

debt, deficits and decline, and we ought to avoid it at all cost.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID. I would be happy to yield, indicating that one of the things we have not talked about here today with the Clinton plan is something that we recognized very clearly in Nevada. As a result of the Clinton economic plan, in Nevada nine times more Nevada families received a tax cut than an increase. It happened all over the United States. In addition to that, businesses got tax breaks in the Clinton plan of 1993. We fail to talk about it. In the little State of Nevada, almost 7,000 small businesses got a tax break when we passed the deficit reduction plan.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator yield just on that point?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. CONRAD. I asked my staff to find out in North Dakota what happened because we continually are told these are the big taxers and the big spenders. I have reported what happened to spending. Every year under the Clinton administration spending as a share of our national income has gone down—each and every year.

Big spending? I do not think so. This President has reduced spending measured against our national income. And on the tax side, in my State of North Dakota, as a result of the 1993 plan, 29,000 people got a tax cut because of the expansion of the earned-income tax credit that was included in the Clinton plan; about 1,400 people got an income tax rate increase. And who were they? They were couples earning over \$180,000 a year and individuals earning over \$140,000 a year. So 20 times as many people got a tax reduction as got a tax increase.

Mr. DORGAN. If the Senator will yield, one of the concerns I have about the proposal now for a substantial across-the-board tax cut offered by Senator Dole is that it is so at odds with what is required of leadership at this point. I said on the floor yesterday, and I will say it again, I admire Senator Dole. I think the service he has given to this country is something most Americans should be thankful for and grateful for. He has been a good public servant.

I said yesterday I would not trade one Senator Dole and his experience for all 73 House Republican freshmen who boasted they had no experience and came here and proved it quickly.

I admire Senator Dole, but the fact is a test of leadership in our country is are you willing to do what is necessary for this country? Are you willing to propose what is necessary? President Clinton came in 1993 and made a proposal that was not popular. He knew and we knew people are not going to belly up to this one and say, well, sign me up; please let me have some of that—spending cuts and tax increases.

We knew that was not going to be politically popular. We knew it was going

to be hard to do. It turned out to be extraordinarily hard to do. It turned out it passed in this Chamber by a tie-breaking vote being cast by the Vice President. So it turned out to be enormously difficult. Why? Because it was not popular. It was tough medicine. It was needed to put the country back on course. That is the test of leadership.

Mr. REID. And it was very partisan.

Mr. DORGAN. It turned out to be very partisan, regrettably. I wish it would have been a bipartisan effort to say, if we have to do some heavy lifting, let us all lift. But that was not the case. In any event, what has happened now is that Senator Dole, who has always stood here in this Chamber and said I do not agree with those who say let us have a big across-the-board tax cut and the deficits, the heck with the deficits, let us not care what happens as a result of it, he has always been one who stood in the well of the Senate and said these things do not make any sense. This does not make any sense. Now he has been convinced apparently to propose an across-the-board tax cut which will substantially reduce the revenue and substantially increase deficits. And do not trust me on that. Trust the Concord Coalition, a bipartisan organization or nonpartisan organization run jointly by a former Republican Senator and Democratic Senator who say this is going to vastly inflate the Federal deficit.

It seems to me, given the economic story we have talked about today, the question is, do we want to move in that direction again: swollen deficits, slower growth, more unemployment? Or do we want to continue with the plan that has worked for our country?

Mr. REID. I would say to my friend, in closing, we have heard a discussion here this afternoon about the economy and how the glass is half full rather than half empty. I have heard on the Senate floor, over the past month or so, the same type of discussion as it relates to crime in America; that is, "the glass is half empty, it is not half full," when we should recognize that the violent crime rate has dropped for adults. We are making progress with the approximately 40,000 new police officers throughout America. We are making great progress. We should talk about the positive effect of how crime is being attacked in this country rather than continually dwelling on the negative.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The Senator from Georgia controls the next hour.

TAX RELIEF

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, it is not going to be the subject I intended to address, but I could not help hearing some of the remarks from the other side about how onerous it would be if we were to allow the American family to keep more of what it earns in its checking account via tax relief. I

am going to talk for just a second about it.

An average family in my State gets to keep 47 percent of its gross income. In 1950 those people got to keep 80 percent. Now they can only keep 47 percent after they get finished paying their Federal tax bill, State, local, the cost of Federal regulations, and extra costs they pay in interest payments because of the national debt that has been drummed up by an ever-increasing and larger Federal Government here in Washington.

Mr. President, 47 percent is what is left at the end of the day. I will say as long as I am here that any effort to bring relief to those average families and to allow more of their earnings to stay in their checking accounts is laudable and correct, because we have pushed the average family to the wall. That which we ask them to do, get the country up in the morning, feed it, house it, shelter it, take care of its health, is virtually impossible to do today with what is left in that checking account after some Government bureaucrat marches through it.

It is not my purpose to discuss it here this afternoon. But lowering the economic pressure on the average family in our country would do more to end the stress and the anxiety and the behavioral problems in our middle-class families than any other thing we can do. You can track the stress in those families and track it day by day, month by month, year by year, as we ratcheted up the tax pressure on those families. You can see the effect it has had on them—smaller families, no savings in their savings accounts, lower SAT scores, more members of the family having to work just to keep up; in some of them, not only both parents working but both parents having two jobs.

I am absolutely mind boggled that we would be arguing that it would be some evil and sinister thing to lower the tax pressure on the American family.

RE-CREATE A MELTDOWN

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, we are hours away from the end of the fiscal year. There are leadership meetings occurring everywhere. I have become convinced that the other side has concluded it is to their political advantage to try to re-create a meltdown here.

We have learned from reading in the paper that the now famous Dick Morris, political consultant to the White House, spent 5 months planning the last shutdown, and we see the exact same characteristics as we come to trying to bring the year to a logical and bipartisan closure. Let us remember that, unlike a year ago, we have 60,000 troops in harm's way right now in Iraq and Bosnia. We have just watched a hurricane sweep across our eastern shores, and we have families desperately trying to dig out. We are 6 weeks from an election, and we ought to get the electioneering out of the

Halls of Congress, come to closure here, lower the anxiety level for all those families involved, keep the Federal Government on course and move the campaigning to the elections.

Our majority leader, I believe, has done everything humanly possible to keep this in a bipartisan manner, keep tempers cool. He has come out here on the Senate floor and offered a resolution that would keep that safety net under our troops and under our disaster-stricken families. He has offered both sides six amendments and then come to closure on Wednesday night at a logical hour.

What was the response? "No way."

He then offered to start a debate on a resolution that would keep the safety net under the Government this past Tuesday with no limits on the amendments in process but an agreement that we would finish in an orderly manner by Wednesday night. What was the answer? "Absolutely not."

