

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have heard my friends on the other side talk about how important this is. Why didn't they file the bill before July 25 of this year if it is so darned important, if politics isn't being played here.

Secondly, why did they all vote for this? Forty-three Democrats voted for cloture. If they wanted this amendment, why did they vote for cloture? They understand the rule that, by gosh, we vote for cloture, end debate, so we can pass the bill.

The high-tech industry needs this bill, but it will be brought down if we can't get it passed. The Latino fairness bill has not even had 1 day of hearings. Yet they want to grant amnesty to illegal aliens of at least a half million, and some think up to 2 million people, without 1 day of hearings. Where are the amendments to increase the number of legal immigrants?

In 1996, we had a major debate on immigration and there was a serious effort to restrict the numbers of legal immigrants. I fought the fight to preserve the number of legal immigrants. That is Latino fairness. What my colleagues are advocating is a major amnesty program for illegal immigrants, without 1 day of hearing.

Let's just understand the 1982, 1986 situation. The fact is the bill before us, while termed "Latino fairness," does nothing to increase or preserve the categories of illegal immigrants allowed in this country annually. If you listen to their arguments, why don't we just forget all our immigration laws and let everybody come in? There is an argument for everybody.

We all know what is going on: This is a doggone political game, stopping a very important bill that 94 people basically voted for today in voting to invoke cloture.

Their idea does nothing to shorten the long waiting period or the hurdles of persons waiting years to come to this country, playing by the rules to wait their turn. What we hear is an urgent call to grant broad amnesty to what could be more than a million to two million illegal aliens. Now, let's be clear about what is at issue here. Some refer to the fact that a certain class of persons that may have been entitled to amnesty in 1986, have been unfairly treated and should therefore be granted amnesty now. That is one issue, and I am certainly prepared to discuss—outside the context of S. 2045—what we might be able to do to help that class of persons. But that is not really what S. 2912 is about. Rather, this bill also covers that class plus hundreds of thousands, if not millions of illegal aliens who were never eligible for amnesty under the 1986 Act because that Act only went back to 1982.

This is a difficult issue, Mr. President, and one with major policy implications for the future. When we supported amnesty in 1986, it was not with

the assumption that this was going to be a continuous process. What kind of signal does this send? On the one hand, our government spends millions each year to combat illegal immigration and deports thousands of persons each year who are here illegally. But—But if an illegal alien can manage to escape law enforcement for long enough, we reward that person with citizenship, or at least permanent resident status.

Finally, Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues are aware of the cost of this bill to American taxpayers. Specifically, a draft and preliminary CBO estimate indicates this bill comes with a price tag just short of \$1.4 billion over 10 years.

The bottom line is that the Senate is not and should not be prepared to consider this bill at this time. It raises far-reaching questions concerning immigration policy, whose consequences have never been addressed by proponents.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my final few minutes is time that has been given to me by the leader and that time that I claim for myself to deal with the pending legislation, the postcloture debate.

My friend from Utah indicated he was wondering why we didn't file our legislation prior to May of this year. I say to my friend from Utah, as he knows, we have been working on this legislation for more than 2 years, following the 1996 legislation, which has caused much of the controversy and consternation to immigrants. That is the reason this legislation is coming forward—one of the main reasons. Furthermore, one of the main components of the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act would update the date of registry. I introduced legislation in August of 1999—last year—and updated legislation in April of this year, to change the date of registry. So, I respect this isn't something we just started working on. We have been fighting for these provisions for years.

We have talked about this. In fact, in May of this year, I wrote a letter to the majority leader urging him to move expeditiously to allow us time on the floor to consider the H-1B legislation. There have been no surprises. There has been adequate time for all the committees of jurisdiction to hear this legislation at great length. There have certainly been no surprises.

I repeat what was said earlier in this debate. The Democrats, by virtue of this record, support H-1B. We voted for cloture. We believe this legislation should move forward. But in the process of it moving forward, we think in fairness that the legislation about which we speak; namely, the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act of 2000, should move forward also.

I repeat, if my friends on the other side of the aisle do not like the legislation, then they should vote against it. We are not trying to take up the valuable time of this Senate. But what we are doing is saying we want to move

forward on this legislation, and we are not going to budge from this Congress until this legislation is passed.

We have a record that substantiates the statement I just made. No. 1, we moved Friday, we moved today, to proceed on this legislation. We have been denied that opportunity.

No. 2, we have letters signed by more than 40 Senators and we have more than 150 House Members who have signed a letter to the President, saying if he vetoes this legislation, we will certainly support his veto. Your veto will be based on the fact that the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act of 2000 is not included in something coming out of this Congress.

What we are looking to, and the vehicle that should go forward, is the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill. But if there is some other area, we will also support the President's veto on that.

This legislation, among other things, seeks to provide permanent and legally defined groups of immigrants who are already here, already working, already contributing to the tax base and social fabric of our country, with a way to gain U.S. citizenship. They are people who are already here. They are working or have been working. The only reason they are now not working is because the Immigration and Naturalization Service slipped into the 1996 bill that these people, like the people in Nevada, are not entitled to due process. Some of my constituents in Nevada have not had the ability to have their work permits renewed. They have been rejected. Some have been taken away from them. People lost their homes, their cars, their jobs. I am sorry to say in some instances it has even caused divorce. It has caused domestic abuse, domestic violence. People who have been gainfully employed suddenly find themselves without a job. . . their families torn apart.

