

body just gives out and drops. Do not expect that to be anytime soon.

I believe all ages and all occupations should be part of a truly representative body. I also believe society works best when the energy and idealism of youth, youth, youth, pairs with the experience and wisdom of age.

America is the land of opportunities. I don't think our some 36 million citizens over the age of 65 are disqualified from participating in the life of the country that we—we—helped to build. Our country rejected those kinds of arbitrary barriers long ago, and this Senator loudly and proudly rejects them now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Alaska is recognized.

---

BRIGADIER GENERAL KEN  
TAYLOR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to BG Ken Taylor, who will be buried at Arlington National Cemetery later this afternoon.

From his service as a pilot during World War II to his tenure as Commander of the Alaska Air National Guard, General Taylor was always a hero—in every sense of the word, and to all who knew and loved him.

As a young boy in Oklahoma, Ken set his sights on becoming a pilot. After completing high school and 2 years of college, Ken fulfilled his dream by joining the Army Air Corps.

In April 1941, newly commissioned as a second lieutenant, Ken received his first assignment. He was stationed at Wheeler Field, on the Hawaiian island of Oahu, as a member of the 47th Pursuit Squadron. And it was there, during one of the darkest days in our Nation's history, that Ken's bravery shined brightest.

Early in the morning on December 7, 1941, after a long night of poker, dancing, and a little drinking at the officer's club, Ken awoke to the sound of low flying Japanese aircraft fighters and bombers on course to attack the Navy's Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor.

Ken and fellow pilot George Welch, who was staying in a neighboring apartment, took immediate action. They called ahead to their air crew with instructions to load their P-40s with fuel and ammunition.

Both pilots hurriedly pulled their evening wear back on, and sped off in Ken's new Buick toward Haleiwa Field. Dodging Japanese strafing runs and driving at speeds in excess of 100 miles per hour, they soon arrived at the airfield. The pair quickly strapped into their P-40 Tomahawks, which were fully fueled but only partially armed.

Outnumbered, outgunned, and without orders, the two pilots taxied to the runway intent on engaging the over 300 unchallenged Japanese aircraft.

Once airborne, Ken and George immediately came under fire. Ken later described the ensuing combat as "shooting fish in a barrel"—a definite understatement, as the Japanese shot

back at their pursuers. At least one round hit Ken's cockpit, embedding shrapnel in his arm and leg.

Determined to stay in the air as long as possible, Ken and George attacked a group of bombers until they ran out of ammunition. The pair then landed at Wheeler Field to resupply and refuel.

While an air crew rearmed their planes, the duo received a dressing down from a superior officer for taking off without orders. The officer also insisted they stay on the ground, but when another attack forced airfield personnel to scatter, Ken and George took the chance to get back into the fight.

With a fresh supply of .50 caliber ammunition, Ken positioned himself on the runway to take off just as a group of dive bombers flew overhead. He described his second takeoff to Army Times as follows:

I took off right toward them, which gave me the ability to shoot at them before I even left the ground. I got behind one of them and started shooting again. The only thing I didn't know at that time was that I got in the middle of the line rather than the end. There was somebody on my tail. They put a bullet right behind my head through the canopy and into the trim tab inside. So I got a little bit of shrapnel in my leg and through the arm. It was of no consequence; it just scared the hell out of me for a minute.

Before the last fires were extinguished from the remains of the Pacific Fleet in Pearl Harbor, Ken Taylor and George Welch had shot down at least eight Japanese fighters. Many believe their decision to take to the air prevented a full assault on Haleiwa, saving the field from sure destruction. By the end of the day, the two lieutenants had become America's first heroes of World War II—all while wearing tuxedo pants and a Hawaiian flower-print shirt.

For his tremendous courage under fire, Ken received the Distinguished Service Cross and a Purple Heart. But his service to this Nation was far from finished. Ken went on to fight at Guadalcanal, where he was credited with destroying another Japanese plane. After a broken leg ended his combat career, Ken returned stateside and served for 27 more years. He served in the Alaska Air National Guard.

In 1967, Ken became the Assistant Adjutant General for the Alaska Air National Guard. Before retiring in 1971, he was promoted to Brigadier General and served as the full Commander of the Air Guard.

