

going to make people healthier. Their lifestyles are going to be better. They are going to have pumps to bring water to their homes. They are going to have electric heating units to cook their food so they do not have to go out and gather wood or waste to burn. And it is going to clean up our global environment in ways we have never known before. We have prospects, if we don't run from science and if we don't retreat from the future. If we go forward and take advantage of the opportunities given to us, we can really have a terrific century. I think it is going to be better and better.

But it does make you wonder sometimes how people who seem to be caring deeply for the environment and our future could block the things that would be most helpful to us. That is a concern I have.

I hope we can reach the extra two votes. We have 65 votes. We need 67 to override a Presidential veto. There is bipartisan support—Republicans and Democrats—for this bill. It is the right thing to do.

I urge the President not to veto it. If he does, I urge the Members of this body in both political parties to vote for clean air, vote for the future, vote for improving the quality of our lives, both in the United States and the world. For over 50 years the United States has been a leader in the peaceful use of nuclear power. The United States needs to continue to be a leader in this industry. We don't need to be sitting on the sidelines while the rest of the world is developing the technology to produce even safer electric power through nuclear energy and even greater productivity through nuclear energy.

I have had the opportunity to talk to some of the country's finest scientists. They are absolutely convinced that if we improve regulations, have a little more research and a little more commitment, we can create a nuclear power plant that may even eliminate nuclear waste entirely. But that is a step for the future, but the not too distant future. It is an exciting time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

PRESIDENTIAL VETO

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about President Clinton's veto of the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. I am very concerned about this veto. It was a very difficult bill. There is no question about it, given the budget caps that both Congress and this administration adopted and agreed they would adhere to.

Still, the bill provides the resources needed to continue our strong efforts to fight crime, enhance drug and border enforcement, respond to the threat of terrorism, and help women and children who are victims of family violence. A key component of our crime-fighting effort is stopping drugs at our

borders. Thanks to Senator JUDD GREGG and Senator FRITZ HOLLINGS, this bill provides for 1,000 new Border Patrol agents to guard our borders.

The President's decision to veto the bill makes clear that funding for these critical matters is not a priority to the President. Despite our budget constraints and our need to preserve Social Security, this bill provides nearly \$3 billion more than last year's bill. This bill is not a cut; it is an increase.

The President said he vetoed the bill because it didn't fully fund his COPS Program. The reality is that Congress provided funding for 100,000 police for our cities all over America 2 years ago. In fact, we have provided funding for 115,000 police. The President says he wants 30,000 to 50,000 more, but the irony is he hasn't even met the first goal. We still don't have more than 60,000 police on the streets. Yet he is vetoing the bill when the funding is there. The full funding was given by Congress with the excuse that he wants 30,000 to 50,000 more when he has 40,000 that are fully funded that he has not been able to fill.

I am concerned because this is not the only law enforcement initiative in which the President has failed. This administration was under direction from Congress to hire 1,000 new border guards in 1999. It failed when only 200 to 400 were actually hired. Yet every penny of the money that went to the 1,000 has been spent. Yet this year in the budget that the President has just vetoed, the President didn't ask for one new Border Patrol agent.

I ask, what is the role of the Federal Government? Is it to put police on the streets of our cities or is it to guard the sovereignty of our Nation, the borders of our Nation? I think the President of the United States is not fulfilling his responsibility when Congress comes forward and says we are going to guard the borders of our country; we are going to provide for police on streets as requested, and he vetoes the bill and asks for no new Border Patrol agents.

Our border is a sieve. The distinguished chair and I both represent States on the Southwest border. There is no other way to describe it when an estimated \$10 billion in marijuana, heroin, cocaine, and other drugs crossed our border last year, according to the Office of National Drug Control Policy. These drugs find their way to cities and school yards all over America. This is not just the Southwest. It is not just Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California. These illegal drugs go all over the country. They end up in the school yards, preying on our children. We are a gateway, but we are not the stopping point. They are coming in record numbers. In 1998, there were over 6,000 drug seizures along the Southwest border. The total value was \$1.28 billion. Our drug czar, General McCaffrey, has argued we should have 20,000 Border Patrol forces to stop the flow of drugs across our border.