We want a vote, an up-or-down vote. As I have said, we don't want a lot of time. We will take 10 minutes, 5 minutes for the majority, 5 minutes by the minority: Vote on this bill. We will take it as it is written.

I think anything less than an up-or-down vote on this shows the majority, who in effect run this Senate, are unwilling to take what we do not believe is a hard vote. From their perspective, I guess it is a hard vote because they do not want to be on record voting against basic fairness for people who are here. Although we are willing to vote to bring 200,000 people to this country—we support that, too—we think in addition to the people who are coming here for high-tech jobs, the people who have skilled and semi-skilled jobs, who are badly needed in this country, also need the basic fairness that this legislation provides.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now

stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:36 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. INHOFE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant legislative clerk continued the call of the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator from Oklahoma, objects.

Objection is heard.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk continued the call of the roll.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will continue the call of the role.

The assistant legislative clerk continued the call of the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCAIN, Senator BREAUX, and Senator MURRAY be recognized to speak on the issue of pipeline safety for up to 15 minutes, followed by Senator REID for 9 minutes; Senator MURKOWSKI to be recognized to speak for 20 minutes on energy policy; Senator DURBIN for up to an hour on postclosure debate; and that all time be charged to the postclosure debate. Further, I ask unanimous consent that no action occur during the above described time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I say to my friend from Alaska we would like to proceed on the postclosure debate as rapidly as possible. We have a number of people who want to speak on that. I hope that this afternoon we can move along.

I also ask that the unanimous consent agreement be changed to allow Senator WELLSTONE 5 minutes for purposes of introduction of a bill. He would follow Senator MURKOWSKI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. The ranking member and the chairman of the committee also asked that following Senator WELLSTONE, Senator HATCH be recognized for 30 minutes and Senator KENNEDY be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I have another request that Senator THOMAS be recognized for 5 minutes in the order.

Mr. REID. Democrat, Republican; Democrat, Republican.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. That is fair enough to me.

Mr. REID. I ask, further, that Senator BIDEN be allowed 15 minutes. We would also say, if there is a Republican who wishes to stand in before that, or after Senator BIDEN, they be given 15 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I wonder if I could ask the Presiding Officer—so we will have the clarification of the words—to indicate what the unanimous consent request is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would repeat the original unanimous consent request and add to that, Senator WELLSTONE for 5 minutes, Senator HATCH for 30 minutes, Senator KENNEDY for 30 minutes, Senator THOMAS for 5 minutes, Senator BIDEN for 15 minutes, and a Republican to be named later for 15 minutes, alternating from side to side.

That is the amended unanimous consent request.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I believe Senator THOMAS wanted to follow Senator WELLSTONE with 5 minutes.

Mr. REID. That is fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, thank you.

PIPELINE SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to speak to my colleagues in this body as well as to our colleagues in the other body regarding the subject on which the Senate has spent a considerable amount of time; that is, pipeline safety, legislation which passed the Senate by a unanimous vote, with Republicans and Democrats supporting a unanimous consent request to pass this legislation without any dissent and without any arguments against it whatsoever.

On September 9, that bill passed the Senate and is now pending over in the other body where our House colleagues are taking a look at this legislation, trying to figure out what course they should take.

This legislation passed this body by unanimous consent because of the good work for over a year by colleagues in both parties. I particularly commend and thank the chairman, who I understand is coming over from the Commerce Committee, Senator MCCAIN, for his good work and for working with me

as a member of the committee but also taking the rather unusual step of inviting other interested Senators to actually participate in the markup in the Commerce Committee.

I credit Senator MCCAIN for making it possible for Senator MURRAY of Washington to come over and actually sit in on the hearings, which is unusual for a Member, to take the time not only to attend to her duties in her own committee but to take time to listen to witnesses in another committee, which she did sitting at the podium with those of us on the Commerce Committee and also participating in asking questions.

It was a good combination between what Senator MCCAIN allowed, which was a little unusual, and what Senator MURRAY was able to participate in because of her strong interest and because of what has happened in her State with the recent tragic accident involving a pipeline which exploded, resulting in the tragic death of individuals from her State.

The result of those hearings was a compromise piece of legislation, which is a 100-percent improvement over the current situation with regard to how we look at the issue of pipeline safety. This is an issue that is extremely important to my State. We have over 40,000 miles of buried natural gas pipelines in the State of Louisiana.

If you look at a map of our State, it shows all of the buried pipelines. It looks like a map of spaghetti in an Italian restaurant because we have pipelines all over our State transporting the largest amount of natural gas coming from the offshore Gulf of Mexico as well as onshore pipelines that distribute gas not just to the constituents of my State but to constituents throughout the United States who depend upon Louisiana for a dependable source of natural gas. Pipelines in Louisiana are important not just to Louisianians but also to people from throughout this Nation.

The bill we have is one that requires periodic pipeline testing. It says if we can do it from an internal inspection, we will do it that way. If that is not possible, we have to do it with what we call a "direct assessment" of the lines, which actually means companies would have to dig them up and physically inspect the lines.

We require enhanced operator qualifications to make sure the people who are doing the work are trained and have a background in this particular area. We call for investments in technology to look at better ways of doing what is necessary to ensure their safety.

States would be given an increased role. But I have to say that the primary role would be the Federal Government's because these are interstate pipelines we are talking about under the pipeline safety area.

Communities would also be given increased involvement. I think it is important to let them know where the