

The numbers all point to the same thing—an ill-trained, underequipped, and demoralized U.S. military force.

It is time to restore America's military strength and readiness. Obviously, Congress needs to look at increased funding for the military. But it also has to take a look at U.S. defense policy and how those dollars are spent. Congress needs to look at priorities, on how it is spent, on what weapons, and where we want this country to be 20 years from now, and we need to force the administration to stick to those policies.

The administration needs to examine the number and level of military commitments that U.S. forces undertake. The U.S. Armed Forces right now must have the necessary funds to fulfill the missions that they have been given.

The problem is funds that should be used for readiness have been diverted. That GAO study cites that between fiscal 1990 and 1993, \$10.4 billion out of the defense budget was used for such activities as World Cup Soccer and the Summer Olympics. In the fiscal years 1990 to 1994, total defense spending fell 25 percent, while nondefense spending rose 361 percent. So it is time to put some of the priorities on how we spend those dollars back into the budget.

Just as alarming is the new trend of raiding the Defense Department's budget for "operations other than war." U.S. troops involvement in U.N. peacekeeping missions around the world put an immense strain on the already tight defense budget.

President Clinton proposed spending \$246 billion for defense for fiscal year 1996. It is now up to the Congress to take a serious look at the U.S. defense policy and come up with a realistic defense budget.

After years of cuts in the defense budget and a drawdown of forces, we have to look at where we are, where we should be, and where we want to be.

So the Defense Department budget has fallen steadily for 10 years since 1985. The procurement amount has fallen 65 percent over the same period. The reduction of U.S. Armed Forces generally has been too deep and, yes, too fast.

Over the last 10 years, infrastructure has only been cut 15 percent. That is compared to draconian cuts in weapons and equipment procurement, research and development, and force structure.

If the United States had maintained a realistic defense budget, we would not be looking at another round of base closings and realignments. We would have a fully ready and well-equipped military force ready to handle any eventuality.

The defense budget has been stretched too thin and now it is our bases that will pay the price. Bases around the country, bases instrumental to our national defense, will be scrutinized and possibly closed and given new missions.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, in my home State of Montana, is one of those

bases that will be looked at in this round of BRAC. Malmstrom is an important cog in the base structure and is an integral part of the city of Great Falls, MT, and to the rest of the State.

It is too bad that we get mixed up in our priorities regarding this defense budget, and bases such as Malmstrom could be lost in the shuffle.

Mr. President, with a great deal of concern that I ask my colleagues to look closely at our defense policy and where our priorities lie for the Defense Department and the U.S. Armed Forces in this coming fiscal year.

Yes, we sit here and debate a balanced budget amendment and we have heard all of the-sky-is-falling fears that has come out of this debate. It will still make us set our priorities and reevaluate the mission of government and what the role of government really should be, especially at the Federal level.

I happen to believe the protection of our shores and a strong national defense is very important to the security of this country and, yes, those children of the future

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NICKLES). The Senator from Wyoming. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is recognized to speak for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Chair.

THE IMMIGRANT CONTROL AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1995

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I return here to a familiar refrain, a theme revisited, not, as has my good friend from Montana, with regard to the balanced budget amendment or base closing. Those are critical issues we will face in these next weeks. But there is one that we will face that is rather awesome in nature, too, and that is the issue of illegal immigration.

Mr. President, on January 24 I introduced S. 269, the Immigrant Control and Financial Responsibility Act of 1995. At that time I presented to my colleagues and to the American people a rather general overview of the bill.

Today I wish to describe in greater detail one particular part of this legislation—the requirement for a new system to verify eligibility to work in the United States and to receive benefits under certain government-funded programs of public assistance.

Let me speak first about the urgent need for effective enforcement of the current law against knowingly employing aliens in U.S. jobs for which they are not authorized, and about the simple fact that such law cannot ever effectively be enforced without a more reliable system to verify work authorization. After explaining clearly why a new system is needed, I will describe to you the provisions of S. 269 which will require—no, demand—the implementation of such a system.

