

In short, I commit to being a positive partner with all those who understand the need for tough decisions and want to move forward to real recovery.

It is time to rise above the current debate, which traps people into false choices while letting the possibility of other solutions slip away from us.

Mr. President, this is not an issue that is going to be solved by November 7, 2000. This is an issue that will be with us for years—perhaps generations—to come.

What we need now are public servants and private citizens with both the will and the vision to sit down, roll up their sleeves, and figure out how to move forward.

Right now we are on the path to salmon extinction. Anyone who delays progress keeps us on that path. Anyone who divides rather than unites, brings extinction closer.

Mr. President, as we proceed on this issue, I wish to state my willingness to work with the next President, with the tribal governments, with my colleagues in the Congress, with the State and local governments, and with private citizens to address the important issues related to recovering wild salmon.

And we can make progress while maintaining our region's economic viability.

The opportunity the administration has given us today is to move forward in a constructive way.

They have presented a plan that moves beyond the debate about bypassing dams and onto the issues we really need to focus on.

While I may disagree with some of the specifics of this plan, it does provide a comprehensive roadmap for how we can resolve these difficult issues.

I believe if we take the comprehensive approach, we will save salmon and steelhead runs; we will be able to produce essential power; we will be able to meet the needs of our farmers, and we will keep water healthy for our children's children.

Mr. President, as I conclude I want to make one final point. This really isn't just about fish or dams. It is about the type of world we want to live in. We have a choice about the legacy we leave for our grandchildren.

The choice I have called for today is the choice to leave future generations clean rivers—full of salmon.

The choice I've called for today is the choice to show our grandchildren that no matter how big our difference may appear we can work together and be good stewards of our land.

That is the choice I hope we will make.

The other path leaves a far different legacy. A legacy that leaves our grandchildren polluted waters—resources divided from nature, and even worse—people divided from each other.

Mr. President, that is not the legacy I want to leave. We cannot shrink from this challenge.

Let's use today's reports as a tool to help us move forward toward real salmon recovery.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

#### LATINO AND IMMIGRANT FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of a bill that will correct severe injustices affecting thousands of immigrants to the United States, while at the same time strengthening their ability to contribute to the U.S. economy and to the struggling economies of their countries of birth.

A short time ago on the floor of the Senate a unanimous consent request was made by Senators KENNEDY and HARRY REID of Nevada asking that this legislation, the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act, be brought to the floor for immediate consideration. It is very difficult to argue that we are so consumed with work in the Chamber of the Senate that we can't consider this legislation. In fact, we have done precious little over the last several days because of an honest disagreement between the leadership on the Democrat and Republican side.

I do believe this legislation should be brought on a timely basis for the consideration of the Senate. The bill in question is the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act. It has the support of an impressively broad coalition of groups and individuals, labor unions, business groups, human rights groups, religious organizations, conservative and progressive think tanks. Empower America supports this bill as pro-family and pro-market. The AFL-CIO supports it because it is pro-labor.

The administration is committed to its passage. Perhaps the most compelling reason for passing this bill is that it embraces the principles of fairness and justice that are of value to the American spirit and to the work we do in the Senate.

I recall, when we discuss the issue of immigration, one of my favorite stories involving President Franklin Roosevelt. President Roosevelt, of course, came from a somewhat aristocratic family in New York and was elected President in 1932. As the first Democratic President in many years, he was invited to speak to the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, DC. Of course, the DAR is an organization which prides itself on its Yankee heritage and the fact many have descended from those who came over on the *Mayflower*. They have a history of being somewhat skeptical of immigration policy in this country. When Franklin Roosevelt spoke to the DAR, his opening words set the tone. He introduced himself by saying: Fellow immigrants, a reminder to the DAR, a reminder to all of us, with the exception of Native Americans, who have been here for many centuries, we are all virtually immigrants to this country.

I am a first generation American. My mother immigrated to this country at

the age of 2 from the country of Lithuania in 1911. My father's family dates back to before the Revolutionary War, so I really represent both ends of the spectrum of white immigration to America. This bill tries to address the basic principles of immigration fairness and justice which we have tried to hold to during the course of this Nation's history. I bring particular attention to the Senate to the plight of immigrants from Central America and Haiti who have been dealt a severe injustice during the past 20 years, one that would be directly addressed by this legislation.