A University of Texas study last year indicates 16,133 agents are needed to do the job. We have about 8,000—less than half of that needed to do the job, which is the responsibility of the Federal Government and which Congress is trying to provide, with no cooperation from this administration. Only 200 to 400 are likely to be hired this year, according to the administration's own records.

I think the President of the United States needs to stop the rhetoric. He needs to stop playing games with important appropriations bills and do something that is going to stop illegal immigration and illegal drugs coming through our borders and spreading all over our country. The President needs to fulfill the commitments he has already made and that we have funded to get 1,000 police officers on the streets and 1,000 more Border Patrol agents each year, for 5 years, as Congress has directed the administration to do.

Vetoing this bill does not help crime-fighting efforts. Signing the bill, keeping his promises for police and Border Patrol does.

I am very concerned the President of the United States has not taken seriously enough the need to control our borders, from illegal immigration to illegal drugs. Vetoing the Commerce-State-Justice bill shows that he is not taking this seriously, as Congress most certainly is. I urge the President to understand how important this issue is and to start doing what Congress has directed and what his own drug czar is recommending; that is, start working toward 20,000 Border Patrol agents who keep the sovereign borders of our country safe and secure.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S BUSINESS WEEK

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize National Women's Business Week, a series of national events held recently to recognize and celebrate women entrepreneurship.

Women now own 38 percent of all businesses in this country, and it has been reported that half of all new businesses started today are started by women. In my home state of Texas alone, there are now 627,300 woman-owned businesses employing 1.8 million people and generating \$222 billion in annual sales, a growth of 157 percent over the last seven years.

As a former small business owner, I know it is no easy feat to develop a business plan, generate the necessary start-up and operating capital, and make a payroll when you start a business. As if all those economic hurdles were not enough, small business owners in this country must comply with literally hundreds of local, state, and federal licensure, regulatory, and tax laws and requirements.

That tens of thousands of small businesses do get started in this country every year is truly a testament to the vision and hard work of so many Americans, especially American women.

Women like Patricia Pliego Stout, owner of the Alamo Travel Group, headquartered in San Antonio. Ms. Pliego Stout has grown a small travel business into the fourth largest agency in San Antonio. In recognition of her achievements and, as importantly, her encouragement and support of other women entrepreneurs in Texas, Ms. Pliego Stout was recently appointed to the National Women's Business Council, which promotes the goal of woman business ownership.

There are countless other success stories, as well. Unfortunately, there are also far too many stories of lack of access to adequate capital, of inability to break into established government and contracting networks, and other problems that continue to hamper women as they seek to become financially independent and to contribute to their greater economy and community.

As a United States Senator, I have worked hard to break down some of these barriers, and to open more opportunities to more people of all backgrounds and talents. In particular, I was proud to have been able to lead the effort in Congress to establish a 5 percent federal government-wide contracting goal for woman-owned small businesses. In addition, I have worked to expand such successful federal efforts as the Women's Business Centers program, which helps women with those critical first steps of starting a business. In addition, of assistance to all small businesses, including a disproportionate number of woman-owned businesses, I have worked to limit the federal government procurement practice of "bundling" contracts, which can also leave newly-formed firms out of the contracting game.

Mr. President, I again congratulate the women in Texas and across the nation who every day continue to overcome obstacles and who create success, jobs, and wealth through their sheer determination and energy. The events and activities of National Women's Business Week are evidence that women business ownership is alive and well, to the betterment of us all.

AGRICULTURAL JOB OPPORTUNITY BENEFITS AND SECURITY ACT OF 1999

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise with Senators GRAHAM, CRAIG, CLELAND, McCONNELL, COVERDELL, MACK, COCHRAN, HELMS, GRAMS, CRAPO, BUNNING, and VOINOVICH to encourage support of S. 1814, the Agricultural Job Opportunity Benefits and Security Act of 1999.

Our bill will reform the agricultural labor market, establish and maintain immigration control, provide a legal workforce for our farmers, and restore the dignity to the lives of thousands of farmworkers who have helped make the U.S. economy the powerhouse that it is today.

I am sure you are aware of the problems that have arisen within American

agriculture. For many years, employers in the agricultural industry have struggled to hire enough legal workers to harvest their produce and plants.

