

States to cover certain classes of individuals under the State-run Medicaid Program. Again, this runs counter to our effort to provide States with more flexibility—not less.

A similar amendment was offered by Senator PRYOR. His amendment would have extended existing Medicaid standards with regard to nursing home facilities. At the time of the vote, it was my understanding that the Senate leadership would offer a subsequent amendment addressing the concerns raised by the Senator from Arkansas. This amendment was offered and accepted, and it ensures that Federal nursing home standards remain the minimum protection level afforded to nursing home residents. Under this amendment, States may receive a waiver from Federal requirements, but only if the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that the State's regulations are as tough—or tougher—than Federal regulations. With the understanding that this amendment would be offered, I voted against the Pryor amendment.

Mr. President, another amendment worthy of note was the Kassebaum amendment to restore funding to the school loan program. I had an opportunity to address these issues first as a member of the Senate Labor Committee. At that time, we were confronted with the need to meet our reconciliation instructions by reducing the cost of the school loan program. While the committee met its instruction by choosing the most acceptable of undesirable alternatives, several of my colleagues and I promised to work to reduce the impact these cuts would have on students and their parents. The result of this effort was the Kassenbaum amendment to strike provisions eliminating the 6-month grace period for student, imposing a loan fee on institutions, and increasing the interest rate on PLUS loans. This amendment effectively shielded college students from increased out-of-pocket costs, and I was pleased to see it adopted.

Senator BIDEN offered President Clinton's education tax credit proposal as an amendment to the bill. I voted against it because the reconciliation bill already includes a student loan tax credit of up to \$500 for middle-class families. Our plan also provides considerable additional relief to those families struggling to find enough resources in their limited family budget to cover the rising costs of college.

Senator BAUCUS offered an amendment to strike the ANWAR provisions of the bill. I support responsible, environmentally controlled efforts to explore and develop certain wilderness areas and, for that reason, I voted to table this amendment.

It is important to note that, on this issue, the State of Alaska and its citizens have spoken out. The Eskimos and Alaska's elected representatives recognize the potential benefits of development and support exploration of the region. The Inupiat Eskimos are the his-

toric residents of Alaska's North Slope; they are subsistence hunters who live off the land. Proceeds from oil production means good schools, medical services, and a better standard of living for them and their children.

Furthermore, responsible development of these oilfields is in Alaska's and the Nation's best interest. Alaska's current production facility at Prudhoe Bay, which provides more than 20 percent of domestic oil, is in decline. The State's revenues from oil are projected to fall from more than \$2 billion today to \$700 million in 2010. This could cause a grave fiscal crisis for Alaska. By contrast, if a commercial field is discovered projected Federal revenues could approach \$40 billion.

Finally, it should be noted that the Eskimos, who are dependent on the Caribou, fish, and other wildlife, believe that opening the refuge is compatible with their lifestyle and crucial to their survival.

For these reasons, I support the exploration of the coastal plain. I believe exploration can be done in a manner that protects the environment and also provides needed economic development.

A final tax matter which was addressed during debate was the Specter amendment supporting replacing the current Tax Code with a flat tax. As an extraneous matter, this amendment was subject to a point of order. I voted to sustain this point of order, but I want to emphasize that this vote should not be interpreted as opposition to the idea of the flat tax—but rather opposition to including it on this vehicle at this time. I agree with Senator SPECTER that our current Tax Code is too complex and inefficient and needs to be replaced, and I support investigating the benefits of all of the proposed reforms that have been put forward, including a flat tax.●

WOMEN OF DISTINCTION—1995

● Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise to pay a tribute to three individuals who were named the 1995 Women of Distinction by the Girl Scout Council of Hawaii. These women, Gladys Ainoa Brandt, Carole Kai Onouye, Gretchen R. Neal, as well as Sibyl Nyborg Heide, the Girl Scout Council of Hawaii's 1995 Living Treasure, have impressive records of service to the community that more than justify this great honor. They are outstanding role models for young women in the State of Hawaii.

Gladys Ainoa Brandt, an outstanding educator and community volunteer, has committed herself to improving the quality of education in Hawaii. Ms. Brandt held a wide range of positions in the field of education, from classroom teaching to chairwoman of the University of Hawaii Board of Regents. She has exemplified the very best in public education.

Carole Kai Onouye, an inspirational champion of Hawaii's charities, devotes

herself to improving the quality of life in Hawaii. Ms. Onouye serves on the boards of the Variety School, the Girl Scout Council of Hawaii, the Great Aloha Run, and Hawaii Maritime Center, and the USO Golf Tournament.