In this capacity, Ken quickly distinguished himself as an able and respected leader. He worked closely with MG C. F. Necrason, then the Adjutant General of the Alaska National Guard, to save the Air Guard component in our State. Under Ken's direction, the reinvigorated Air Guard units provided rural Alaskans with access to health care, medivacs, and disaster relief services.

As a Senator for Alaska, it was my privilege to work with Ken on many occasions during this period. My wife

Catherine's father, Bill Bittner, Sr., was a close friend of Ken's and his fishing partner. Bill and I often spent long summer days fishing with Ken and talking about World War II.

To this day, Ken's family has strong ties to Alaska. Ken's son, Ken Jr., followed in his father's footsteps and also became commander of the Alaska Air National Guard. They remain the only father and son in our Nation's history to have achieved such an honor. Also, Ken Sr.'s grandson, Eric Taylor, now serves in the Alaska Air National Guard with distinction.

The remarkable story of Ken Taylor reminds me of a statement once made by General George Marshall. Asked if America had a secret weapon to help win World War II, General Marshall replied in the affirmative. He said we had "the best darn kids in the world."

One can't help but wonder if these words were partly inspired by Ken Taylor, who, at age 21, exemplified great courage and bravery during the battle that drew America into World War II. For those who remember, his was one of the two planes that took off in the movie entitled "Pearl Harbor."

It gives me great pride to have known this man. On this solemn day when we put him to rest, let us all take a moment to reflect on the life—and honor the memory—of this great American hero.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

---

HOMAGE TO SENATOR BYRD

Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, first, let me pay homage to the senior Senator from West Virginia who, in a typically eloquent way, spoke to the Senate about his long service to his State. Let me tell the people of West Virginia, they don't need to worry; they have a very strong Senator in this body. Any comments about his age are misplaced, because his passion and his intellectual heft and his knowledge of history and the Constitution far outweigh any considerations one would have about his age.

(The remarks of Mrs. McCASKILL pertaining to the introduction of S. 1723 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

---

PROGRESS ON S. 1

Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, there are times since I have been here that I have been surprised and shocked. This week was one of them, when I saw the leader of my party rise to ask the body to send S. 1 to conference. Keep in mind what S. 1 is. S. 1 was the first piece of legislation we passed in the Senate this year. That is why it is called S. 1. Keep in mind what the vote was. It was 96 to 2. There are not going to be very many times that we do anything 96 to 2. That was months ago.

Now, all this time we have been waiting to send this bill to conference so we can move ahead and make it law. This is ethics reform. This is the essence of what we should be about. We are here to do the people's business, not big money's business. We are here to protect average people in these United States, not the lobbyists in the hallway.

Ethics reform should be at the top of our list. What happened when our leader asked for this bill to go to conference? The Republican leader objected. What in the world is going on that we would pass a bill 96 to 2 and then the Republican leader would say, "I object to it going to conference"?

The American people have been very engaged on the immigration issue for weeks. That bill has come to its conclusion. I urge every American out there to use those same fingers and those same phones, to use those same e-mails and those same letters, to immediately begin calling their Senator and say to them: Why in the world would you be blocking ethics reform in the Senate? There is no good excuse—except politics. If we cannot get beyond politics to reform ethics, then I think the people have a right to give us an approval rating in the cellar.

So I call on the Republican leader, I call on our Republican colleagues: Stop playing games with ethics reform. Let's move forward. Let's make this happen on behalf of the people we came here to represent. If we cannot do this, we ought to put our tail between our legs, be ashamed, and go home.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Presiding Officer for his insight into the legislation we considered. I guess the Presiding Officer understands, when you have completed a tough campaign and you have talked to voters, you learn some things. Hopefully, our Senate has learned some things: That the heart of the American people is good, that they are not mean spirited, but they are concerned about a lawful system of immigration.

I was on an Alabama-based radio show "Rick and Bubba." They are expanding out around the country and do an excellent job and are very fair about immigration. One told me the other morning: Senator, let me tell you my philosophy. My philosophy is that if you have a broken pipe in your attic, and there is water on your floor, you don't go spend all your time mopping up the floor, you fix the leaking pipe.

