

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to other ALC's. Then they later on, when this administration took a position against it right before the election, they rescinded that report, but the GAO, which is independent of that political influence, came out and said very clearly if you do it, it is going to cost the defense system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

something we really need to grant a work visa for?

Our immigration policies are simply out of control. We have hit a record number of immigrants coming into the country. In fact, so many are coming in that people with criminal records are getting by like they were moving through a sieve. We are filling the country with anybody with any excuse or reason who wants to come. People like Mr. Kansi are getting in by lying, false records, or whatever they want to present. They wind up here one way or another and we simply refuse to send them out.

Our immigration policies are out of control and people are coming without being examined, without being checked. They are here. The World Trade Center bombing is an example. The shooting at the Empire State Building is another. The CIA killing in 1993 is another. All of these acts were committed by people that were willingly let into this country. How many instances does it take like this before we have the common sense to change the immigration laws that we are letting wreck this country?

I think we need to take a hard look at the laws and determine if we are letting people into this country that are prone to commit terrorist acts against the Nation once they get here.

One of the basic problems, of course, with immigration is that we have a more-than-generous welfare system—more than generous. People are coming into this country not to work, but to sit down. They are coming here to become part of our welfare system, not to become part of our work force. When we attempted to change our welfare laws and cut off cash assistance to non-citizens, the Congress got frightened, and we decided it was being too harsh not to give cash money to noncitizens. How cruel could we be not to hand out cash to an illegal noncitizen? We have perpetrated an immigration system that is out of control.

Madam President, we know that there are many people who want to be Americans. Many people want to come here and make a contribution to the United States. We have a long history of immigration. We are all descendants of immigrants from somewhere at one time, except Native Americans. But somewhere we have gone wrong. At one point, people came to this country to work and to labor and be a part of it. But now they come to be a part of charity. I think we began to go wrong when we lost common sense in our immigration policies.

Madam President, I think the problem began when we lost common sense altogether in the Government, and particularly with the welfare programs supporting the things that these people were coming for. Why should we give noncitizens welfare? Why should the Federal Government punish a county or town if they don't print documents in languages other than English? Madam President, we do that.

Why do we have pages and pages of legislative language just to define the word "work." I think anybody that has done a day's work would not need 14 pages of legalese language to describe it. Madam President, again, I want to thank the agents with the CIA and the FBI that played a role in bringing this man back to the United States. They represent what is best about the country. But the immigration laws that allowed Mr. Kansi to get into this country and to stay here represent the worst.

I thank the Chair and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. FAIRCLOTH]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. SPECTER pertaining to the introduction of S. 934 and S. 935 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

In the absence of any other Senator present, 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. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

DENYING VETERANS BENEFITS IN CAPITAL CASES

Mr. SPECTER. First, Mr. President, I would like to update my colleagues on our efforts to have an amendment on veterans benefits occasioned by the conviction of Timothy McVeigh who does have veterans benefits. We have been working to put the legislation in final form, and I think we are now very close to it. If we can accomplish that, we still have time today to introduce the bill and, I think, to get a rollcall vote on it. That will be the final call, obviously, of our majority leader, Senator LOTT, but I do think we have a chance to do that.

(The remarks of Mr. SPECTER pertaining to the submission of Senate Resolution 102 are located in today's RECORD under "Submissions of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I yield the floor in the absence of any other Senator seeking recognition and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DENYING VETERANS BENEFITS IN FEDERAL CAPITAL OFFENSES

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on behalf of our distinguished majority leader, Senator LOTT, I ask unanimous consent that the Veterans' Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 923, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 923.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 923) to deny veterans benefits to persons convicted of Federal capital offenses.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 414

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, there is an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] proposes an amendment numbered 414.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike "or star".

Mr. SPECTER. During the pendency of this bill, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 5 minutes be allotted to Senator NICKLES for debate.

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, at this time 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are ordered on final passage of the bill.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, this bill would amend existing law to deny benefits to veterans who have been convicted of a Federal capital offense. Current law denies such benefits to veterans convicted of Federal crimes, such as sabotage, treason, and sedition, but not murder.

I offer this bill on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Senator TORRICELLI, and also Senator BYRD, Senator NICKLES, Senator INHOFE, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator CAMPBELL, and the distinguished Presiding Officer, Senator SANTORUM.

Mr. President, yesterday I was informed by staff in the Veterans' Affairs Committee, which I chair, that there is a gap in the law which allows Mr. Timothy McVeigh to be entitled to veterans benefits notwithstanding his murder of 168 persons, and his conviction