Gretchen R. Neal is a dedicated health care provider. Ms. Neal, whose goal from childhood was to be a nurse, was the first female to enter the Health Services Administration masters program at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. She has been actively involved with the Girl Scouts throughout her life.

Sibyl Nyborg Heide is an important benefactor in the local community. She, too, has been actively involved with the Girl Scouts throughout her life.

For all that they do for the community, and especially for young women, these four women deserve our respect and admiration.●

IMMIGRATION REFORM

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my Senate colleagues an important article prepared by Stuart Anderson and Steve Moore of the Cato Institute entitled "GOP Breaches of Contract." This piece explains why the immigration reform bill moving through the House violates the core principles of more freedom and less government that form the basis of the GOP's Contract With America. I would also like to highlight a recent statement signed by several business leaders on the need to maintain America's historic commitment to legal immigration. As we begin debate on immigration legislation here in the Senate, I would urge my colleagues to consider this information carefully. I ask that these materials be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 6, 1995]
GOP BREACHES OF 'CONTRACT'?

(By Stuart Anderson and Stephen Moore)

The "Contract With America" was not simply a list of 10 bills to be voted upon, but rather it represented the governing philosophy of the Republican Party. Unfortunately, the immigration bill recently voted out of the House Judiciary Committee, with unanimous Republican support, violates the four key precepts of the "Contract with America."

(1) Family values. The Contract states: "The American family is at the very heart of our society. It is through the family that we learn values like responsibility, morality, commitment, and faith." The House immigration bill, H.R. 2202, strikes at the heart of family unification by preventing brothers, sisters and nearly all adult children from joining their families here in the United States.

A guarantee to admit 25,000 eligible parents annually (half the current yearly total) was included in the bill, but only after an outside analysis confirmed that no parents could have immigrated if the bill had passed without amendment. But the bill contains a new obstacle for parents—only those who purchase nursing home and Medicare-comparable health insurance will be allowed to

immigrate. That leaves only spouses and minor children, who could immigrate only if their sponsors meet new income requirements.

(2) Fiscal responsibility. "Controlling spending is the primary means to controlling the deficit," states the Contract, yet the House immigration bill carries several big ticket items. First, up to \$80 million would be needed to return fees paid by petitioners whose siblings or adult children have received permission to immigrate but who will be cut off the waiting list if the bill passes in its present form. Second, estimates by the Cato Institute, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Social Security Administration reveal that hundreds of millions of dollars would eventually be needed to pay new and current federal bureaucrats to staff, maintain and clean up the proposed computer verification system. The system is designed to check the legal status of new private and public sector hires via telephone or modem. Third, the federal government will assume the potentially quite large liability for compensating any individual who loses a job or wages from being wrongfully denied employment due to an error under the new employment verification system.

(3) Rolling back government regulations. The Contract notes, "To free Americans from bureaucratic red tape, we will require every new regulation to stand a new test: Does it provide benefits worth the cost? To help our cities and states, we will ban unfunded mandates." The bill's various new mandates on cities, counties and states, including requiring such entities to verify new hires through a federal computer system, violate the intent of the recently passed Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, which requires that new mandates be paid for.

According to the Justice Department report on the nine-company pilot project that the bill's new computer system is based upon, compliance cost for companies using the system has averaged \$5,000 annually. During the Judiciary Committee markup, Republicans defeated an amendment to stop the computer system if a GAO study found the new program cost small businesses more than \$5,000 a year to implement. However, even this figure understates the true cost to businesses, since the pilot project allowed companies to check the legal status of only self-identified immigrants, while the House bill requires companies to check citizens as well. As for the cost-benefit analysis for new regulations recommended in the Contract, any benefit from this new system is only hypothetical, since there is no evidence this new mandate on businesses will reduce illegal immigration.

(4) Individual liberty. The Contract criticized the "Clinton Congress" when it argued, "Big Brother is alive and well through myriad government programs." In committee, Ohio Republican Rep. Steve Chabot attempted to delete the computer system from the bill, calling it 1-800-BIG BROTHER, but his effort lost on a 17-15 vote. He promises to fight the measure on the House floor.

Advocates of individual liberty should at least question any program that would centralize data on all Americans in a place where future social engineers can wreak havoc on the citizenry. Senate legislation attempts to ensure that only Americans and legal residents are listed in the computer system by requiring that everyone be fingerprinted or provide other biometric data (such as a retina scan) to "personalize" birth certificates by age 16. The House bill moves in that direction by mandating a study of "counterfeit-resistant" birth certificates. Moreover, at least one computer system supporter in the House has said the

system will not work without some type of national ID card.

