

at the age of 19, coming from a village in northern New Mexico, and spending 5 years working in the War Department as part of that “greatest generation” which gave back so much to America to give us the kind of greatness we have had for the last 60-plus years here in the United States. My father became a soldier in the Army. He retired as a staff sergeant after having served his time in the U.S. Army.

There were other members of my family. My uncle Leandro, who is my mother’s brother, 2 years older than my mother, gave his life in the soils of Europe defending this country’s efforts in World War II as the United States of America saved this world from the hands of the Nazis and the hands of the fascists who would have turned civilization back to a place none of us ever wanted to go back to.

So today, as we stand here on the floor of the U.S. Senate debating what we should do with the immigration laws of this country, it is important to remember that this country has indeed come a long way, that we are, in fact, an America in progress, that the America in progress we have seen for centuries and for generations is one we must build upon. For us here in the Senate to simply accept what some would suggest—and that is that we do nothing with this issue of immigration—is, in my view, a dishonor to our country and to the responsibilities we have. It is an abdication of duty, for those of us who have taken the oath of office to uphold the laws of the United States and the Constitution of our country to make this country greater than it is today, for us to simply say that this issue of immigration is too tough for us to deal with and that all we ought to do is somehow ignore it or figure out ways of sidestepping it and go on to work on other issues.

I so much admire Senator HARRY REID because he has said to the Nation that he would hold the feet of the Senate to the fire as we deal with the issue of immigration. It may not be a comfortable issue for most people to deal with. It is a contentious issue. The phone calls and e-mails—and I am sure every Senator, both Democratic and Republican, has had their phones ringing off the hook for the last several weeks as we have dealt with this issue. Through the courage of Senator REID, he has said we will move forward with this issue, and we are dealing with the issue. Through the courage of other Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, we have said this is an issue we can tackle. Yes, there are tough amendments, and we are working our way through those tough amendments, trying to make this immigration legislation which is on the floor better legislation, perhaps, than what was introduced here at the beginning of last week, and we are making progress.

As I said, I think there are now 21 amendments which have been made to the legislation. There will be others we will make as the week goes on. But at

the end of the day, America’s greatness really depends upon chambers like this Chamber here, which holds the keys to the democracy of our country, and debating those issues which are difficult and getting us to a point of a conclusion to deal with these issues which are so fundamental to the 21st century of America. When we deal with this issue, what we will have done is we will have found solutions to the issue of a broken border that has been broken for a very long time. When we effectively deal with this issue, we will deal with the reality of the economic demands of the United States of America and how we treat people with the kind of humanity and morality we would expect of others.

It is true that when one looks back at the immigration history of this country, there have been chapters in that immigration history which have been very difficult and very painful for those involved.

From 1942 until 1964, there was a chapter in our immigration laws called the national Mexican immigration program, or the Bracero Program, in which people were brought into this country because there was a need for labor, and we had many of our men and women in uniform serving in faraway places, as those in my family were serving at that particular time, but because there was a need for labor in our factories and on our farms, people were brought to this country under a program. But it was a program that did not have worker protections, and the consequence of that program was that there were many people who suffered and who lived through a tremendous amount of pain because they did not have the protection of the laws of the United States of America.

Today, in the legislation we have brought forward, we have included the worker protections that will ensure these people are protected. At the same time, the legislation we brought forward recognizes the importance of the American worker because even under the temporary guest worker program, which is a controversial issue being debated on this floor, what we have said in that part of the legislation is that a job has to be advertised first to the American worker and that if an American anywhere is willing and ready to take that job, it will not be available to somebody who would come in under the temporary guest worker program.

So the economic issues, the national security issues, the human and moral issues which are at stake in this debate are some of the most important issues we face. I am hopeful that colleagues, working together in the Senate for the remainder of this week, will be able to come to a successful conclusion with respect to immigration reform legislation.

Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

SEQUENTIAL REFERRAL REQUEST

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Majority Leader HARRY REID dated June 4, 2007.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 4, 2007.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REID: Pursuant to paragraph 3(b) of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress, as amended by S. Res. 445 of the 108th Congress, I request that S. 1538, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, as filed by the Select Committee on Intelligence on May 31, 2007, be sequentially referred to the Committee on Armed Services for a period of 10 days. This request is without prejudice to any request for an additional extension of five days, as provided for under the resolution.