Then he said, let's take the Department of Defense appropriations conference report and, with a continuing resolution, you know, a safety net under the Government, omnibus spending vehicle attached to it. "No way."

So, option after option is presented, denial after denial occurs, and the clock is running and the troops are still in harm's way.

The White House has indicated that it wants to make the illegal immigration bill, which is a very, very large piece of legislation on which hours and hours and hours have been expended, wants to make this a center point, some sort of a leverage to bring us to the brink. I am reading from the Los Angeles Times: "Clinton seeks to halt further limits on noncitizens. Holdup of appropriation would vex GOP members anxious to hit campaign trail."

Washington—Setting up a confrontation with Republican leaders, the White House indicated Thursday that President Clinton will not sign a must-pass spending bill [that is the safety net] until the GOP agrees to amend separate immigration legislation.

There will be others who will speak to this, but the White House said you have to take out the Gallegly amendment. The Gallegly amendment left States the right to choose to allow legal immigrants in schools or not, and it has been argued and argued and argued. But the Republican leadership of the Senate and House said, "OK. In an effort to maintain the safety net, in an effort to bring a bipartisan conclusion to the 104th Congress, we will remove it." So, they did. After they did it, the White House says, "No, that is not enough. Now we want more changes in it before we will agree to sign it."

This reminds me of the system that apparently Dick Morris organized a year ago. Let me read from one of our daily papers, the Washington headline. It says:

Immigration and Naturalization Service officials have learned that about 5,000 of the 60,000 immigrants naturalized in six days of mass ceremonies in Los Angeles last month

concealed past criminal records that might have disqualified some of them from citizenship. . . .

Of the 5,000 who proved to have criminal records . . . their alleged crimes ranged from serious offenses, such as murder and rape, that would disqualify them from citizenship to minor violations that would not.

This article says, "Clinton administration election year program to naturalize 1.3 million new citizens during this fiscal year ending October 1 * * *"

In other words, it is a rush, it is a political plan we have here to rush people through so fast that the FBI cannot even provide the traditional background check that would have spotted these murderers and rapists who are now U.S. citizens because of this political program.

Right here, it reads:

Because of the rush to naturalize citizens, none of this FBI data was available to the Immigration and Naturalization Service before the ceremony.

What kind of nonsense have we gotten ourselves into here? What price are these elections worth?

It reads that:

Prior to the inception of citizenship, USA officials said the INS generally waits until it receives the result of an FBI check on applicants for naturalization before granting them citizenship.

But that was pushed aside because the politics of this program was more important.

Now we come to this illegal immigration bill, and all of a sudden, it has become bigger than running the Government, and one cannot help but miss the connection that we have throttled up this immigration bill, we have used it as a wedge against keeping an orderly transition of Government, a safety net under these troops that are overseas, our seniors, our children's programs, school programs, all set aside for the politics of the moment.

The idea of strategically using immigration and naturalization politically, the idea of a political plan for posturing to destabilize our troops, disaster victims, is not a very pretty picture. No wonder there is so much cynicism about this process that goes on in our Capital City.

Mr. President, we have been joined by the senior Senator from Utah, by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate, by an individual who has been deeply involved in this process since its inception. I yield up to 10 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have to say I am very disappointed. The Clinton administration is playing political games with the illegal immigration reform bill. This is one of the most important bills of this whole Congress. The Congress has worked very hard on this very necessary legislation.

On August 2, 1996, President Clinton wrote to Speaker GINGRICH. The only item on which he said he would veto

the immigration bill was the Gallegly provision on the free public education of illegal aliens. The provision was, in fact, contained in a draft conference report proposal circulated on the evening of September 10 by Republican conferees.

At no time in the next 2 weeks, as this draft proposal was circulated, was I advised that the administration wanted to remove title V of that proposal, dealing with restrictions on benefits for aliens.

Indeed, the administration mentioned the Gallegly provision was really the big item to them; that if we took Gallegly out, the President would sign the bill.

In order to accommodate this administration and facilitate passage of this very tough illegal immigration bill, the Republican conferees dropped the Gallegly provision outright, and I argued for the dropping of that provision, mainly because I wanted to get this bill through because there are excellent provisions in this bill that are desperately needed.

Additional changes were made to accommodate other concerns expressed by some Members on the other side of the aisle. For example, illegal aliens' use of Head Start programs, English as a second language programs, and job-training programs would not count in the determination of whether the alien had become a public charge and, therefore, subject to deportation. A legal immigrant's use of emergency medical services would not be subject to deeming.

But the administration is now engaging in a shell game. Even though we removed the one item the President said would lead to a veto and made still other changes in the September 10 draft, and even though the President had 2 weeks to weigh in and did not do so, the administration is now calling upon its congressional allies to slow down and even derail this bill unless wholesale changes are made to it. These changes are coming out of left field. By so demanding, the President is acting as the "Guardian in Chief" of the status quo.

These tactics make me wonder whether the President really favors tough anti-illegal-immigration legislation. Why did he wait until after the conference to make these demands as a condition of his support for the bill?

The American people want Congress and the President to deliver on this subject. The Congress is prepared to do so. Is the President?

Let me go over just a few of the items in the conference report that the President is helping to delay action on.

This is the illegal immigration conference report. On border control and illegal immigration control, we provide for 5,000 new Border Patrol agents, which are dramatically needed at this time if we are going to make any headway in this battle; 1,500 new Border Patrol support personnel; and 1,200 new Immigration and Naturalization Service investigators, which are very badly

needed. They will not be there unless this bill passes.

We provide for improved equipment and technology for border control; for an entry-exit control system to keep track of the aliens who are supposed to leave the United States; and for additional and improved border control fences in southern California. All of that is included in just part of this bill.

Let me go on.

With regard to alien smuggling, document fraud, and illegal immigration enforcement, we provide:

Increased criminal penalties for alien smuggling and document fraud;

New document fraud and alien smuggling offenses;

New Federal prosecutors to investigate and prosecute immigration violations;

That alien smuggling penalties will be calculated for each alien a smuggler has smuggled in;

Wiretap authority in alien smuggling and document fraud cases; and

A new civil penalty for illegal entry.

We also make it unlawful to falsely claim U.S. citizenship for the purpose of obtaining Federal benefits, which has been going on now for years, and it is time to bring a stop to it. This bill will do it, and this President is stopping this bill.

With regard to removal of illegal aliens, we streamline the removal procedures so it can happen, so it can be done. Illegal aliens who are removed will be inadmissible for certain periods.

We revise expedited exclusion provisions of the Terrorism Act to ensure that those with valid asylum claims receive adequate protections from persecution. We take care of those with valid asylum claims.

You can see, these are just a few more of the things that this bill does, all of which are absolutely critical to solving this illegal alien problem in our country. Let me just go on.

