

status under the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act, NACARA, and the Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act, HRIFA. The original deadline expired on March 31. But the Senate did not extend the deadline—an action that the Judiciary Committee unanimously approved—by March 31. And the Senate has not acted to extend the deadline in the intervening five and a half months. No one has expressed any opposition to S. 2058, which counts Senators MACK and HELMS among its sponsors; rather, the majority has simply allowed the bill to sit and fester, perhaps holding it hostage to the passage of S. 2045. As a result, we in the Congress have had to rely upon the Administration's assurances that it would not remove those who would be aided by the extension from the United States while this legislation was pending. As someone who has served for more than 25 years in the Senate, I find it profoundly disturbing that this body must rely on the Administration not to enforce the law because it has taken us so long to actually make good on our intention to change it. We should not need to rely on the good graces of the Administration—we should do our job and legislate.

I am well aware that immigration is just one of the many issues that Congress must address. Indeed, there may be some Congresses where immigration needs to be placed on the backburner so that we can address other issues. But this is not such a Congress. It was only four years ago that we passed two bills with far-reaching effects on immigration law—the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act. There are still many aspects of those laws that merit our careful review and rethinking. Among many others, Senators KENNEDY, MOYNIHAN, and DURBIN have been actively involved in promoting necessary changes to those laws, in an attempt to rededicate the United States to its historic role as a leader in immigration policy. But their efforts too have been ignored by the majority.

When a bill such as S. 2045 comes to the floor, then, those of us who are concerned about immigration legislation would be abdicating our duty not to raise other potential immigration legislation. Most members of both parties want to see a significant increase in the number of H-1B visas. If there had been another avenue to obtain consideration of the rest of our immigration agenda, we would have taken it. But such an avenue was not offered.

I voted to proceed to consideration of this bill. I hold out hope that we can reach an agreement to discuss other critical immigration matters. If the majority truly wishes to display compassionate conservatism, and show concern for all Americans, such an agreement should be easy to reach.

#### LATINO AND IMMIGRANT FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, let me speak about the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act and why we should consider this bill now.

I say this with no ulterior motive. Obviously, if anyone looks at the demographics of Vermont, they know I am not speaking about this because of a significant Hispanic population in the State of Vermont. I speak about it out of a sense of fairness. It is called the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act. That is what it is.

I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation, not only as a Senator but as ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, because it addresses three very important issues to the Latino community.

We fought on our side of the aisle consistently to obtain debate and a vote on these proposals either as an amendment or as a freestanding bill.

Once again, I call on the leadership to give us either a vote as a freestanding bill or as an amendment because we ought to stand up in the Senate and say how we stand on this issue. If my colleagues on the other side believe in compassionate conservatism, they will allow a vote on this bill, which offers help to hardworking families who pay taxes and help keep our economy strong.

First off, this legislation ensures that we treat all people who fled tyranny in Central America equally, regardless of whether the tyrannical regime they fled was a left-wing or right-wing government.

I remember going into a refugee camp in Central America and talking to a woman who was there with her one remaining child. Her husband had been killed. Her other children had been killed.

I said: Do you ally yourself with the left or the right? She didn't know who was on the left or who was on the right in the forces that were fighting. She only knew that she and her husband had wanted to raise their family and to farm a little land. And yet the forces of the regime came in and killed the whole family with the exception of her and her one child.

People who have no political position get caught in terrible circumstances, in between forces to which they have no allegiance.

In 1997, Congress granted permanent residence status to Nicaraguans and Cubans who fled dictatorship and who met certain conditions. It may well have been the right step. But others were left behind.

It is past time to extend the benefits of the 1997 law to Guatemalans, Salvadorans, Hondurans, and Haitians. To benefit under this bill, an immigrant would have to have been in the United States since December of 1995 and would have to demonstrate good moral character.

