

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, could I have the attention of our colleagues.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### NOMINATION OF JAMES W. ZIGLAR, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 286, the nomination of James Ziglar to be Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization; that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, any statements thereon be printed in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not, may I be recognized for 2 minutes as soon as the Senate has completed this action?

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

Without objection, the foregoing request is agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James W. Ziglar, of Mississippi, to be Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

The nomination was considered and confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues.

We have all come to know and, I would say, have a great deal of affection for Jim Ziglar. He has been an extraordinary Sergeant at Arms. This afternoon there is a reception. I hope our colleagues will wish Mr. Ziglar well.

I have come to admire his work and have said already on the floor how much I appreciate his commitment to the Senate, to this institution, to public service.

In an effort to accelerate his nomination and confirmation, we wanted to have the opportunity to take this matter up prior to the time his reception is held this afternoon.

I think on behalf of the entire Senate, we wish Jim Ziglar well in his new role and new responsibilities. I can think of no one who could serve more ably. I am grateful to my colleagues for the consideration and ultimately for the adoption of this confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank Senator DASCHLE for moving this nomination. I have been very proud of the job that Jim Ziglar from Pascagoula, MS, has done as the Senate Sergeant at Arms.

When he came, I asked him to make sure the office was run efficiently and fairly, certainly in a bipartisan way, a

nonpartisan way. He certainly did that. Sometimes I think maybe he got a little carried away doing that. But he did a great job. I know he has friends on both sides of the aisle. When he came to me to talk about the possibility of becoming Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, I questioned him about his desire to do that, but he assured me he was prepared for that challenge and that he wished to do so.

I am glad he has been confirmed. I hope my colleagues will join him at the reception this afternoon. Certainly we all wish him well in this very important job that is going to take a lot of administrative ability and a lot of willingness to make changes to make sure that agency is run more efficiently.

I also hope this is a sign that this is the first of many nominations that will follow very shortly that will move as quickly and easily as this one, that this is the opening in the floodgates.

I thank Senator DASCHLE for bringing up the nomination.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I'm pleased the Senate has confirmed the nomination of Jim Zigler to the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. He is well suited for this job, and I am sure he will discharge the responsibilities he is undertaking with a high level of competence and dedication.

Jim once served on the staff of Senator James O. Eastland of Mississippi whom I succeeded when he retired from the Senate in 1978. One of Senator Eastland's interests and responsibilities when he was Chairman of the Judiciary Committee was the work of INS. I can recall his very close supervision of the work of his agency when I was a Member of the House.

I know Jim Eastland would be very proud indeed that his former protege, Jim Zigler, has been confirmed today as Commissioner. I'm proud of Jim, too, and wish for him much success and satisfaction in this important new job.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am pleased that we have the opportunity to consider today the confirmation of the Honorable James Ziglar for Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. While there is little doubt that Mr. Ziglar faces tremendous challenges as commissioner of the INS, I also believe that there is little doubt that Mr. Ziglar has the ability to take on those challenges. I therefore join my colleagues in support of his confirmation and look forward to great things from Mr. Ziglar and the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am glad this has gone through as quickly as it has. After hearing the minority leader's comments, he is obviously not aware of how fast the Judiciary Committee is moving.

By the end of this week I hope that a few more nominations will reach the Senate floor from the Judiciary Committee. If they do, I will request a roll

call vote on them in order to demonstrate to all the Members how quickly we are moving nominations. The Ziglar nomination received a hearing before the Judiciary Committee within two weeks of the time that the other side of the aisle allowed the Senate to reorganize. We also held hearings for ASA HUTCHINSON, the President's choice to head the Drug Enforcement Administration, along with four judicial nominees and two additional Justice Department nominees. This pace was probably the fastest the Judiciary Committee has moved on nominations in the last six years.

In addition, we completed confirmation hearings on Robert Mueller's nomination for FBI director this morning. I am pleased that we were able to begin his hearing within days of receiving the papers from the White House. If he is not blocked by the other side, we will bring him up Thursday before the Judiciary Committee.