With regard to criminal aliens—and we have plenty of those in this country right now; they are causing an awfully high percentage of the crimes in our country today. We have expanded the definition of “aggravated felon” for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act. We have mandatory detention of most deportable criminal aliens. We have improved removal of deportable criminal aliens.

We eliminate loopholes under which criminal aliens have stayed within the United States. We improve the identification of deportable criminal aliens. We increase the Immigration and Naturalization Service detention space by 9,000 beds, something they tell us absolutely has to happen or we are going to have an even greater crisis on our hands than we have now.

We also have additional financial resources for the detention of criminal aliens and other detainees, which is absolutely critical if we are going to fight and win this battle with regard to illegal immigration. Let me go a little bit further.

With regard to interior enforcement, we provide that State and local authorities will be able to perform immigration control functions, including transporting illegal aliens to INS detention facilities across State lines, something that currently we have difficulty doing. A lot of States, just to get these people out of their States and get them into detention facilities, would pay for the costs themselves. Many States would provide the sheriffs’ deputies and others to get these people out of their States. We provide they can do that, of course, with the cooperation and help of the INS.

We ensure at least 10 active-duty INS agents in each State. We certainly think that is critical. Of course, in the major border States, we have many more than that.

We improve legal border crossing.

We have increased border inspectors to speed up legal border crossing.

We have commuter-lane pilot projects for frequent border crossers.

As you can see, all of these various provisions that we have in this bill are absolutely crucial if we are going to make any headway against this problem of illegal immigration.

I have to tell you that it took this Congress to do some of these tough things. I want to personally compliment the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Senator SIMPSON, for working so hard as subcommittee chairman to get it done, and the whole Judiciary Committee, because it was there that we really worked out the difficulties between the Democrats and the Republicans, and I think came up with a pretty superior bill, which now has become primarily the bill that came out of conference.

I want to compliment LAMAR SMITH and Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. MCCOLLUM, and others over in the House who have played a tremendous role in this matter.

In the Senate, of course, Senator SIMPSON and everybody on the Judiciary Committee deserves enormous credit. On the other side of the aisle, Senator KENNEDY and Senator FEINSTEIN have really played significant roles, although Senator FEINSTEIN is primarily working with us today to try to get the bill through. She has done an excellent job. She has fought hard for her State. She realizes California, Texas, Arizona, Florida—all of these Southern States, these border States—have to have the bill. So she is fighting to get it. At the same time she is fighting her guts out, this administration is trying to undercut her and undercut what we have done.

It is an amazing thing that we have been able to bring 535 people together in the legislature, at least a majority of them, to pass a bill that will make a difference in this country.

This conference report passed overwhelmingly in the House for good reason. People over there are concerned about what is happening. And it will pass overwhelmingly here if we can get

it up. Frankly, the only logjam in getting it up happens to be the President of the United States and his cohorts who are all over Capitol Hill trying to ruin this illegal immigration bill.

To me, I cannot understand that kind of reasoning. I cannot understand that type of activity. I cannot understand the President doing this. I cannot understand why they are not working with us to get this bill through, especially since we made every effort to get the Gallegly amendment out of that bill.

To be honest with you, the Gallegly amendment was not as bad as some people have been making out. It was a rule of Federalism. All Mr. Gallegly and California wanted is for the States to have a right to determine whether or not they will educate illegal alien kids, at a tremendous cost—\$2 billion to \$3 billion in California.

I do not think there is a State in this Union that would decide not to do so, even California, in spite of what some out there would like to do. But the fact of the matter is, it was not a bad amendment in terms of Federalism. It would not have hurt anybody, in my opinion. We even modified it to try to please the President, so we grandfathered K through 6 and 7 through 12. We provided a safety valve so we could rip it out of the bill at a future time, with expedited consideration by the Congress. But that was not good enough.

Finally, it came down to literally just ripping it out of the bill, calling it up maybe separately, but ripping it out of the bill to satisfy this President who said he would not veto this bill if we got rid of Gallegly. No sooner did we do that, and last night they come up here and said, we want title 5 out of the bill. Title 5 is a pretty important provision of this bill. As a matter of fact, it contains a number of very important provisions if we are going to get a handle on illegal immigration in this country. It is incredible to me that they would do that after they gave their word, it seemed to me, with regard to the Gallegly amendment and taking it out of the bill.

Mr. President, I see my time is up. Let me just finish by saying this. This is an important bill. It is one of the most important bills in this country’s history. We can no longer afford to allow our borders to be just overrun by illegal aliens. There are some indications that this administration has been soft on letting people into this country, most of whom vote Democratic once they get here as noncitizen illegals. Frankly, a lot of our criminality in this country today happens to be coming from criminal, illegal aliens who are ripping our country apart. A lot of the drugs are coming from these people.

This bill will play a significant role in making a real difference for the benefit of our country, and I am calling upon the President and the people at the White House to get off their duffs

and start helping us to get it passed and quit this type of activity. I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks by the Senator from Utah. I now yield up to 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Missouri and the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee on VA-HUD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Georgia. I appreciate the opportunity to explain to some of my colleagues, and those who might be interested, what is going on with the appropriations process.

I think all of us know that the time has come to shut down this session of Congress. We have a couple of very important things pending.

The fine chairman of the Judiciary Committee has just described what needs to be done on a problem that everyone recognizes, and that is the problem of illegal immigration. Can we move forward on that bill? I think it is one of the key elements of a resolution of this session of the Congress. But everybody knows that before we leave town we have to provide the appropriations measures to keep the Government running and to keep programs going which the Federal Government has undertaken as a responsibility.

I understand that perhaps an hour or so ago the Democratic leaders on this side and on the House side had another one of their infamous non-infomercials, a news conference in which the facts were not necessarily the absolute requirement of any of the discussions. I believe they were talking about how the Republicans intend to shut down the Government again.

Let me be clear about one thing, Mr. President. The distinguished occupant of the chair chairs an important appropriations subcommittee. The appropriations bills are extremely important, and we work on those appropriations bills on a bipartisan basis.

I have the pleasure of serving as chairman of the Veterans' Administration, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee. And on that subcommittee, I am greatly aided and assisted by my ranking member, Senator Barbara MIKULSKI, a Democrat from Maryland.

Now, we often have disagreements on those measures, but we work them out here on the floor. We can, in this body, pass measures that are greatly objectionable because of the right of any Senator to filibuster. So we, in essence, need to have 60 votes for a controversial provision in any measure. And we customarily operate on the basis of courtesy to take into consideration the views of the minority.

In this VA-HUD bill, we went a long way because there were a lot on this side of the aisle who were not thrilled about AmeriCorps, the national service program. Yet, as an accommodation to those who felt strongly about it—Sen-

ator MIKULSKI was an original sponsor of it; it had the strong backing of the administration—we put \$400 million in that bill for AmeriCorps. We carried it over to conference with the House. And the House, many on our side, felt even more strongly in opposition. We made the point that we fought the battle and we won because we knew it was important to Members on the Democratic side here, to the President. We included that in the bill.