In addition to the clear humanitarian justifications for treating an immi-

grant from Guatemala who fled terror in the same way we treat an immigrant from Nicaragua who fled terror, there is also a strong foreign policy justification for this bill. These immigrants send money back to their families. They help support fledgling economies in what remain fragile democracies. The United States has devoted significant effort to assisting democratic efforts in Latin America, and the hard work that Latin American immigrants perform in America helps to stabilize the growth of democracy there.

Second, this amendment would reinstate section 245(i), which, for a \$1,000 fee, allows immigrants on the verge of getting permanent residence status to achieve that status from within the United States, instead of being forced to leave their families and their jobs for lengthy periods to be able to complete the process. Section 245(i) was a part of American law until 1997, when Congress failed to renew the provision. There is bipartisan support for correcting this erroneous policy, and now is the time to do it. It is important to note that these are people who already have the right under our laws to obtain permanent residency—this provision simply streamlines that process while contributing a significant amount to the Treasury. Indeed, in the last fiscal year in which section 245(i) was law, it produced \$200 million in revenue for the government. At a time when the Immigration and Naturalization Service is plagued by backlogs, that is funding that would be useful.

Third, of course, the amendment would allow people who have lived and worked here for 14 years or more, contributing to the American economy, to adjust their immigration status. That has been a part of the immigration law since the 1920s. It has been continually updated. It should be updated now for the first time in 14 years. This will adjust the status of thousands of people already working in the United States, helping both them and their employers to continue playing a role in our current economic boom. These are people who have built deep roots in the United States, who have families here and children who are American citizens, and who have in many cases done jobs that American citizens did not want. We should continue our historical practice and update the registry.

This legislation has the strong support of numerous groups representing Hispanic Americans, including the League of United Latin American Citizens, the National Council of La Raza, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, and the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials. It also has the support of conservative groups such as Americans for Tax Reform and Empower America. It has received union support from the AFL-CIO, the Union of Needletrades and Industrial Textile Employees, and the Service Employees International Union. Religious groups ranging from the U.S. Catholic Conference to the Anti-Defamation League

to Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services have also endorsed the bill. Finally, business organizations including the National Restaurant Association and the American Health Care Association have also encouraged this bill's passage.

When we talk about H-1B visas, we are usually talking about giving immigration benefits to people who are going to have high-paying, high-tech jobs. Everybody wants to do that. We worked to get that out of the Judiciary Committee.

But I would say to those who are holding up the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act, don't think only of people in high-tech, high-paying jobs. Think of the needs of ordinary workers.

It seems that the immigration concerns of everyday families have been ignored day after day in this Congress. I am talking about people who are not going to be in executive positions, and who cannot afford lawyers or anything else they want. I am talking about men and women who work for an hourly wage, who try to raise their families, who go to church, who want to see their children go to school, who want to live the American life, the American dream.

My grandparents came to this country. They did not speak a word of English. But they raised a family. They raised six children, including my mother. They started a small business. They had a grandson who ended up in the Senate. But they also had six children. They weren't wealthy. My grandfather came here not speaking a word of English, with his brother, and they started a stone shed. Then when they had enough money to afford to send back to Italy for their wives and their children, they did. It was the American dream. People still have that dream. We should help them, especially in this case.

There are also important due process issues that need to be fixed if America wants to retain its historic role as a beacon for refugees and a nation of immigrants. But in this Congress, even humanitarian bills with bipartisan backing have been completely ignored, both in the Judiciary Committee and on the Senate floor. The bipartisan bills that have suffered from the majority's neglect include both modest bills designed to assist particular immigrant groups and larger bills designed to reform substantial portions of our immigration and asylum laws. Bills to assist Syrian Jews, Haitians, Nicaraguans, Liberians, Hondurans, Cubans, and Salvadorans all need attention. Bills to restore due process rights and limited public benefits to legal permanent residents have been ignored.