As one of the most rapidly growing industries in this country, we can only expect the demand for agricultural labor jobs to continue to rise. When coupled with the lowest unemployment rates in decades, a crackdown on illegal immigration, and increased Social Security audits, the agriculture industry—and ultimately its consumers—face a crisis of devastating proportions.

Contrary to some media accounts, these labor shortages and the need for a revised H-2A temporary foreign worker program exist around the country. Mr. President, my colleagues and I agree with the General Accounting Office's (GAO) statement that while the labor shortage is not caused by one single problem, regional shortages stemming from region-specific problems do exist.

We have a shortage of legal workers in this country and the GAO estimates that there are in excess of 600,000 self-identified illegal aliens currently employed in U.S. agriculture. Another survey done by the Department of Labor also revealed that more than 70 percent, or about 1 million, of those hired to work on U.S. farms are here illegally.

Due to the highly sophisticated fraudulent documents in circulation and strict U.S. laws prohibiting employers from scrutinizing these documents too carefully, thousands of illegal workers have been unknowingly hired as a result. This situation leaves many agricultural employers vulnerable to potential labor shortfalls in the event of concentrated or targeted Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) enforcement efforts or Social Security Administration audits.

Immigrants are also severely impacted when they must work as undocumented workers. These foreign workers risk their lives paying human "coyotes" \$1,200 to be smuggled across the desert border in the trunk of a car to work in this country. Because of the risks these foreign workers face in coming here and the difficulty of returning if they leave for a visit home, many go for years without seeing their spouses and children, some never return home. These illegal workers are extremely vulnerable to these "coyotes" and other dark elements of society that prey upon them, prohibiting the basic human rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

A recent survey published by the William C. Velasquez Institute demonstrated that a vast majority of registered Latino voters support a new farmworker program. In addition to supporting higher wages and unionization for farmworkers, the overwhelming majority of registered Latino voters—76% in California and 67% in Texas—supported a program where "illegal immigrant" farmworkers were allowed to become per-

manent residents in exchange for several years of mandatory agricultural labor.

This poll clearly demonstrates that the current farm labor system serves no one well. Farmworkers support changing an illegal system that victimizes them and their families.

This issue is not new to Congress. Our government's H-2A agricultural guest worker program was designed in part to help solve the labor problems facing our farmers. Instead of helping, the H-2A program—the only legal temporary agricultural worker program in the United States—it merely adds bureaucratic red tape and burdensome regulations to the growing crisis. And it is failing those who use it.

The H-2A program is not practicable for the agriculture and horticulture industry because it is loaded with burdensome regulations, excessive paperwork, a bureaucratic certification process and untimely, inconsistent, and hostile decision-making by the U.S. Department of Labor. This program is over 50 years old.

To illustrate, Mr. President, this is the application I filled out to run for the United States Senate. It is one page, front and back.

This is the Department of Labor's 325-page handbook, from January 1988, which attempts to guide employers through the H-2A program's confusing application process. The GAO itself found that this handbook is outdated, incomplete, and very confusing to the user.

Even the December 1997 GAO report illustrated the burdensome H-2A process with which employers must comply in order to bring in legal, foreign workers. A grower must apply to multiple agencies to obtain just one H-2A worker. This process is further complicated by the multiple levels of government, redundant levels of oversight and conflicting administrative procedures and regulations. Also, as reported by the recent Department of Labor Inspector General, the H-2A program does not meet the interests of domestic workers because it does a poor job of placing domestic workers in agricultural jobs.

We are looking for solutions to not only make it easier for employers to hire legal workers to harvest their crops, but also to ensure that U.S. workers find jobs and are treated fairly in the process.

Our bill is a win-win-win for farmers, farmworkers, and immigration control. It reforms the agricultural labor market and establishes and maintains immigration control. It gives farmers the stability of a legal workforce and the certainty that the crops will be harvested in a timely manner. It gives farmworkers the ability to earn the right to legal status, avoid the risks of undocumented status and receive U.S. labor law protections. It addresses a status quo that persons on both sides of the issue agree is indefensible, but until now, has been too easy to ignore. It is a balanced bill that seeks both