S. Res. 400, as amended by S. Res. 445 of the 108th Congress, makes the running of the period for sequential referrals of proposed legislation contingent upon the receipt of that legislation “in its entirety and including annexes” by the standing committee to which it is referred. Past intelligence authorization bills have included an unclassified portion and one or more classified annexes.

I request that I be consulted with regard to any unanimous consent or time agreements regarding this bill.

Thank you for your assistance.
Sincerely,

CARL LEVIN,
Chairman.

REPORT FILING

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated May 25, 2007, to Senator BYRD be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, May 25, 2007.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
President Pro Tempore,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of all members of the Select Committee on Intelligence, we are filing the Committee’s report on the “Prewar Intelligence Assessments About Postwar Iraq.” The report was approved by a majority vote of the Committee at a meeting held on May 8, 2007.

Senate Resolution 400 of the 94th Congress (1976) charges the Committee with the duty

to oversee and make continuing studies of the intelligence activities and programs of the United States Government, and to report to the Senate concerning those activities. Pursuant to this charge, the Committee undertook a multi-faceted review in February 2004 of issues related to intelligence produced prior to the Iraq war.

The report is in both classified and unclassified form. The classified report is available to members in the Committee's secure spaces. The classified report is also being provided to appropriately cleared officials of the Executive Branch. The unclassified report, which we are hereby transmitting, includes the Committee's conclusions and the additional views of Committee members.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV,
Chairman.
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
Vice Chairman.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, on May 24, I voted for H.R. 2206, but I am disappointed that it took so long to complete work on this legislation, while we have troops deployed and under fire fighting against an enemy that, as few others have in history, seeks our total destruction.

For 108 days, the majority held up vital funding for our troops' equipment and training. All this time, the majority was playing politics with this funding, even sending to the President a bill that they knew would be vetoed. And this is not my analysis; we know this through the Democrats' own words. Senator HARRY REID, the Democratic leader in the Senate, said, "We are going to pick up Senate seats as a result of this war." And "well, it doesn't matter what resolution we move forward to. You know, I can count. I don't know if we'll get 60 votes. But I'll tell you one thing, there are 21 Republicans up for reelection this time."

So, with that in mind, we finally received the final version of the security supplemental at 8 p.m., the last night before the Memorial Day work period. While Democrats finally decided to listen to our generals and not MoveOn.org and yielded to Republicans' demand to exclude an arbitrary withdrawal date, this bill still has serious flaws. A policy that would potentially restrict the very economic reconstruction funds that are necessary to achieve the political and diplomatic solution General Petraeus says we need represents bad public policy, to say the least.

What's more, I am disappointed to see, yet again, that the majority would use the needs of our troops as leverage to include extraneous, and in many cases ill-conceived, spending and policy provisions. Among these are a raise in the federal minimum wage to \$7.25 an hour; \$22 million in Corps of Engineers funding specifically earmarked for Long Island and Westchester County, and certain areas of New Jersey; \$40 million in agriculture assistance specifically earmarked for certain areas of

Kansas affected by the recent tornadoes; \$10 million for radios for the Capitol Police; several new provisions to give certain labor unions and Continental and American Airlines relief from their employer pension plan contribution obligations; and a provision that mandates that the Secretary of Health and Human Services approve a state's request to extend a waiver for the Pharmacy Plus program, making Wisconsin the only state to benefit from this provision.

The delay in passage of the security supplemental caused by the majority party created significant disruptions for the Department of Defense and for our men and women deployed in the war against terrorists.

Since the emergency request was submitted by the President, the Department of Defense has realigned significant funds internally and submitted to Congress approximately six reprogramming requests driven by the delays in the supplemental.

Secretary Gates stated in an April 11 letter to the Senate Appropriations Committee, "[i]t is a simple fact of life that if the . . . [supplemental] is not enacted soon, the Army faces a real and serious funding problem that will require increasingly disruptive and costly measures to be initiated—measures that will, inevitably, negatively impact readiness and Army personnel and their families."