I am particularly pleased that we were able to move quickly to consider James Ziglar's nomination. I think he is extraordinarily qualified to head the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and I applaud President Bush for choosing him. Mr. Ziglar will work with both Republicans and Democrats. He will not seek partisan advantage but will rather act in the Nation's best interest, just as he has as Sergeant at Arms here.

It was a very good move when Senator LOTT first appointed him to this position. I am very impressed with him. I am pleased to be his friend, and I am happy to vote for his nomination.

He has a distinguished background as a lawyer, investment banker, and government official. As Sergeant at Arms, he worked behind the scenes to ensure that the business of the Senate went smoothly even in stressful times such as the impeachment trial of President Clinton. We here all owe him a debt of gratitude for his hard and effective work.

These next few years will be a pivotal time for the INS and for immigration policy in the United States. The Administration has expressed interest in reorganizing the INS and having the new Commissioner implement the reorganization plan. The Administration is also apparently considering proposing numerous changes in immigration law as part of bilateral discussions with Mexico. I trust that Mr. Ziglar will play a role in the Administration's consideration of these matters, and will encourage a fair approach to the problems faced by undocumented workers from both Mexico and the rest of the world.

In addition to the new proposals the Administration is considering, there is significant unfinished business in the immigration area. The new Commissioner will inherit a number of questionable immigration policies that Congress enacted five years ago in the

Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act. There are also a number of unresolved issues from the last Congress that we must address in this one.

Mr. Ziglar promised at his confirmation hearing to be an advocate for the many fine men and women who work for the INS, and I was glad to hear him say that. I know that in my State there are many hardworking men and women who work for the Law Enforcement Support Center, the Vermont Service Center and Sub-Office, the Debt Management Center, the Eastern Regional Office, and the Swanton Border Patrol Sector. These are employees Mr. Ziglar can rely on in his attempt to improve the agency.

One of the bigger issues facing the next Commissioner will be restructuring the INS. I strongly support improving the agency and giving it the resources it needs. The tasks we ask the INS to do range from processing citizenship applications to protecting our borders, and I agree that there are some internal tensions in the INS' mission that might be resolved. I also believe, however, that we must ensure that the INS does not lose its strengths, which I think are well represented by the great efficiency of the INS offices in Vermont. I intend to play an active role in the development and consideration of any INS reorganization plan.

I am also heartened that Mr. Ziglar questioned our nation's use of expedited removal and detention at his confirmation hearing. Later this week I will join with Senator BROWNBACK and others to introduce the Refugee Protection Act, which would sharply limit the use of expedited removal and reduce the use of detention against asylum seekers. I think I can speak for Senator BROWNBACK in saying we look forward to working with Mr. Ziglar to move this legislation.

The use 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, calls the United States' commitment to refugees into serious question. Since Congress adopted expedited removal in 1996, we have had a system where we are removing people who arrive here either without proper documentation or with facially valid documentation that an INS officer simply suspects is invalid. This policy ignores the fact that people fleeing despotic regimes are quite often unable to obtain travel documents before leaving—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 received reliable reports that valid asylum seekers have been denied admission to our country without the opportunity to convince an immigration judge that they faced persecution in their native

lands. To provide just one example, as Archbishop Theodore McCarrick described in an op-ed in the July 22 Washington Post, 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. I believe we must address this issue in this Congress.

In addition to questioning expedited removal and detention, I hope that Mr. Ziglar will work with us to address some of the other serious due process concerns created by passage of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act in 1996. Through those laws, Congress expanded the pool of people who could be deported, denied those people the chance for due process before deportation, and made these changes retroactive, so that legal permanent residents who had committed offenses so minor that they did not even serve jail time suddenly faced removal from the United States. The Supreme Court has recently limited some of the retroactive effects of those laws, in INS v. St. Cyr, but we must do more to bring these laws into line with our historic commitment to immigration. Many of us have attempted throughout the last five years to undo the legislation we passed in 1996—it remains a high priority and I hope we can find areas of agreement with Mr. Ziglar and the Administration.