Mr. President, it has been recognized for so many years—I would hunch for as long as there has been interest in the issue, and that is quite a time—that the primary magnet for most illegal immigrants is the availability of jobs that pay so much better than what is available in their home countries. It is also widely recognized that satisfactory prevention of illegal border entry is most unlikely to be achieved solely by patrolling the very long U.S. border. That border of the United States is over 7,000 miles on land and 12,000 miles along what is technically called "coastline." Furthermore—and heed this or hear it—the real sea border consists of over 80,000 miles of what the experts at the Nautical Charting Division of the National Ocean Service call "shoreline," including the shoreline of the outer coast, offshore islands, sounds, bays, and other major inlets. And patrol of the border is, of course, totally inadequate to deal with foreign nationals who enter the United States legally—for example, as tourists or students—and then choose openly, blatantly to violate the terms of their visa, by not leaving when their visa expires or by working at jobs for which they are not authorized.

Therefore, every authoritative study I have seen has recommended a provision such as that in the 1986 immigration reform law, making it unlawful to employ illegal aliens—those who entered the United States illegally and those violating the terms of their visa. These studies include that of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy, on which I served over 10 years ago, and the Commission on Immigration Reform, now doing such fine and consistent work. They are doing beautiful work under the able chairman, former Congresswoman Barbara Jordan.

Such studies also recognize that an employer sanctions law cannot possibly be effective without a reliable and easy-to-use methods for employers to verify work authorization.

Accordingly, the 1986 law instituted an interim verification system. This system was designed to use documents which were then available, even though most of them were not resistant to tampering or counterfeiting. Not only that, but it is surprisingly easy and totally simple to obtain genuine documents, including a birth certificate. Thus, we believed then that the system would most likely need to be significantly improved. In fact, the law called for "studies" of telephone verification systems and counterfeit-resistant Social Security cards.

Unfortunately, the interim system is still in place today, over 8 years later. This is true even though—as many of us feared and which certainly came to pass—there is widespread fraud in its use.

As a result, the employer sanctions law has not been as effective in deterring illegal immigration as it could be—and should be. In the fiscal year that ended about a month before the 1986 law passed, apprehensions of illegal aliens had reached the highest level ever—1.8 million. After the law passed, there was a decline for 3 years to just over 900,000. But then the level began to rise again. The latest figure available is for the fiscal year that ended in September—1.3 million.

It is most assuredly disgraceful that, over 8 years after a law was enacted making it unlawful to knowingly employ illegal aliens, so many are still able to find work, thus still having that powerful incentive to violate America's immigration laws in doing so.

We must do better. An improved system to verify eligibility to work in this country must be implemented—in order that the enforcement tool with the greatest potential to deter illegal entry and visa abuse can produce the benefit that is required.

Mr. President, as I said in my introductory statement on the 24th, "We must be able to assure the American people that whatever other goals our immigration policy may pursue, its overriding goal is to serve the long-term interest of the majority of our citizens." It is our paramount duty as legislators to serve that singular interest, and that is precisely what the goal of our immigration laws should be.

Yet no matter how successful we might be in crafting a set of immigration laws that would—in theory, at least—lead to the most long-term benefit to a majority of U.S. citizens and their descendants, such benefit will not actually occur if those laws cannot be enforced.

Effective enforcement requires effective employer sanctions, and effective employer sanctions requires an effective verification system. It is just that simple. Nothing more. And S. 269 is intended above all else to lead to a verification system that has the needed degree of effectiveness.

S. 269 would require the President to implement a new verification system—the word is "implement"—not merely talk about it; not merely establish scores of studies to talk about it and read about it, to do it. And it imposes an 8-year deadline for the implementation.

The bill does not require that any particular form of verification be used, only that it satisfy certain criteria of effectiveness and protection for privacy and civil liberties.

It also authorizes separate 3-year demonstration projects in five or more States, so that the design of the final, nationwide system would be based not only on theory, but on what has actually been found to work in practice.

The system must reliably verify first, that the person who the applicant claims to be is authorized for the work, and second, that the applicant actually is this person.

If the system requires that a card or other document be presented it must be in a form that is resistant to tampering and counterfeiting.

Most importantly, very importantly, the bill explicitly states that no such card or other document may be required by any Government entity as a "national ID card," and I have been through all that.

It is not to be required to be carried on a person. It is not to be presented except at the time to verify eligibility to work or to receive benefits under Government-funded programs of public assistance. There is a tremendous fraud in the receipt of Government-funded public assistance. We will hold hearings on the issue of SSI fraud, disability insurance fraud.