Our bill has some very, very difficult things. Allocating scarce funds for housing, for urban affairs, for the Veterans Administration, for EPA, for NASA, for the Federal Emergency Management Agency. We worked all those out. During the course of those conversations, we had not only the budget requests from the White House in front of it, but we were assured that the White House had conversations with and expressed their views to the members on the minority side in our committee.

We came up with what I think was a good bill. It passed overwhelmingly. It had some additional things on it this time. It became not just an appropriations bill, it is an authorizing bill, a new entitlement bill. But we got it through.

Yesterday, at about 10 o'clock, the President signed the VA-HUD bill. He signed it, signed it into law. It is law. The appropriations bill is the law for spending for those key agencies for the coming fiscal year.

Imagine my surprise when I was summoned to a meeting of the negotiators on the omnibus appropriations bill to handle the unresolved issues in appropriations. I was told by Mr. Panetta, a representative of the White House, that they wanted to put \$160-plus million in the VA-HUD bill. I said, "Excuse me, I believe the President just signed the bill yesterday." They said, "Well, the President had some reservations and he wanted more money."

There are a lot of things, Mr. President, on which I wanted more money. We did not put enough money into the preservation of low-income housing. We need to do more in terms of an investment to make sure we have an affordable housing stock, that we have the stock of housing that is either publicly owned or reflects public assistance through section 8 programs in this country. If we had more money in the budget I could find some very, very important places to put it in terms of housing, in terms of science, space, and environment, giving more money to the States for their State revolving funds.

The White House said, "But we want to add some more money to your bill." I said, "This is the bill that you signed about 26 hours ago." They said, "No, we had reservations."

Mr. President, I heard of the old trick of moving the goalposts. Some may like the analogy of the Peanuts cartoon strip, where every fall Lucy promises to hold the football for Char-

lie Brown. She says she will not move the ball this year, but every year she takes the ball away.

We are beginning to learn very slowly, too slowly I am afraid, that this administration does not negotiate in good faith. This administration has some other game they are playing. It is not designed to achieve a reasonable accommodation between the parties, between the legislative and executive branch, to move forward on appropriations.

Now, if there is a shutdown, let me assure you it will be a shutdown engineered by the White House and their allies in Congress. This is where the responsibility will lie.

Why do we have a number of bills that are not signed? Mr. President, you and I have been here while we went through the process. Now, a lot of people may not understand what we say by the term "filibuster by amendment." But for those who do not understand the procedures of the Senate, unless you have a unanimous consent agreement, unless there is an agreement before you start out on a bill, you can continue to add things and add things and add things. You can never come to closure. As Republicans we have 53 votes. If we wanted to cut off debate we have to have 60 votes. We cannot stop people from talking or filibustering by adding amendment after amendment after amendment. That is what was done on Treasury-Postal. I worked on the Treasury-Postal bill in the previous Congress as the ranking member, and it funds some very important things—White House, Treasury, Customs, GSA, things like that are very, very important. There are not 50 different amendments that needed to be offered to that bill.

I remember one of the measures we voted on was a measure to establish a new Federal responsibility, a new Federal responsibility relating to guns in schools. Mr. President, if there is one area where the Federal Government has not been before, it is in local law enforcement. I suggest that the Federal Government has fallen short in those responsibilities which are properly the Federal Government's responsibility.

We fought—and when I was the ranking member, Senator DeConcini was the chairman of the committee, my good friend from Arizona—we fought against cutting back on the Customs work in interdiction, to stop drugs coming into this country. We have cut too much in the Federal law enforcement agencies. We certainly do not need to be setting up new Federal responsibilities which directly overlap and are totally inconsistent with local law enforcement responsibilities.

But that amendment was voted on on the Treasury-Postal appropriations bills, after 3 days on the floor, a bill

which should take at most 2 days to debate those issues, that genuinely related to appropriations for Treasury-Postal accounts. We had so many amendments still hanging out that the majority leader had to withdraw the bill.

We went on to Interior, to try to get a resolution for those. Then the amendments kept coming out of the woodwork. If anybody does not understand it, I can tell you unless you have 60 votes and can invoke cloture continually, you can continue to hold this place hostage by offering amendments or talking as long as you want.

Now, we have made a good-faith effort across the board to get the appropriations bills done. I have no interest in going back and reopening one of the appropriations bills that has been signed. More and more ideas keep floating in from the White House. They want to add this. They want to add that. They want to write their own legislation. It is as if they never worked in a government where there was a strong opposition party—in this case, a party in control of the Congress.

I came from Missouri where I served as Governor for 8 years with a 2-1 Democratic majority in both houses. I learned early on, I had to learn, that bipartisan cooperation, comity, honesty in dealing with the other side was essential to make the process move. We do not have that here. It is perhaps the fact that the President comes from a one-party State.

All I can say is we are doing our work on appropriations. We are going to move forward on appropriations. I hope our leaders will make the best offer they can, trying to guess what the White House's latest demands are to accommodate as many as they can. If they will not, we should do a continuing resolution and get out of town.

One last piece of business that we have from the small business committee, since my colleagues on the other side are not present I will not at this point ask unanimous consent to proceed to H.R. 3719. That is vitally important if we are to keep the lending programs, 5047(a) program, SBIC program working, for the Small Business Administration. It is being held up on the minority side. I will come back and explain in detail why the SBA and small business in this country needs that measure. I hope the hold is lifted so we could pass this measure, many of the provisions of which have already been passed in this body.

I acknowledge and appreciate the work of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his remarks. The moving goalposts, as he has described, become clearer and more evident with each passing hour here in the Nation's Capitol. Unfortunately, the anxiety level of those—not suffered by us—by the families of the troops overseas and flood victims and all those people dependent on the system, needing the safety net we are trying to put in place.

We have been joined by the senior Senator from Wyoming who is the pre-eminent authority on legal and illegal immigration and has been undergoing this moving goalpost now for some period of time. I am glad he could join us.

I yield up to 10 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank my colleague from Georgia, Senator COVERDELL. I think it is tremendous that you have arranged this bit of time to share with the American people so we each get to step forward and tell the theory of the moving of the goalpost. To me it is the moving of the stadium. I think they moved the end zones, the stadium, and as far as I know, the campus. We will review this for a minute.

I have been doing this stuff for 31 years. It is called legislating. You do it with Democrats if you are a Republican, and hopefully if you are a Democrat, you do it with Republicans. It cannot work any other way.