Mr. Ziglar did not present himself at his confirmation hearing as an expert on immigration and immigration law—he said frankly that he has much to learn. He did offer his expertise in management and promised to work hard to solve some of the problems the INS has faced over recent years. We in Congress want to be partners in this effort, and I hope that the excellent working relationship we have had with Mr. Ziglar over the years will continue in his new capacity.

James Ziglar is the President's choice to be the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and I am happy to vote for his nomination. He has a distinguished background as a lawyer, investment banker, and government official. Furthermore, he was a distinguished Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, serving the needs of every Senator in a time of great partisanship. He worked behind the scenes to ensure that the business of the Senate went smoothly even in stressful times such as the impeachment trial of President Clinton. We here all owe him a debt of gratitude for his hard and effective work.

These next few years will be a pivotal time for the INS and for immigration policy in the United States. The Administration has expressed interest in reorganizing the INS and having the new Commissioner implement the reorganization plan. The Administration is also apparently considering proposing numerous changes in immigration law as part of bilateral discussions with

Mexico. I trust that Mr. Ziglar will play a role in the Administration's consideration of these matters, and will encourage a fair approach to the problems faced by undocumented workers from both Mexico and the rest of the world.

In addition to the new proposals the Administration is considering, there is significant unfinished business in the immigration area. The new Commissioner will inherit a number of questionable immigration policies that Congress enacted five years ago in the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act. There are also a number of unresolved issues from the last Congress that we must address in this one.

Mr. Ziglar promised at his confirmation hearing to be an advocate for the many fine men and women who work for the INS, and I was glad to hear him say that. I know that in my State there are many hardworking men and women who work for the Law Enforcement Support Center, the Vermont Service Center and Sub-Office, the Debt Management Center, the Eastern Regional Office, and the Swanton Border Patrol Sector. These are employees Mr. Ziglar can rely on in his attempt to improve the agency.

One of the bigger issues facing the next Commissioner will be restructuring the INS. I strongly support improving the agency and giving it the resources it needs. The tasks we ask the INS to do range from processing citizenship applications to protecting our borders, and I agree that there are some internal tensions in the INS' mission that might be resolved. I also believe, however, that we must ensure that the INS does not lose its strengths, which I think are well represented by the great efficiency of the INS offices in Vermont. I intend to play an active role in the development and consideration of any INS reorganization plan.

I am also heartened that Mr. Ziglar questioned our nation's use of expedited removal and detention at his confirmation hearing. Later this week I will join with Senator BROWNBACK and others to introduce the Refugee Protection Act, which would sharply limit the use of expedited removal and reduce the use of detention against asylum seekers. I think I can speak for Senator BROWNBACK in saying we look forward to working with Mr. Ziglar to move this legislation.

The use 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, calls the United States' commitment to refugees into serious question. Since Congress adopted expedited removal in 1996, we have had a system where we are removing people who arrive here either without proper documentation or with facially valid documentation that an INS officer simply suspects is invalid. This policy ignores the fact that

people fleeing despotic regimes are quite often unable to obtain travel documents before leaving—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 received reliable reports that valid asylum seekers have been denied admission to our country without the opportunity to convince an immigration judge that they faced persecution in their native lands. To provide just one example, as Archbishop Theodore McCarrick described in an op-ed in the July 22 Washington Post, 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. I believe we must address this issue in this Congress.

In addition to questioning expedited removal and detention, I hope that Mr. Ziglar will work with us to address some of the other serious due process concerns created by passage of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act in 1996. Through those laws, Congress expanded the pool of people who could be deported, denied those people the chance for due process before deportation, and made these changes retroactive, so that legal permanent residents who had committed offenses so minor that they did not even serve jail time suddenly faced removal from the United States. The Supreme Court has recently limited some of the retroactive effects of those laws, in INS v. St. Cyr, but we must do more to bring these laws into line with our historic commitment to immigration. Many of us have attempted throughout the last five years to undo the legislation we passed in 1996—it remains a high priority and I hope we can find areas of agreement with Mr. Ziglar and the Administration.