In the recent past, thousands of people from Central America and Haiti have been forced to flee their homes in order to save their lives and the lives of their families. In Guatemala, hundreds of so-called "extra-judicial" killings occurred every year between 1990 and 1995; entire villages "disappeared", most probably massacred. In El Salvador, political violence was rampant—63,000 people were killed in the 1980's by a combination of leftist guerrillas, right-wing death squads, and government military actions. Ironically, an end to twelve years of civil war did not mean an end to violent internal strife; the death toll in 1994 was higher than it was during the war. In Honduras, the Department of State's Human Rights Reports cite "serious problems", including extrajudicial killings, beatings, and a civilian and military elite that have long operated with impunity. In September 1991, Haiti's democratically-elected government was overthrown in a violent military coup d'etat that, over a three year period, was responsible for thousands of extra-judicial killings.

Current law creates a highly unworkable patchwork approach to the status of these immigrants, one that assaults our sense of fair play. Immigrants from Nicaragua and Cuba who have lived here since 1995 can obtain green card status in the U.S. through a sensible, straightforward process. Guatemalans and Salvadorans are covered by a different, more stringent and cumbersome set of procedures. A select group of Haitian immigrants are classified under another restrictive status. Hondurans by yet another. As if this helter-skelter approach isn't bad enough, existing policies also treat family members of immigrants—spouses and children—differently depending on where they live, and under which provision of which law they are covered.

The United States is known around the world as the land of equal opportunity, but the opportunities we are affording to Central American and Haitian immigrants who have lived in this country for years are anything but equal. The current situation is untenable. Why should a family that has set down firm roots in the United States after fleeing death squads in Nicaragua be treated differently under the law

than another family from, say, El Salvador, who left that country for precisely the same reason. The point was made brutally clear when Amnesty International documented the case of Santana Chirino Amaya, deported back to El Salvador and subsequently found decapitated. This, and many similar stories, led to charges that the U.S. was engaged in a "systematic practice" of denying asylum to some nationals, regardless of the merits of their claims. A class-action lawsuit brought by the American Baptist Churches and other faith-based organizations on behalf of Salvadoran and Guatemalan immigrants made a similar case, and was eventually settled in favor of those seeking a fairer hearing.

Or consider the plight of Maria Orellana, a war refugee from El Salvador, who fled the country when soldiers killed two members of her family. She has lived the past ten years in the United States. Recently, the INS ordered her deported even though she is eight months pregnant and even though her husband—himself an immigrant—has legal status here and expects to soon be sworn in as a U.S. citizen. When a newspaper reporter asked the INS to comment on Maria's case, the reply was: "I don't know why Congress wrote it differently for people of different countries. We're not in a position to change a law given to us by Congress . . . we just enforce the law as written."

Well, the law, in this case, was written badly, and needs to be fixed. The Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act would resolve these many inequities by providing a level playing field on which all immigrants from this region with similar histories would be treated equally under the law. And it would address two other issues of great importance to the immigrant community as well.

The provision to restore Section 245(i) would restore a long-standing and sensible policy that was unfortunately allowed to lapse in 1997. Section 245(i) of the Immigration Act had allowed individuals that qualified for a green card to obtain their visa in the U.S. if they were already in the country. Without this common-sense provision, immigrants on the verge of gaining their green card must return to their home country to obtain their visa. However, the very act of making such an onerous trip can put their green-card standing in jeopardy, since other provisions of immigration law prohibit re-entry to the U.S. under certain circumstances. This has led to ludicrous situations, like the forced separation of married couples because one spouse must leave the country to obtain a visa, uncertain as to when they can be reunited. Restoring the Section 245(i) mechanism to obtain visas here in the U.S. is a good policy that will help keep families together and keep willing workers in the U.S. labor force.

Let me add, in my office in Chicago, IL, two-thirds of the casework we do

relates to immigration. We understand the plight of these families on a personal basis. We meet them in our office, we meet their friends and relatives, we meet members of their churches who ask why the laws on immigration in America have to be so unfair and contradictory. That is why this bill is so important.

The Date of Registry provision is equally important. Undocumented immigrants seeking permanent residency must demonstrate that they have lived continuously in the U.S. since the date of registry cut-off. This amendment updates the date of registry from 1972—almost 30 years of continuous residency—1986. The Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act recognizes that many immigrants have been victimized by confusing and inconsistent INS policies in the past fifteen years—policies that have been overturned in numerous court decisions, but that have nonetheless prevented many immigrants from being granted permanent residency. Updating the date of registry to 1986 would bring long overdue justice to the affected populations.