Over the years of my time here I have served as chairman or ranking member with some very unique partisan people. Senator Al Cranston with the Veterans' Affairs; Gary Hart, nuclear; TED KENNEDY, Senator KENNEDY, with Immigration and Judiciary; JOE LIEBERMAN, BOB GRAHAM, nuclear; JAY ROCKEFELLER.

These are the things that I have done. It has always been done with civility. It has always been done openly and honestly. I can't function in an atmosphere where people lie. That is what is happening here, and I am appalled by it. Let me tell you, it isn't about TED KENNEDY, who is one of my most delightful friends, and I have the highest respect for him. Let me tell you what happened yesterday. Get it down. The administration, the White House—remember, they told us if we would take the Gallegly amendment off the immigration reform bill, it wasn't, "Well, I might," but it was, "I will probably sign it." It was said that way. We didn't have any reason to believe they would not sign it at the White House.

Last night, in good faith, myself, Senator KENNEDY, HOWARD BERMAN, a Democrat from California who I delight in and enjoy very much, Congressman LAMAR SMITH, who is just one of the most splendid young men I know, who does a tremendous job with the chairmanship of immigration, the four of us sat down to see if we could give a little on title V because the latest request from the White House was, "If you get rid of title V, we will complete all the work on the CR and sign it by tonight at midnight." The only thing wrong with that is nobody had ever agreed to give up title V—not ORRIN HATCH, the chairman of the committee, not Senator KYL, a member of the subcommittee, not Senator FEINSTEIN, who has been an absolute stalwart in working with me; she deserves extraordinary credit for doing strong, strong legislative work in an atmosphere of high emotion from her State.

She and Senator BOXER are more affected than anybody else in this place. They have stepped up to the plate, and it is a great honor to work with them.

So we are going to get down to title V. I said we are going to go to cloture next Monday on that bill, and we have about 70 votes in our pocket, which will get you cloture in any ballpark here; you need 60 votes. So most of the Republicans would vote for cloture, and thanks to the work of Senator FEINSTEIN and others on that side of the aisle, we would get cloture because there are 15 to 20 Democrats who will get cloture for us and help with that. So here we are.

On August 2, the President wrote a letter to the Speaker to express concern about a single provision of the immigration bill, which was authorizing the States to deny a free public education to illegal aliens. The President threatened to veto the conference report if that provision or anything like it was included. No other provision was opposed in that way.

After several weeks of hard, considerable debate and efforts to develop an acceptable compromise—admittedly, it was done, I think, in too much of a partisan way, but it was done and everybody knew what happened; everybody has seen the conference report—we agreed to delete the provision that was very popular in the House and had considerable support in the Senate. Yet, within the last day or so, the White House and Democrat allies have moved the goal posts. They have been attempting to obtain even further changes. All the time there is something new.

You have had it reported here. I have never seen anything like it in 31 years of legislating. It would be bad enough if this were done by another veto threat, and early in the session. But this time the President is attempting to blackmail this Congress into accepting the changes he wants in the immigration bill, as well as changes in several other bills. Get this one: You could tell by the tenor of the discussion when the White House person entered the room last night that what they were really trying to do was get the stuff they could not get in the welfare bill and get it out of the immigration bill and correct the deficiencies in the welfare bill. I am not having any part of that. The President signed the welfare bill. I commended him on that. I thought that was great. He got flack and he wants to change some of it. But he isn't going to do it on this watch and, surely, he is not going to do it with an immigration bill. I can assure you of that.

Then we have this threat to refuse to sign the CR. We have the threat to close the Government. Let me tell you, that won't work this trip because we are going to stick around to see that the Government does not shut down, because we are going to shovel this back and say there is nothing in there that would shut the Government down.

The Democrats and the Republicans in the House and the Senate, trying their best, did what they could. If they fail, then the Republicans, which is the duty of leadership, produce a bill. If the President wants to veto it, do so.

So here we are. You can see the scenario—oh, it is so vivid. Tuesday, we will have to think about closing the Government. Guess who will take the flack for that? Those bone-headed Republicans that let it happen the last time. That is not going to happen this trip because there is nothing in there to veto. It is called doing the business of the United States. It is done by people like MARK HATFIELD and Senator ROBERT BYRD, and by people like Senator MIKULSKI and Senator BOND, and it is done by people like Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator SIMPSON; it is done that way over here. Maybe the White House does not understand that, but I understand it.

So now what are the changes that we want here? Oh, well, title V, get rid of title V. Why would you want to get rid of title V? I will tell you what is in it.

Without the requirements that sponsors earn at least 140 percent to 200 percent of the poverty line, welfare recipients will be in a position to sponsor immigrant relatives, even though they will be unable to provide the support for that relative that they have promised. These immigrant relatives will then be able to qualify for welfare programs costing the United States billions of dollars.

That is in title V.

Without the amendments making a "public charge" deportation effective, immigrants who go on welfare soon after their entry will be able to continue to receive it indefinitely, without fear of deportation.

That is in title V.

Without "deeming"—in other words, considering that the petitioner and his or her income is that of the immigrant—for immigrants now in the country, many immigrants will continue to receive welfare, even though their middle-class or wealthy relatives who sponsored them are perfectly able to provide needed support.

That is in title V.

Without the new welfare verification requirements, illegal aliens, who claim to be U.S. citizens and just stand there and say they are, will continue to receive assistance, such as AFDC, Medicaid, and public housing.

That is in title V.

Without the provision authorizing full reimbursement to States—listen to this one—now being forced by Federal mandate to provide emergency medical services to illegal aliens, the heavy burden of that mandate will continue to grow.

That is in title V.

Without the provisions expediting removal of illegal aliens from public housing—which is the work of Senator REID and what he has been talking about for years—illegals will continue to occupy public housing, displacing U.S. citizens and lawful resident aliens.

That is in title V.

Without the prohibition on States treating illegal aliens more favorably than U.S. citizens, States will be able to make illegals eligible for reduced in-State tuition at taxpayer-funded State colleges.

That is in title V, together with all the stuff to clean up their use of unemployment compensation, their use of the Social Security system, and much, much more.

That is what is in title V.

There we are. I thank Senator FEINSTEIN for being most courageous in the face of the onslaught that I am sure she is going to get. I want to commend Senator KENNEDY, who worked with me until 2 in the morning to do a package, which must have drawn such a great big chuckle this morning when it got down to the White House. I have been doing this a long time, and I have always done it with absolute honesty. I have done it with orneriness, with passion, and I have done it with glee, with grief, but I didn't lie. This is appalling, absolutely appalling.

If the trick is simply to shut down the Government, well, that is nothing. I never spent a nickel's worth of time figuring out how to do a bill that would go to the President so he would veto it so he would lose California. That has never been in my scenario—never would be; don't care about that. I care about doing something about illegal immigration. We couldn't do anything about legal immigration. That is for another date.