So I guess I would say the failure of the legislation today, despite the good efforts of my esteemed colleagues who met together and wrote this bill—and they did not want anybody to change a jot or tittle of it—despite all of that, despite their good efforts, it did not do the job. It did not shut off the water. According to the Congressional Budget Office, it would only have reduced illegality by 13 percent, and in the next 20 years we would have another 8.7 million people here illegally.

I think our Senators—after hearing that and having it pounded in and seeing this is not an exaggeration but an objective report by the Congressional Budget Office, and then we heard the promises: The only way to get a lawful system in America is to vote for this bill—they were not persuaded, especially because the American people saw through it.

Rightly, the American people have grown to be cynical about the words of Congress on immigration. They have grown to be cynical about that. For 40 years, Presidents and Congresses have promised we are going to make a lawful system: We are going to do this. Don't worry, I voted for that bill last year. It was going to do this and do that, double Border Patrol—but nothing ever happens.

We arrested a million people trying to enter our country illegally last year—a million people. Why do we have that many people arrested? One reason is because the border is known, worldwide, to be insecure and that you have a very good chance of being able to enter the country illegally.

If we can change that and we create a clear message around the world that our border is secure and if you come you are going to be apprehended and you will be prosecuted if you come across the border illegally, we could see a dramatic dropoff in that and a dramatic increase of people applying, waiting in line to come legally. That is what it is all about, and this bill did not do it.

Now, somebody was saying to me and asking me recently about President Bush and his legacy. I have to tell you, I like President Bush. He is a friend of mine. I believe his heart is good. I believe he wanted to do something good about immigration. I have the highest regard for him.

What I would ask President Bush to do with regard to his legacy on immigration would be to carry on at a much more effective and aggressive rate than he has with a movement toward enforcement. He has done things in the last several years to improve immigration enforcement more than the previous four or five Presidents, but it has not been enough.

So I would suggest to the President: Make it your legacy to leave a secure border for America. Enforce our current laws. Utilize every effective and appropriate tool we now have, which would make a huge difference. Ask the Congress for what additional tools you

need. Let's begin to create a lawful system at the border.

As the American people see that and gain confidence in us as a government, then we begin to talk about some of the more difficult problems: What do we do about 12 million people who are here illegally?

One of the things that very much concerned me in this bill—and it shows the mindset that seemed to be driving the legislation and was an indication there was no real commitment to enforcement—was moving the date of the people who would be allowed to go on a path to legality and even citizenship to even if you came into our country last year.

Now, last year's bill, which I vigorously criticized, said you could take advantage of the amnesty or legalization process if you came into America before January 1, 2004. This bill said you could take advantage of the amnesty—you would not be asked to leave—and you could become an American citizen if you broke into our country before January 1, 2007, this year.

So after the President has called out the National Guard, after we have said the border is closed—and it has not been closed; we made some improvement, but it has not at all closed the illegality at the border—but if you could get past the National Guard last December 31 and get into this country, this bill would have put you onto a citizenship path.

But that is not what our colleagues told us who supported the legislation. They said it was going to help those people who have deep roots in America who have children here and ones we cannot ask to leave. I am sympathetic to that. I am prepared to work on something like that. But the idea that some single person who broke across the border last December, past the National Guard, is being given all the benefits of citizenship, all the benefits we would give to somebody who waits in line to come legally makes no sense to me and indicates the mindset we have here.

The mindset is confused is all I am saying. The President, the executive branch, and the Congress have not yet gotten the message. The message is: We don't want talk. We don't want promises. We want you to get busy and create a lawful system of immigration, and then we can begin to talk about how to deal with people who are here illegally and what our future flow of immigration would be. They had some good ideas in the bill about how to improve the future process by which we select for admission immigrants who desire to come. We know we can't accept everybody. Eleven million people applied for the 50,000 lottery slots we had in the year 2000. It just indicates that the number of people who would like to come here vastly exceeds our ability to admit them all, so we must select some way for those who come. I believe that a touch, a bit, in this bill that tended toward a Canadian-type