Then, Secretary Gates in a May 9 letter to Senator McCAIN wrote:

[i]n submitting the FY07 supplemental request in early February, the Department planned on these funds becoming available by not later than mid-April. Accordingly, starting in mid-April, the Department began a series of actions to mitigate the impact of the delay in the supplemental on our deployed forces by slowing down spending in less critical accounts. In addition, funds budgeted for fourth quarter Army operations and personnel costs have been or are in the process of being moved forward and expended to partially make up the shortfall.

These actions have resulted in the Army having to take a series of steps including deferring repair of equipment and restraining supply purchases. In short, these steps, while necessary to account for the delay in the supplemental, have already caused disruptions within the Department.

Mr. President, here are just a few specific examples of disruptions that have occurred within the Army:

Facility maintenance and purchases for barracks, mold abatement projects, and dining facilities has been deferred. As a result, there is a risk of troops returning from combat tours to sub-standard barracks and facilities that had been scheduled for renovation or updates while soldiers were deployed.

Orders of supplies have been reduced. Deferring orders for major repair parts and unit level maintenance items creates system lag and an accumulation of backlogged orders waiting to be placed. Units can sustain operations for only a limited time by consuming existing inventory.

In his May 9 letter to Senator McCAIN, Secretary Gates also made clear that these disruptions would have effects on the war effort:

[T]he lack of timely supplemental funds has limited the Department's ability to prop-

erly contract for the reconstitution of equipment for both the active and reserve forces. This situation increases the readiness risk of our military with each passing day should the nation require the use of these forces prior to the equipment becoming available. In other cases, the funding delay negatively impacts our forces in the field by needlessly delaying the accelerated fielding of new force protection capabilities such as the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicle and counter-IED technologies developed and acquired by the Joint IED Defeat Organization (JIEDDO). Finally, the ongoing delay resulted in the depletion of funds necessary to accelerate the training of Iraqi security forces.

Multinational Force-Iraq spokesman, Army Maj. Gen. William Caldwell, on April 4 said, "At the current moment, because of this lack of funding, MNSTC-I—Multi-National Security Transition Command-Iraq—is unable to continue at the pace they were in the developmental process of the Iraqi security forces . . . It is starting to have some impact today, and will only have more of an impact over time."

While I firmly believe that the manner in which Democrats managed this legislation reveals their misplaced priorities, it is absolutely necessary that we get this funding to the men and women on the front line without further delay. That is why I voted for this supplemental. Having forced our troops to wait 108 days for this needed funding, there is no other choice but to accept this legislative blackmail.

I would also like to speak to a larger point, Mr. President. My friends on the other side of this issue in both houses talk about a failed strategy, and about a war that is lost. How do they know the Petraeus strategy has failed? It isn't even in place yet. The fifth brigade of the surge isn't there yet, and the fourth has only just arrived.

Even commentators like Joel Klein of Time magazine, no friend of this administration or this policy, have been forced to admit that progress is being made. While pointing out the many struggles that remain, Mr. Klein said:

There is good news from Iraq, believe it or not. It comes from the most unlikely place: Anbar province, home of the Sunni insurgency. The level of violence has plummeted in recent weeks. An alliance of U.S. troops and local tribes has been very effective in moving against the al-Qaeda foreign fighters. A senior U.S. military official told me—confirming reports from several other sources—that there have been "a couple of days recently during which there were zero effective attacks and less than 10 attacks overall in the province (keep in mind that an attack can be as little as one round fired). This is a result of sheiks stepping up and opposing AQI [al-Qaeda in Iraq] and volunteering their young men to serve in the police and army units there." The success in Anbar has led sheiks in at least two other Sunni-dominated provinces, Nineveh and Salahaddin, to ask for similar alliances against the foreign fighters. And, as Time's Bobby Ghosh has reported, an influential leader of the Sunni insurgency, Harith al-Dari, has turned against al-Qaeda as well. It is possible that al-Qaeda is being rejected like a mismatched liver transplant by the body of the Iraqi insurgency.

What is now happening is an attempt to reconsider the vote of four years ago