With regard to the Social Security system, people bring their relatives from another country and say they are disabled, they do not speak English, they need the help of our Government, and we, as Americans, generously respond. But that system needs careful attention. We found recently one of the applications for that particular benefit had been filed overseas, so they have figured that one out. They are beginning even to file for assistance from a foreign country, come here, take them to the agency, and say: Here is this person; they require assistance; they do not speak English; they are not well. And then they are placed in our social support system, our safety nets, the ones for our U.S. citizens. This is not what the safety net is about.

This was part of the reaction of proposition 187 in California. The document will be used only to enforce certain criminal statutes related to fraudulent statements or fraudulent manufacturer or use of documents.

Let me just share this most fascinating picture ID. I did this several weeks ago, but it is so dazzling that I thought I would do it again. Several months ago, a member of my staff was contacted by a person in California who said, "Look, just send me SIMPSON biostatistics, and we will go from there." So he just went down—this is a dazzling picture of one of the most certainly attractive Members—oh, no, excuse me. This gentleman here is a very astute, wise-looking fellow. This is my California identification card, which expires on my birthday, September 2, in the year 1998. ALAN KOOI SIMPSON. My address, I have never heard of. I have never been to Turlock, CA, but the mayor has contacted me and made me an honorary citizen. I appreciated that, and I enjoyed the lovely letter. There is an address here of 4850 Royal, Turlock, CA, and included are the correct vital statistics. This is not my signature.

All right, that was obtained on a street corner in Los Angeles, at night, with \$100 bill. It was illegal, of course, but someone else did it. My father always taught me, in the practice of law, "If anyone goes to jail, be sure it is your client." Now, it is my Social Se-

curity card. I did block out two of the numbers, but here it actually is. This is not my number. This is a counterfeit-resistant so-called card. It has the same material in it, and so I am now in the Social Security system with somebody else's number. I do not know whose number this is. I am not sharing with you the entire number.

Now, that is just a \$100 buckner, an overnighter. This document would enable me to seek public assistance in California. I could go into any public assistance agency. There is a holographic card, and this is the correct one. But if you were not careful and you were not looking carefully, you would not notice the holograph in the true card.

So this little card which is reproduced here would enable me to get social support. It would likely even enable me to vote in certain jurisdictions of California. It would certainly get me a driver's license, and it would get me into the money stream. Now, that is what is happening in your country.

It is endemic. Within 500 yards of this building, we can pick up not only these—these are minor documents, they will get a person anything—but a person can pick up passports, pick up birth certificates. So we have a cottage industry of fake documents. The documents then lead into things like Social Security and workmen's compensation, and drain away the systems of the country.

So this is what we are up to. We are going to do something with documentation. We are going to do something to people who provide these documents. We are going to see that we might use the driver's license system, the holographic system in the State of California. But we are going to see that these documents are not easily forged, and those who do forge them and produce fraudulent documents will serve big time in the big place.

Now, these are the only uses to which any form of the system might be utilized, including one not even relying on the presentation of documents—for example, a telephone call-in system. We might look into that. That is part of the recommendation. The bill also provides that the privacy and security of any personal information obtained for or utilized by the system must be carefully protected. It must be treated as highly confidential information, and not made available to any person except as is necessary to the lawful operation of the system.

Furthermore, a verification of eligibility to any person may not be withheld or revoked for any reason other than that the person is ineligible under the applicable law or regulation. The bill explicitly provides all of those protections.

So, Mr. President, in concluding, I feel so very strongly that the greatest contribution this current Congress could make toward the enforcement of

our U.S. immigration laws would be to improve the effectiveness of the current law against the knowing employment of aliens not authorized to work or even to be present in this country. The passing of a bill such as S. 269 would be a monumental step toward making that contribution.

In the coming weeks, I will make additional statements to this body, describing other provisions of S. 269 and exactly why those provisions are important. Hearings will begin at the end of that period in the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration, which I chair. And a fine group of Members are on that subcommittee, Democrat and Republican alike. I look forward to working with my ranking member, Senator KENNEDY. He and I have worked together on immigration issues for 17 years.

Hearings will be held. We will consider all other immigration reform legislation from all of my colleagues, comprehensive, bipartisan, as well as specific proposals such as this one for the accuracy of a more fraud-resistant system for issuing these documents. We have to look into the one for issuing of birth certificates and matching records. Can Senators believe we do not even match birth and death records?

I sincerely look forward to hearing the ideas of my fine colleagues on these issues. Then we will be able to avoid things that are bringing down the system, things that give rise to the power of the force of proposition 187.