It is worth reviewing the recent history of immigration policy to understand how we arrived at such a highly convoluted and piecemeal approach. Prior to the passage of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Responsibility Act in 1996, aliens in the United States could apply for suspension of deportation and adjustment of status in order to obtain lawful permanent residence. Suspension of deportation was used to ameliorate the harsh consequences of deportation for aliens who had been present in the United States for long periods of time.

In September of 1996, Congress passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Responsibility Act. This law retroactively made thousands of immigrants ineligible for suspension of deportation and left them with no alternate remedy. The 1996 Act eliminated suspension of deportation and established a new form of relief entitled cancellation of removal that required an applicant to accrue ten years of continuous residence as of date of the initial notice charging the applicant with being removable.

In 1997, Congress recognized that these new provisions had resulted in grave injustices to certain groups of people. So in November of 1997, the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act (INACARA) granted relief to certain citizens of former Soviet block countries and several Central American countries. This select group of immigrants were allowed to apply for permanent residence under the old, pre-IIRRA standards.

Such an alteration of IIRRA made sense. After all, the U.S. had allowed Central Americans to reside and work here for over a decade, during which time many of them established families, careers and community ties. The complex history of civil wars and political persecution in parts of Central

America left thousands of people in limbo without a place to call home. Many victims of severe persecution came to the United States with very strong asylum cases, but unfortunately these individuals have waited so long for a hearing they will have difficulty proving their cases because they involve incidents which occurred as early as 1980. In addition, many victims of persecution never filed for asylum out of fear of denial, and consequently these people now face claims weakened by years of delay.

Correcting the inequities in current immigration policies is not only a matter of fundamental fairness, it is good, pragmatic public policy. The funds sent back by immigrants to their home countries sources of foreign exchange, and significant stabilizing factors in several national economies. The immigrant workforce is important to our national economy as well. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan has frequently cited the threat to our economic well-being posed by an increasingly tight labor pool, and has gone so far as to suggest that immigration be uncapped. While these provisions will not remove or adjust any such caps, it will allow those already here to move freely in the labor market.

I come to the floor disappointed because the effort for unanimous consent to bring up the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act was denied. This is an act which advances justice, keeps families together, and strengthens the national and international economy. It deserves unqualified support and rapid passage.

Not that many years ago, immigrants to this country faced an onslaught of criticism. There were propositions in the State of California, speeches made by politicians, charges made by groups that really caused a great deal of fear and concern among those who had immigrated to this country. It is a stark reminder that, as a nation of immigrants, we should continue to have a fair and consistent policy of immigration.

This country opened its doors to my mother, her family, to give her a chance to leave her land and come to live here. I often think about the courage involved when their family came together, her mother and three small children, to get on a boat in Germany to come to a country where they did not speak a word of the language.

But they heard they had a better opportunity here in America, as many millions before them and many millions since have heard the same thing. Should we not in this generation show we are compassionate conservatives, compassionate moderates, and compassionate liberals when it comes to immigration fairness? The way to show that, the way to prove it, is to bring to the floor this legislation as quickly as possible.

I hope on a bipartisan basis we can have Republicans and Democrats join in the enactment of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

# INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION ACT OF 2000

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 692, H.R. 2909.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2909) to provide for implementation by the United States of the Hague Convention on Protection of Children and Cooperation in Respect to Intercountry Adoption, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 4023

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, Senator HELMS has a substitute amendment at the desk. I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], for Mr. HELMS, for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, and Mrs. LINCOLN, proposes an amendment numbered 4023.

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

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, countless Americans will be pleased to know that the Senate has unanimously approved the Intercountry Adoption Implementation Act to implement the Hague Convention on Protection of Children and Cooperation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption. This is a treaty that was approved by the Foreign Relations Committee about 3 months ago—in April of this year.

Senator LANDRIEU and I had offered the Intercountry Adoption Implementation Act a year ago, because when this legislation becomes law it will provide, for the first time, a rational structure for intercountry adoption.

This significant legislation is intended to build some accountability into agencies that provide intercountry adoption services in the United States while strengthening the hand of the Secretary of State in ensuring that U.S. adoption agencies engage in an ethical manner to find homes for children.