Supporters of smaller government and family values will find that the House immigration bill violates the spirit, indeed the essence, of the Contract. It also contradicts Majority Leader Dick Armey's vision of a freedom revolution and Speaker Newt Gingrich's desire to create a "Conservative Opportunity Society." The immigration bill's provisions against families, the mandates on businesses, cities and states, and the specter of creating yet another uncontrollable government program should give pause to reformers. These measures would represent business as usual, not the Republican Revolution promised by the "Contract With America."

[From the Alexis de Tocqueville Institution,
Arlington, VA]

BUSINESS: IMMIGRATION HELPS NOT HURTS

We are concerned that legislation on immigration before the Congress will significantly damage U.S. economic growth, jobs, and competitiveness. It seems to proceed from the assumption that immigration is a mild ill which can only be tolerated to a degree. Yet far from being a drain on U.S. society or the economy, immigrants are a vital engine.

Immigrants generally pay more to the U.S. government in taxes than they use in services, as a number of studies have shown. In fact, a sudden drop in immigration levels would sharply reduce Social Security revenues.

Immigrants play a key role in product and technological development, the cutting edge of U.S. industrial growth. Many of our fastest-growing firms, and largest exporters, employ a significant share of immigrants in research and overseas marketing. Most of them cannot be replaced, and their loss would mean the loss of thousands of other jobs for Americans. Each year, many immigrants, some of them at our firms, obtain patents for products and processes that generate jobs, growth, indeed entire industries.

Immigrants own a significant share of small businesses. These small businesses are the engine of jobs growth in the U.S.: As a number of studies have shown, a large number of new jobs are generated by the smallest U.S. firms. Often these small operations become the driving force by which whole communities and cities are revived: Cuban renewal of Jersey City; the Vietnamese corridor of Arlington, Virginia; prosperous Asian communities throughout California.

On balance, a survey of Nobel economists released by the Alexis de Tocqueville Institution showed near-unanimous agreement immigration is a major economic plus.

Of course, we believe measures to increase the costs and complexity of hiring immigrants, and to reduce ceilings on such hirings, and other measures pose a special threat to American competitiveness. But we recognize that restrictions on family reunification, refugees, and other categories not labeled as economic are vitally important as well. Workers have husbands, wives and children. Many present employers came to this country not as major business executives, but as victims of persecution, famine or civil war. If these categories, or general immigration levels, are reduced, economic immigration will suffer, too.

U.S. immigration policy could certainly be improved, and illegal immigration brought under more reasonable control (without national databases and i.d. cards). But the core of any reform should involve extension and refinement of present immigration levels, not tighter restrictions. And it should be based on the understanding that high levels

of immigration are no liability; they are part of America's strength.

John Whitehead, former co-chairman, Goldman Sachs, former deputy secretary of state

George Soros, president, Soros Fund Management

Kenneth Tomlinson, editor-in-chief, Reader's Digest, former Director, Voice of America

Richard Gilder, Gilder, Gagnon and Howe
Lewis Eisenberg, co-chairman, Granite Capital International Group

Cliff Sobel, CEO, Bon Art International
Ed Zschau, International Business Machines

Donna Fitzpatrick, president and CEO, Radiance Services Company

Dr. J. Robert Beyster, chairman and CEO, Science Applications International Corporation

Lawrence Hunter, president, Business Leadership Council

Barton M. Biggs, chairman, Morgan Stanley

Jerry Junkins, chairman, President and CEO, Texas Instruments

T.J. Rodgers, president and CEO, Cypress Semiconductor

Felix Rohatyn, managing director, Lazard Freres & Co.

Mortimer Zuckerman, chairman and editor-in-chief, U.S. News and World Report

Lee Iacocca
Thomas Weisel, chairman, Montgomery Securities

**ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY,
NOVEMBER 15, 1995**

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 noon, Wednesday, November 15; that following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask further that tomorrow, from 12 to 12:30, there be a period for morning business, with a 5-minute time limitation.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we hope to turn to S. 908 tomorrow, the State Department reorganization bill, under a 4-hour time limitation. It is also possible that the Senate may consider a continuing resolution or debt limit extension, if received from the House. The Senate may also turn to any available appropriations conference reports.

I hope that we can go to S. 908. Certainly, it has been controversial, and it has been discussed and discussed. I think now we have some agreement between the Senator from North Carolina, Senator HELMS, and the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY. If we can complete that, it might free up some of the nominations and also some