Ladies and gentleman, this is a strong, potent, powerful bill. And, if all goes well, it will be voted on; Monday at 2 o'clock on a cloture vote. And cloture will carry. The debate will be cut off, and after the hours of postcloture and debate are over, we will do that on through the night, we will vote. We will do an immigration bill, and place it on the President's desk. I hope and pray that he will sign it. But it isn't crafted to blow up in his face, and it was not crafted by people who come to Congress, as they have been doing in these last days who stand in front of you and do something different than they said they would do before. And I am sick of it.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Wyoming for coming and sharing these last 2 days with us, and the American people. It is quite an alarming story.

We have been joined by the senior Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the Budget Committee, and I yield up to 10 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you, very much, Mr. President. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Let me thank Senator SIMPSON for his forthrightness and the way he con-

ducted himself as a Senator. The fact that he has been honest, and the fact that he has been diligent in everything he has done around here, lends great credence to what he is talking about here today.

Frankly, let me just pledge to the Senator—not that I can be of any help, but I agree with everything he has said here on the floor. In fact, I think there is a lot of game playing going on right now, not only with reference to that bill but also the immigration bill. But there are a lot of other things going on about who is going to be responsible for closing down the Government. Everybody is on that kick. We have a few hours, and we have to get our work done. That is what the Senator has been talking about—getting our work done. There isn't anybody trying to close the Government down. And the President is getting almost everything he has asked for in major expenditures in terms of education, and in terms of the environment. What is there to close the Government down over? It can't be the kinds of things he was talking about last year. It must be something very strange that is in somebody's craw around here. And I wonder just precisely who it is and what the agenda is.

I do not think we ought to be threatening each other with closing down the Government, or using tricks, or gimmicks to try to blame it on somebody. We can get this job done, and get it done right. Every piece of legislation that is ever dreamed up can't get passed. With 200 amendments around here that have nothing to do with appropriations, we can't fix all of those in the last 72 hours of the U.S. Congress.

I didn't come down here to talk on that. I came to take on the economy and a few of the contentions presented on the floor of the Senate by some on the Democratic side about the status of the economy. If I get enough time when I am finished analyzing what really has happened and whether there is really anything to brag about in terms of how the economy has proceeded in the last year or two, if I have enough time, what I have to say will fit right into why Senator Dole has a new economic plan.

Let me first suggest that yesterday some Census data came out that permitted the President of the United States and some Members of the other party to tell the American people that things are really going right, and that the economic facts are really on the side of staying the course that the President has set for America.

One of the things that they talked about has to do with real median household incomes. Listen to this. They are saying the real median household income rose. And so they are saying we are on the right track. It is going up.

Let us get the numbers and let us get the facts. It rose from \$33,178 in 1994 to \$34,076—not a significant increase, but an increase. But what was not said was

that even as it has increased, it is still lower than it was in 1990 under President Bush. It was only higher in 1995 relative to the low levels it fell to in the early 1990s. It increased in 1995 because it went down after 1990 during this era that the President claims is a great economic era and we ought to maintain the status quo. Under the Bush administration it was \$34,914, which is almost \$900 higher than it is now. The year 1995's level only rose from 1994 because it was recouping some of the ground lost in the preceding years.

Arguments are also being made that Census data shows a lessening of income inequality in 1995. They note that the income share of the top quintile has gone down some, thus bridging that gap between the poor and the rich, or the rich and the poor. Let us look at that.

In 1995, there is seemingly something to brag about because the top quintile's income share went from 49.1 percent to 48.7 percent, four-tenths of a percent down. What isn't said is that the income distribution was much more fair in 1992—at that point, the top quintile had only 46.9 percent of the total income pie. Thus, income inequality was much less when the President was inaugurated, it then worsened significantly, and then eased back fractionally last year. For this, we should tell America the economy is doing splendidly? When in its best status under President Clinton, income inequality is still worse than the last year of the previous Presidency.

I do not choose to make this a battle among Presidents in a partisan fashion. But I do choose to say that when I left the White House yesterday at a bill signing, I heard our President make these statements. Somebody wanted my comments. I will tell the Senate what I said to that newsperson. I said, "I do not want to comment now, because I want to go back and look at the facts because something intuitively tells me that there is another side to this story." I came back and asked: Is there? I just told you that, indeed, there is.

Let me take another one. We are talking about trying to have the lower income people get a bigger share of the economic pie when compared with the wealthier people. So bragging is going on that in fact the bottom quintile did increase its share a little bit in 1995, in terms of the size of the income pie that they took in. There again, it is interesting to note that that the bottom quintile's income share was higher in the last year of Bush Administration than it is now during the bragging year. It only went up in 1995 because their share went down so far during the first 2 years of this administration.

But most importantly, there is another aspect of the Census report which concerns me greatly—real median earnings for full-time workers in America are still going down—not up. The very same survey that yielded

some limited good news about 1995 median incomes says the following: For men in 1995, real median earnings were down 0.7 percent, and for women, real median earnings were down 1.5 percent—not up; down. In fact, real median earnings have fallen in every year of the Clinton administration for both men and women.

That brings me to what I would have been saying on the floor in light of some of the discussions about the Dole economic plan. And I am going to run out of time. But it is a perfect entre to say to those who want to listen, that the distinguished Republican majority leader who is running for President of the United States had two options on the economy when he decided to run. One was to say, "The status quo is neat. Let us just stay on the status quo for the next 4 years, if I am elected President." That would have put him right alongside of our President saying things are really going very well. Or he could ask some experts for the best we can put together. "Can we do better? Should we do better?" He did that. And the answer given by eminent economists—not wild-eyed economists with new theories, but mainstream Nobel laureate economists—was, "We can do better and we should do better." Then the question was asked: "How do we do it?" And, interestingly enough, what our candidate for President has been busy trying to do is to argue for the six-point plan they recommended, a plan which would produce some economic figures that would be truly worthy of boasting about. I am not here saying he has presented his message magnificently. But, I believe that if the details of his plan got out to the public more fully, it would change the election as people identified increasingly with his vision of America.

Mr. President, I have just summarized for the Senate what the situation is with reference to incomes for men and for women in the year 1995. And even though some Members on the other side of the aisle and the President have touted an increase in real median household incomes in the year 1995, I remind the Senate that is the case only as compared with 1994. But if you look to 1990 during the Bush administration, median household income was higher than it is today. Furthermore, throughout every year of the Clinton administration, real earnings for full-time workers have fallen. They grew by minus seven-tenths of a percent for men, and minus 1.5 for women. That means we are not making any real headway in what people are earning for the time they spend working trying to get ahead.

It also means that income inequality is not getting any less. The President has championed the fact that the wealthy people's share of the total income pie came down in 1995. While this small move toward lessened income inequality is welcome, this gain is small in comparison to significant widening of income inequality which has oc-

curred during his Presidency. In fact, the income distribution is far more unequal today than it was in 1992, the last year of the Bush Presidency.

