIN did appreciate that very much. So we changed that, and not only are we going to give the ability to the public depots to team, and that is to go outside and subcontract some work, I am willing to count that in any formula as public sector work, even though it is done by the private sector.

Now, that is a great, I think, compromise that we made in order to accommodate some of the Senators who had concerns, and consequently that Senator is in support of the language that is found in this bill.

So I think that if we could present the argument, there is no way you could give even a 20-percent advantage to the public sector in depot maintenance and still have a level playing field. We are fully aware of the process that is written into our system that allows the disposition of Federal properties to be first offered to the Federal Government, then the State government, then ultimately to local subdivisions such as Tulsa, OK, or San Antonio, TX. And so in the event they at no cost in the case of a San Antonio, TX, are able to acquire Kelly Air Force Base and have that multi, multi-million-dollar facility at no cost, they in turn then can give that to a contractor who will bid with no overhead whatsoever.

Now, that is something with which we cannot compete in Tinker Air Force Base or they could not compete with in any other military installation. And there are many other—I have already talked about this and talked about those things that are in the bidding process which make it so that we cannot do it.

I was a little bit surprised when the junior Senator from Texas was talking about John White. During the committee meetings that we had, John White was not able to answer questions about how to level the playing field and provide for real competition if it is desirable.

Keep in mind, Mr. President, it is not desirable because we have established as a policy that those core functions that are necessary to protect the lives of Americans should be done in public depots. If you do not do that, you are going to have a situation where we can be held hostage in times of war, and we know what that could mean for us.

Given the manner in which competition is structured, everyone already knows that private sector bids will come in well below depots, and there are two reasons why. The private bidders can use marginal pricing. We know what marginal pricing is in Government work. Private bidders, unlike the public sector, are allowed to use

marginal pricing to underprice something to get their foot in the door, and once the foot is in the door we become reliant upon them and then they run off. I am not saying the people who are the private sector are unscrupulous or in any way demeaning what they do. They are out in the competitive world, and they are willing to use their assets to bid below cost just to get in there so that the public sector would no longer have the ability to provide that work. I think the Senator from Utah made a very good point. We are losing that ability today. As the skilled workers, whether they are located in Oklahoma or Utah or Georgia, are leaving, getting into other professions, so we would have—every week that goes by we would have a more difficult time in having this as public sector work that would defend America.

So I conclude, Mr. President—and I do not want to be redundant—by saying that another bottom line is right here. This is a GAO report. The GAO report agrees with what the Air Force initially said on how much money would be saved by closing the two bases and transfer that workload to other ALC's. Then they later on, when this administration took a position against it right before the election, they rescinded that report, but the GAO, which is independent of that political influence, came out and said very clearly if you do it, it is going to cost the defense system an additional \$468 million a year. And certainly the man who is presiding right now, the honorable Senator from Virginia, who is one of the highest ranking members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, is fully aware that if we have to somehow come up with \$2 billion over a 5-year period to take out of the defense budget in order to accommodate an exception to the BRAC recommendations, where is it going to come from? He will remember very well we had the chiefs of the services there, and we gave them the alternatives. It has to come from quality of life, modernization, force strength or readiness. There are only four places it can come from. We cannot predict the contingencies this administration will get us into that are very expensive. We can predict these, and there is no place we can come up with this money. So this is an extremely important fiscal issue, and I wanted to have the opportunity to respond to the senior Senator from Texas.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mr. INHOFE assumed the chair.)

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELIMINATION OF VETERAN BENEFITS FOR CAPITAL OFFENSE CONVICTION

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, it is my hope that yet this afternoon we will be able to take action on legislation cosponsored by Senator TORRICELLI, Senator NICKLES, and Senator INHOFE which would deal with the issue of eliminating veterans benefits for anyone who has been convicted of a capital offense. This legislation was introduced yesterday and is designed to deal with the situation of Mr. Timothy McVeigh, who last week was convicted of murder in the first degree on 168 murders arising out of the destruction of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City back on April 19, 1995.

I was surprised to learn from my staff on the Veterans Affairs Committee that someone in Mr. McVeigh's situation would be able to receive veterans benefits. There are a wide variety of possible benefits. Exactly which ones apply to Mr. McVeigh would have to be determined, but they are benefits which would include employment training—obviously he cannot do that at the present time—education, other compensation, burial benefits. There was a gap in the law where someone who has been convicted of a number of crimes cannot receive veterans benefits—crimes like treason, sabotage, or espionage—but oddly enough, curiously enough, a conviction for murder in the first degree is not covered.

Senator TORRICELLI had introduced legislation yesterday and so had I. I did not know this when I introduced my legislation and spoke briefly on the Senate floor yesterday afternoon about Senator TORRICELLI's legislation, but I found out about it later in the day and talked to him this morning, and we are coordinating our efforts to produce a joint bill.

I discussed the matter yesterday with the majority leader, Senator LOTT, who said he would work with us to have a prompt determination for the Senate, and we have put it on the hotline, and we are almost complete, with one Senator yet to respond, and there has been a checking now with the administration, with the White House, with the Executive Office of the President, and also with the Veterans' Administration to see if there is any objection. I do not believe that there will be any.

It is my hope we would be able to take action fairly soon this afternoon, or, if we cannot, we may have to put it over until tomorrow. There has been considerable public interest and people expressing surprise that someone in Timothy McVeigh's situation could have veterans benefits and could, illustratively, be buried with heroes from the veterans wars of World War II, Vietnam, Korea, or the gulf war.

So we are proceeding at this time. I wanted to alert my colleagues we are hopeful that bill will come up this afternoon and try to expedite the advice from both the White House and

the Veterans' Administration as to their positions. It is my firm expectation that they will not have an objection but would rather welcome this legislation, but I wanted to inform my colleagues of the status at this time.

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

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO CIA AND FBI

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Madam President, I take the floor today to congratulate the Central Intelligence Agency and the FBI for their efforts in capturing the terrorist who killed two CIA officers in 1993.

Many thought when Aimal Kansi disappeared into Pakistan in 1993 that he would never be caught. I believe that our men and women who played a role in his capture deserve our thanks for the brave effort they went through to catch him.

Another critical question that I do not think has been answered is why was Mr. Kansi ever allowed in this country in the first place? Why was he here to begin with? He came here in 1991, apparently well educated, as a Pakistani immigrant. He came here on a business visa. Supposedly, he came here for 1 month. He used false names and passports, and then the INS gave him a 1-year work visa. Of course, the plan was that he wanted to stay here forever. There was never any doubt about what he wanted. He wanted to be here permanently. A year later, he applied for political asylum. The political asylum issue has been abused to a greater degree than anything I can think of. The Clinton administration has made an absolute mockery of the words "political asylum." There are almost 100,000 applications for political asylum each year.

Now, here is the scandal. When someone has applied for political asylum, they cannot be deported. When you apply for political asylum, you cannot be deported. This application is a complete ruse for people to stay in this country illegally. These people can stay here for years. Now, one of the reasons this man sought asylum—if you can get this—and talk about stupidity on the part of this country—is that he is part of a militant group in Pakistan that opposes United States policies. That is the reason he needed asylum, so he could stay in this country.

Mr. Kansi apparently moved about frequently. He worked at gas stations and as a courier in Virginia. Madam President, why do we need people coming into this country to work at a gasoline station and as a courier? Is this