Mr. Ziglar did not present himself at his confirmation hearing as an expert on immigration and immigration law—he said frankly that he has much to learn. He did offer his expertise in management and promised to work hard to solve some of the problems the INS has faced over recent years. We in Congress want to be partners in this effort, and I hope that the excellent working relationship we have had with Mr. Ziglar over the years will continue in his new capacity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I note that Jim Ziglar is on the floor. I want to be the first among all of our colleagues to congratulate him publicly.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001—Continued

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, we are still on the agriculture package. After having had this last vote, I think it is the wish of the Senate that we move ahead on this bill so we can go to conference.

Again, I remind Senators, as others have reminded them today, time is running short. We would like to finish this bill if at all possible today so that we can go to conference tomorrow, hopefully finish the conference tomorrow at some reasonable time, and come back with the conference report either late tomorrow or early on Thursday so we can finish the conference report and get it to the President before we leave at the end of the week.

It is going to be touch and go because the checks have to get out in September. We will not be here in August. We will be on recess in August.

We do have to complete our work on the bill and get it to the President. This Senator is convinced that if we get this bill done today, we could probably finish conference tomorrow. I don't anticipate a long conference with the House. We would have to work out some disagreements on spending levels. I believe that could be done fairly expeditiously.

If any Senators have further amendments they would like to add, I hope we can reach some agreement on time limits. I hope there is not going to be any effort to string out the bill or to delay it. We just can't afford to delay this bill. We have to get it done, and we have to get to conference. We have to get the conference report back and get it to the President.

I am not saying Senators should not offer amendments. I am just saying if they offer amendments, let's do so right now. Let's have some reasonable time agreements, and then let's finish the bill so we can get to conference tomorrow.

I hope we can move ahead expeditiously and finish this bill yet today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1191

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1191.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU, proposes an amendment numbered 1191.

Mr. SPECTER. 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 and Proposed.")

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I am proposing this amendment on behalf of Senators LANDRIEU, COLLINS, SCHUMER, SNOWE, LEAHY, ALLEN, BIDEN, BOND, BREAU, CARNAHAN, CARPER, CHAFEE, CLELAND, CLINTON, COCHRAN, DODD, EDWARDS, FRIST, GREGG, HELMS, HOLLINGS, JEFFORDS, KENNEDY, KERRY, LIEBERMAN, LINCOLN, MIKULSKI, MILLER, REED, ROCKEFELLER, SARBANES, SESSIONS, SHELBY, SMITH of New Hampshire, THOMPSON, THURMOND, TORRICELLI, and WARNER.

As the distinguished manager, the Senator from Iowa asked for a time agreement—if I might have the attention of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I am sorry.

Mr. SPECTER. I am surprised that the Senator from Iowa was not listening. We have a close partnership on the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Mr. HARKIN. I am always delighted to respond to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I was saying I would be glad to agree to a time limit.

Mr. HARKIN. I would, too. I hope we can enter into a reasonable time limit. I have to consult with my ranking member, Senator LUGAR, to see what might be a good time agreement. Does the Senator have anything in mind he wants to propose?

Mr. SPECTER. I would be agreeable to 4 hours equally divided.

Mr. HARKIN. I am hopeful we do not have to go that long, I say to my friend. I am hopeful we could have a shorter debate than that. That is a pretty long period of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. SPECTER. I do.

Mr. LOTT. I have a couple of observations. Before we lock in any time agreement, we want to make sure we check with the leadership on both sides for when the next vote will occur. If we agreed to 4 hours, we are talking about a vote occurring at 20 minutes to 8 tonight, and I am not sure Senator DASCHLE or I want to do that. We need to do some checking.

In terms of the time, I do not know what the advocates or the opponents of this amendment want. I do think this is a very important issue. We need to make sure everybody has been contacted and sufficient time is available to the proponents and opponents because this could be—well, this is one of the two issues that will determine