Coupled with these above facts, there are other striking economic woes that now face the U.S. economy. We are experiencing the slowest growth rate of any recovery in the last 50 years. We have the lowest productivity growth during any Presidential term in the last 50 years. Tax burdens for middle income individuals have risen sharply under this President. The personal savings rate is now at its lowest average level of any President's term in 50 years. With this unfortunate backdrop, it is no wonder that many Americans wonder why they are working harder and getting less for their work.

Senator Dole, as I indicated in my earlier remarks, looked to five or six of the best economists around and they suggested it need not be this way; that we ought to be able to do it better. What they suggested, he adopted after a few months of study and discernment.

The conclusions reached were that Senator Dole and his running mate should not run for the White House, based upon trying to keep the American economy as it is now and keep the fiscal policy as it is now and the tax policy as it is now and the regulatory policy as it is now and the education policy as it is now, because to do so is to extend this very serious negative backdrop of the American economy for working men and women. The wealth machine that is enumerated in the gross domestic product is not getting big enough each year for those people working to get more for what they do, rather than stagnating or getting less.

Essentially, Senator Dole concluded, as I urged him to do, that we ought to try to do better, and that meant he had to come up with an economic plan that experts would say would do better. One that would ensure that the earnings of all Americans and median household incomes would be up in 7 or 8 years as compared with 1992 or 1996 or 1995.

These economists recommended six things. Six things are his plan. Where people have learned about these and understand them, they opt for this economic direction instead of the status quo. First, he suggests that to get there we ought to adopt a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. Clearly, I believe it is fair to say that whomever is President next year can cause that to happen, for it would already be out there in the States with ratification working had this President wanted it, for all he had to do was say the word and one or two—I cannot remember which—Democrats would have clearly gone with him.

The next key item is a program to balance the budget by the year 2002. Might I say in that regard that there are some who insist that he tell us how, our candidate for President Dole, tell us precisely how he would do that. Mr. President and fellow Senators, he

is not President, he does not have OMB with a couple hundred staff. He cannot produce a 1,000-page document. But he has said essentially here are some things I would do. There are two parts to it and they are both easily understood. Adopt this year's Republican budget and implement it, and then reduce spending over the next 6 years, 1 percent a year for a total of 6 percent over 6 years.

Now, what do you get for that is what the American people ought to ask. And they get the next part of this reform. And it is tax rates are cut 5 percent a year for 3 years—a 15-percent reduction in tax rates. Let me spell out what this means for ordinary citizens. A married couple with two children earning \$30,000 would save \$1,272 per year. A married couple with two children earning \$50,000 would save \$1,657 per year. A retired couple with no children earning \$60,000 would save \$1,727 per year.

This is money that average citizens in our sovereign States would keep. Money that now gets sent to Washington in taxes. They could keep and spend this money however they see fit, instead of under the Federal Government's budget and programs.

In addition, the capital gains tax, which is an onerous imposition upon the sale of assets and the sale of investments would be changed to be 50 percent of what it is now, or 14 percent. All our industrial partners in the world tax these kinds of asset sales much less than we do, and they make their money and their resources work better for them, and make the economy more vibrant. We must do the same. This is a direct effort to cause growth to occur more. It would make productivity go up, for there is more to invest and more to be saved.

His fourth point was to do away with the IRS as we know it.

Furthermore, in his first term, he intends to reform the entire tax structure, to press hard for savings and investments which are now penalized under the code because, for the most part, they are taxed twice.

And that left two other major points, for you can see this plan of his is not just a tax cut, tax reform plan.

The two remaining issues are very important. Modify the regulations on business in America so that you keep those that are needed and effective, and you reduce those that are not effective and not needed. Now, how does that help? To the extent that we are spending money for excess compliance, it cannot go into the pockets of our working people. It cannot be part of real growth for it goes into unnecessary expenditures that cool the economy rather than let it grow.

On that score he recommends in this plan that the best economists in America helped prepare, that the justice system, the civil justice system should be also amended, modified and made more responsive by eliminating some of the drag and costliness of litigation that is

truly not necessary for the American people's well-being. Such litigation extracts an enormous cost from the economy, which goes to attorney's fees and court costs, public punitive damages and things like that that almost everybody thinks are significantly out of hand. To the extent that cost is put on the economy, there is less there for wage earners to get in their paychecks and for small business to earn as the businesses grow.

And then last but definitely not least, if you are going to have more productivity in America and begin to reduce income inequality significantly and permanently, we must reform our education system. Others have different solutions. They say "why don't you tax the rich more?". Well, let me give you a very living example that it does not work, because we have taxed the rich more under this President's economic policies and, lo and behold, the spread between the rich and the poor got bigger. I just told you that in my previous remarks.

It did not get littler; it got bigger. In fact, the President is bragging today because in 1 out of the last 3 years, income inequality came down a bit, but it never was as favorable as it was in the last year of President Bush's term. So, that is not a solution.

Almost everybody says we have to do a better job of training some Americans who are not getting educated very well, not getting trained very well, and thus do not get in the mainstream and cannot earn good money on good jobs. One of the economists advising our nominee, the Republican nominee, is a Nobel laureate named Dr. Becker, from the University of Chicago. His expertise is the development of the human side, that is people development in a capitalistic society. The recommendation is that President-elect Dole be bold, and he say boldly and firmly: We are going to make education in the ghettos and in the barrios and in the areas where our young people are getting inferior education, we are going to change that even if we have to give them scholarships to move out of that area to get educated in another school.

There would be a whole reshuffling, reorganizing, reforming of how we educate those who are getting poor education in this system, for whatever reason. While we are busy about that, the way we train post-high-school kids and young people for living jobs in the workplace, that we take the money we are spending and, instead of throwing it around in hundreds of programs, that we focus it clearly in a competitive way, with a lot of choice on the part of the recipients, in an improved job training program.

Now, Mr. President, for those who would choose to say this plan cannot be done, I merely suggest that they do not know Robert Dole. They do not know these marvelous economists, full-blooded, true-blue Americans, mainstream, but the best, who say the status quo of today is not good enough. A

status quo where real median household incomes are worse than in 1990, where, for men and women who are employed full time, average earnings are still coming down, not going up. That means, contrary to the braggadocio of this administration about what kind of jobs are coming on, that facts seem to indicate many of the new jobs are cheap jobs, where the administration would suggest they are not. That fact that I just gave you would indicate, since there are more jobs but median real earnings are still coming down rather than up for full-time workers, it would mean they are not getting better jobs, in terms of the new entrants in this job market.

So, when you add all these up, I conclude—and since the issue was raised on the floor today I thought I would give my version to whatever Americans are listening and to whatever Senators truly care—I think it can be done, I think we can do better than today's status quo.