It reminded me of the story of the child who was at the graveyard in a jurisdiction noted for rather shabby election processes. Pick your own State, as you might imagine. The child was crying, and the person came up and said, "Son, why are you crying?" And he said, "I just learned that my dad came back to vote, and I never even saw him."

So we do want to try to avoid that in the future, because people use these cards to vote, to vote themselves largess from the Treasury, to then draw on our resources that we taxpayers—legal taxpayers—provide. That must stop. There is a way to stop it. We propose that. I would enjoy working and will enjoy, as I always have, working with all of my colleagues on this most serious issue. We are very dedicated to this process. I intend to spend a great deal of time and effort in these next months in doing responsible immigration reform—not only illegal immigration, but legal immigration.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may use

time from that under Senator DASCHLE's control.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, last year, Congress spent an enormous amount of time considering health care reform. After the debate came to a close, after all the posturing, speeches, and amendments, we failed to produce a health care bill. The greatest disappointment of the 103d Congress was our failure to enact health care reform. Millions of Americans are without health care, millions more are underinsured, and countless others are only a paycheck away from losing health care coverage. The crisis in our health care system will simply not go away.

Thirty-nine million Americans are uninsured. Last year, an additional 1 million Americans lost health insurance. If we don't enact legislation this Congress, the number of uninsured will continue to rise. I commend the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE for recognizing this dire need and for leading the U.S. Senate into the crafting of some form of health insurance for the people of America.

In Hawaii, we have solved the problems of affordability and access. Hawaii has achieved the American health care dream—near-universal health care coverage for its citizens at a cost that is 25–30 percent below the national average. For 20 years, Hawaii has maintained a model health care system. We have one of the healthiest populations in the Nation. A study by the Journal of the American Medical Association found that Hawaii has one of the lowest infant mortality rates. Deaths from chronic health problems such as cancer, heart disease, and lung disease are also among the lowest in the Nation.

Nearly everyone in Hawaii has some form of health insurance, so these life threatening conditions are detected earlier, which reduces premature death and shortens hospital visits. Because our population has ready access to a primary care physician, we use hospital emergency rooms only half as often as other States.

There is no reason why the rest of the Nation should settle for anything less than what Hawaii enjoys. Americans do not want a Band-Aid approach to health care reform. They do not want a medisave program or a savings account approach to health care. They want real, tangible health care that gives coverage when they need it. By developing a bipartisan consensus, we can take major steps to contain costs, expand choice, and increase access to care.

Hawaii has enjoyed its health care program, and we hope that we can extend this to the rest of the Nation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from New Jersey.

DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes this morning to review and comment on action taken this week by the House of Representatives during consideration of the defense supplemental.

I am deeply concerned by the legislation that the House is sending us. It is, in my view, deficient in at least three respects.

First, it spends too much money. The administration asked for a \$2.6 billion in emergency defense spending to pay for operations already undertaken in the past in Somalia, Rwanda, Bosnia, Southwest Asia, Haiti, and Cuba. The House approved that, but it also added an extra \$680 million that neither the administration nor the Pentagon requested.

Even Defense Secretary Perry has said the Pentagon, and I quote him, "has higher priority bills that should be funded first," and that the Pentagon would seek to reallocate money from existing defense funds in the spring to pay some of the \$680 million worth of bills that the House wants to fund immediately. Since there is no urgent need for these unrequested funds, I see no reason to provide them in a supplemental.

My first point then, Mr. President, is simply the additional \$680 million should be stricken out when the Appropriations Committee considers this legislation.

Second, I am not yet persuaded—and I sit on the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee—that all of the \$2.6 billion that the administration did ask for ought to be funded necessarily in the supplemental. A supplemental request is supposed to be reserved for unexpected and unanticipated exigencies. However, at least some of the administration's request appears to be for normal or routine or expected expenses, like the no-fly zone over Bosnia and Iraq, which has been underway for years. If we are to really reform the budget process, we have to prevent agencies from low-balling their initial requests because they believe they can always come back and ask for more later in a supplemental. It is kind of a habit that we have gotten into, and I do not think it is a particularly good one. We need to insist that the military, like every other agency, submit budget requests sufficient to cover predictable expenses.

And third, I am concerned about the offsets the House used to pay for this supplemental. Now, I agree that we should offset expenditures whenever