Although, the majority of intercountry adoptions are successful, it is also a process that can leave parents and children vulnerable to fraud and abuse.

For this reason, under the Intercountry Adoption Implementation Act, agencies will be accredited to provide intercountry adoption. Mandatory standards for accreditation will include

ensuring that a child's medical records be available in English to the prospective parents prior to their traveling to the foreign country to finalize an adoption. (The act also requires that agencies be transparent, especially in their rate of disrupted adoption and their fee scales.)

Moreover, under this act, the definition of orphan has been broadened so that more children can be adopted by U.S. parents. However, in no way is the power of the U.S. Attorney General (who currently has the authority to ensure that all adoptions coming into the United States are authentic) diminished.

Lastly, the Intercountry Adoption Implementation Act will provide much-needed protection for U.S. children being adopted abroad by foreigners. Under this act, it will be required that: (1) diligent efforts be made to first place a U.S. child in the United States before looking to place a U.S. child abroad; and (2) criminal background checks be conducted on foreigners wishing to adopt U.S. children.

Senator LANDRIEU and I have worked together on issues of adoption since her arrival in the Senate in 1997. I am genuinely grateful for her leadership on this issue.

In addition, I thank Senator BIDEN, the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee, for his hard work (and that of his staff) in finalizing the Intercountry Adoption Implementation Act.

I likewise extend my gratitude to Senators GORDON SMITH and JOHN ASHCROFT—both members of the Foreign Relations Committee—and Senators JOHNSON, CRAIG, and LINCOLN for their cosponsorship of this legislation.

Senator BROWNBACK has been as helpful, Mr. President, in making certain that small intercountry adoption agencies will be protected under the implementation of this act.

I also thank all Members in the House of Representatives who have worked to enable the passage of this Act; in particular, BEN GILMAN, distinguished chairman of the House International Relations Committee; Congressman SAM GEJDENSON, the ranking minority member on the House International Relations Committee; Congressmen DAVE CAMP and WILLIAM DELAHUNT; and, last but by no means least, Congressman RICHARD BURR—who introduced the original Senate companion bill in the House.

From our own family, the former legislative counsel of the Foreign Relations Committee, now counsel for Senate Intelligence, Patricia McNerney; and my righthand lady, Michele DeKonty.

Mr. President, The Intercountry Adoption Implementation Act now awaits approval by the House of Representatives. Needless to say, we hope the House will move swiftly toward final passage.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, as the father of five children—two of

whom came into our family through international adoption—I take special interest in the Hague Convention on Intercountry Adoption. The treaty signers hope to improve the international adoption system and provide more homes for the children who need them.

Like many active adoption professionals and leaders of the American adoption community, I support the mission of the treaty to protect the rights of, and prevent abuses against, children, birth families, and adoptive parents, involved in adoptions. The treaty will not only reassure countries who send their children outside their borders, it will also improve the ability of the United States to assist its citizens who seek to adopt children from abroad.

While the treaty will provide significant benefits, I had serious concerns that the proposed method of implementation would have caused more harm than good. After study, it became clear to me that there are few nonprofit private entities in existence that have the funding, staff, and experience necessary to develop and administer standards for entities (agencies) providing child welfare services. Small community based agencies especially would have found it costly and burdensome to deal with only one or possibly two large and most likely distant accrediting entities. For the season, I have repeatedly expressed concerns that many states, especially rural and sparsely populated areas, risk being left with no adoption agencies authorized to help their residents with foreign adoptions.

As I have stated before, I believe it is important for each state to regulate adoption agencies as it deems appropriate to meet the widely varying needs of its families with the resources available in that state. Working closely with the sponsors of this bill, I proposed an amendment that allows public entities (other than a Federal entity), including an agency or instrumentality of State government having responsibility for licensing adoption agencies, to serve as an accrediting entity. (In other words, a state government may serve as an accrediting entity).

In this way, States may continue to participate in intercountry adoption—making sure that interested parties meet the Hague requirements. Giving states the option to continue to participate in intercountry adoption would ensure that small and medium sized agencies have at least one accrediting entity choice that is local, familiar, and easily accessible.

In addition, in order to further lessen the initial burden of federal accreditation on small and medium sized agencies, I worked with the sponsors of this bill to minimally increase the temporary registration period for small and medium sized agencies. Thus, they would have more time to prepare for federal accreditation—a process that may prove to be costly and burdensome