Let me suggest, for those of us who have been trying to move this huge battleship, the battleship of Federal expenditures, which turns ever so slowly in this huge ocean of demands, of people wanting more from their Government, it moves slowly. But for those of us who want to continue the movement in the direction of balancing the budget, we can say to those who will listen to us about the Dole plan: If we cannot do it, we cannot prove balance, then we will not do the plan. If we cannot prove balance, we will not have the tax cuts. If we cannot prove that we know how to turn the expenditure ship in the direction of balance, then obviously we will not carry out this plan.

I thank the Senate for the time, and I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. I have an agreement from the other side to have 5 more minutes under my control of the time for the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor, and if I can find time later in the afternoon, I will complete this.

Mr. COVERDELL. If I might, Mr. President, tell the Senator from New Mexico that after her 5 minutes, it will go to a period of morning business until 5 and there will be ample time.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if that is—

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

Mr. WARNER. Could I be recognized for a period of time following the distinguished Senator from Texas for a period not to exceed 5 minutes, with the understanding that an equal amount of time should be offered to Senator Bob GRAHAM of Florida. The purpose for the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Florida is to introduce a bipartisan bill for consideration by the next Congress.

Mr. COVERDELL. If I might respond to the Senator from Virginia, I am going to ask unanimous consent for 5 minutes to be accorded to the Senator from Texas, and then under—

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield and let me just ask if he would consider letting Senator DOMENICI finish with 3 minutes and then giving me my 5 minutes, and then I think perhaps Senator BYRD is going to ask for some time. So we could work something out so that everyone would have an opportunity with Senator WARNER as well.

Mr. DOMENICI. Do not ask for me to have 3 minutes because I want to use the regular order as best we can, and I need more than 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JEFFORDS). The Senate is now in a period of morning business.

Mr. COVERDELL. Let me ask unanimous consent that the hour of controlled business under the Senator from Georgia be expanded 5 minutes—and we talked to the other side of the aisle—so the Senator from Texas may finish her remarks. I will then ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until the hour of 5 with statements limited to 5 minutes each, which I believe will accord the Senators from Virginia and Florida their opportunity.

Mr. WARNER. And the Senator from Florida, Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. COVERDELL. Yes. So I ask unanimous consent that the period I control be expanded for 5 minutes and that that time be dedicated to the Senator from Texas.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. And I shall not object, but I would like to be recognized following the distinguished Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Florida about whom he has referred. I would like then to be recognized for such time as I may consume. That time would be probably 30 minutes, 35 minutes, or some such. I want to speak about the great senior Senator from Georgia, who will be leaving us, and I do not want to be cramped for time. But I will not overstay my welcome on the Senate floor. So I would like to be recognized at that point for not to exceed such time as I may consume, which probably will not be more than 30 minutes, but it could be 35.

Mr. COVERDELL. If I might respond to the Senator from West Virginia, I do not know the purpose for which the leader asked for morning business to be extended until 5.

I am advised that is certainly appropriate, and I am glad to accord the Senator from West Virginia the appropriate time he is seeking.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, could the Chair restate the entire unani-

mous-consent request as it applied to the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Florida, and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the Senator from Georgia to restate his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. COVERDELL. I am asking unanimous consent the time I control be extended 5 minutes to accord the Senator from Texas 5 minutes; following that unanimous consent, that 5 minutes be granted to the Senator from Virginia, followed by the Senator from Florida for 5 minutes, and then to be followed by the Senator from West Virginia for up to 30 minutes, and that the hour of morning business be extended until the hour of 5:30 with statements limited to 5 minutes each.

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not want to be limited to 30 minutes. But I will be very considerate of the desires of others to speak.

Mr. COVERDELL. I would amend the unanimous consent to extend the Senator of West Virginia the time that he needs, but that there be a period of morning business to extend 30 minutes at the conclusion of his remarks with statements limited by each Senator to up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I hope not to, will the Senator from Georgia add at the end of the statement by the Senator from West Virginia 20 minutes. I had 20 minutes earlier in the day which was taken for another purpose. I would request 20 minutes at the conclusion of the Senator from West Virginia in morning business.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. COVERDELL. I would have to check, I say to the Senator from Florida. I would have to check with the leadership before I could agree to that position. But I have agreed to the 5 minutes in accordance with the Senator from Virginia. The Senator is included in that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection—

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will withdraw my objection at this time, but I want to alert the Senate that at some time I will be reinitiating my request for 20 minutes for purposes other than that which I am going to speak in conjunction with my colleague and friend from Virginia.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair.

GOOD FAITH NEGOTIATIONS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the senior Senator

from Wyoming for an outstanding job on a bill that really will put teeth in the laws against illegal immigration into our country. He has been working for months in a bipartisan way to make sure that before the end of this session we did a meaningful job of addressing a terrible problem in my State and for the whole country, and that is an influx of illegal aliens that is causing the taxpayers of my State and our country millions of dollars.

The senior Senator from Wyoming worked until late in the night last night trying to make sure that this bill stays together. All we have heard from the White House is that the White House objected to the Gallegly amendment, and beyond that would sign the bill that was indeed a bipartisan bill in both Houses of Congress.

Today, we have a change of mood, and all of a sudden now the bill that will stop, or at least give us a chance to stop, the illegal immigration into our country is now being held up by the White House saying, no, we want you to take out title V. Now, title V would, in fact, take out the enforceability of the welfare reform bill that also passed this body and this Congress overwhelmingly.

It is time for us to have an integrity in the system that says once you come to an agreement, it is an agreement, our word is good, and we go forward. We cannot have the goalposts changing every time we make an agreement. I believe that Senator LOTT has really tried to work with his colleagues on the other side of the aisle to offer them all of the options to do what is the responsible thing that we must do in order to fund Government before October 1 when the fiscal year ends.

A week ago, Senator LOTT asked Senator DASCHLE if he would like to have a continuing resolution offered in which there would be six amendments on each side, and then we would pass the continuing resolution that would fund Government. That was rejected. Then another offer was made. Let us start debate on Tuesday on a continuing resolution to make sure that we do the responsible thing and keep Government going. Unlimited amendments on either side, but we finish by Wednesday night. That was rejected. The last offer was a Department of Defense appropriations conference report that all the other spending bills that are now outstanding would be put together with, and that has not yet been accepted.

The time has come for it to be called what it is. That is a delay tactic, an inability to come to an end, a closure so that we can all do what is responsible, and that is fund Government.

I think Senator LOTT is trying very hard. Senator HATFIELD was up until 4:30 in the morning this morning trying to negotiate in good faith with the White House and both sides of the aisle and both sides of this Capitol, trying to do the right thing, but has been thwarted at every step either by delay tactics during the process of handling