The Refugee Protection Act, a bipartisan bill with 10 sponsors that I introduced with Senator BROWNBACK, has not even received a hearing in the Judiciary Committee, despite my request as Ranking Member. The Refugee Pro-

tection Act addresses the issue of expedited removal, the process under which aliens arriving in the United States can be returned immediately to their native lands at the say-so of a low-level INS officer. Expedited removal was the subject of a major debate in this chamber in 1996, and the Senate voted to use it only during immigration emergencies. This Senate-passed restriction was removed in what was probably the most partisan conference committee I have ever witnessed. The Refugee Protection Act is modeled closely on that 1996 amendment, and I hope that it again gains the support of a majority of my colleagues.

As a result of the adoption of expedited removal, we now have a system where we are removing people who arrive here either without proper documentation or with facially valid documentation that an INS officer suspects is invalid. This policy ignores the fact that people fleeing despotic regimes are quite often unable to obtain travel documents before they go—they must move quickly and cannot depend upon the government that is persecuting them to provide them with the proper paperwork for departure. In the limited time that expedited removal has been in operation, we already have numerous stories of valid asylum seekers who were kicked out of our country without the opportunity to convince an immigration judge that they faced persecution in their native lands. To provide just one example, a Kosovar Albanian was summarily removed from the U.S. after the civil war in Kosovo had already made the front pages of America's newspapers.

The majority has mishandled even those immigration bills that needed to be passed by a date certain to avoid significant humanitarian and diplomatic consequences. In the most egregious example, the Senate failed to pass a bill to make permanent the visa waiver program that allows Americans to travel to numerous other countries without a visa. The visa waiver pilot program expired on April 30, and the House passed legislation to make the program permanent in a timely manner, understanding the importance of not allowing this program—which our citizens and the citizens of many of our closest allies depend upon—to lapse. The Senate, however, simply ignored the deadline and has subsequently ignored numerous deadlines for administrative extensions of the program.

I am well aware that immigration is just one of the many issues that Congress must address. Indeed, there may be some Congresses where immigration needs to be placed on the backburner so that we can address other issues. But this is not such a Congress. It was only four years ago that we passed two bills with far-reaching effects on immigration law—the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act. There are still many aspects of those laws that

merit our careful review and rethinking. Among many others, Senators KENNEDY, MOYNIHAN, and DURBIN have been actively involved in promoting necessary changes to those laws, in an attempt to rededicate the United States to its historic role as a leader in immigration policy. But their efforts too have been ignored by the majority.

In the limited time we have remaining, I urge the majority to just bring up the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act and have a vote on it. We know we could pass it if we could only be allowed to have a vote. Let's show the kind of fairness that America wants to show. Let us be the beckoning country that it was to my grandparents and my great-grandparents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### MEDICARE HOME HEALTH

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, it is absolutely critical that Congress take action this year to address some of the unintended consequences of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, which has been exacerbated by a host of ill-conceived new regulatory requirements imposed by the Clinton administration.

The combination of regulatory overkill and budget cutbacks is jeopardizing access to critical home health services for millions of our Nation's most frail and vulnerable senior citizens.

Tonight, the Senator from Wisconsin and I are taking the opportunity to talk about this very important issue. The Senator from Wisconsin has been a real leader in helping to restore the cuts and to fight the onerous regulatory requirements imposed by the administration which have affected home health care services across the Nation.

I also want to recognize that there have been many other Senators who have been involved in this fight. I am going to put a list of the cosponsors to the legislation that I have introduced into the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent a list of cosponsors, which exceeds 50 Senators, be printed in the RECORD, reflecting the contributions many of our colleagues have made to this fight.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### COSPONSORS OF S. 2365

Spencer Abraham, Wayne Allard, John Ashcroft, Max Baucus, Robert F. Bennett, Jeff Bingaman, Christopher S. Bond, Barbara Boxer, Sam Brownback, Conrad R. Burns.

Lincoln D. Chafee, Max Cleland, Thad Cochran, Kent Conrad, Michael DeWine,