

be confirmed, en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table, en bloc, that no further motions be in order; that upon confirmation, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session; and that any statements relating to any of these nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy while serving as the Attending Physician to the Congress, under Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution:

To be rear admiral

Capt. Brian P. Monahan

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Michael A. Brown

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN78 AIR FORCE nominations (86) beginning BRIAN D. AKINS, and ending JEFFREY J. WIEGAND, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 9, 2009.

IN THE NAVY

PN79 NAVY nominations (24) beginning CHRISTOPHER M. ANDREWS, and ending EZEKIEL J. WETZEL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 9, 2009.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I understand the Senate is in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

IRAQ TROOP WITHDRAWAL

Mr. MCCAIN. I rise to address the President's plan to withdraw American troops from Iraq that he will announce today in Camp Lejeune, NC, as has been widely reported in the media.

Yesterday afternoon, I participated in a White House briefing with other Members of Congress, during which the President and his national security team described the contours of a plan to withdraw troops from Iraq. As he described it, this plan would aim to remove the bulk of combat troops by August of 2010, approximately 19 months, leaving up to 50,000 troops in place. That is a little over a third of the present troop level in Iraq. Most combat forces would remain in place for the duration of this year, ahead of national elections likely to take place in December. National elections in December are of the utmost importance. To have security and the ability of the Iraqi people to take part in that election is a vital part of the progress Iraq will make toward freedom and democracy. The President noted that he reserves the right to revisit the timeline currently envisioned based on conditions on the ground.

It is encouraging that the dramatic success of the surge strategy has enabled us to move from a discussion about whether the United States could bear the catastrophic consequences of failure in Iraq to planning the way in which to consolidate the success. Thanks to the leadership of GEN David Petraeus, Ambassador Ryan Crocker, GEN Ray Odierno, and the many brave men and women who have served under them, the failing situation in Iraq has been arrested and reversed.

It is important to point out that the President's plan is not without risk. We have not yet completed the mission in Iraq, and the gains we have made there remain fragile. We will need to be cautious as we withdraw troops so as not to jeopardize these achievements and listen closely to commanders on the ground as the administration determines the pace of withdrawals. The greatest risk will be present ahead of the December elections, and conditions could worsen before or even after they take place.

With these factors in mind, I believe the President's withdrawal is a reasonable one. The plan is reasonable. Given the gains in Iraq and the requirements to send additional troops to Afghanistan, together with the significant number of troops who will remain in Iraq and the President's willingness to reassess based on conditions on the ground, I am cautiously optimistic that the plan, as laid out by the President, can lead to success.

The American people should be clear. The President's plan, even after the end of its withdrawal timeline is reached, will leave in place up to 50,000

U.S. troops. All will be in harm's way. Some will continue to conduct combat operations. They will play a vital role in consolidating and extending the remarkable progress our military has made since early 2007. That is why I believe the administration should aim to keep the full complement of 50,000, as briefed by Secretary Gates and Admiral Mullen, and not succumb to pressures, political or otherwise, to make deeper or faster cuts in our force levels. The President's plan, as briefed yesterday, is one that can keep us on the right path in Iraq.

I worry, however, about statements made by a number of our colleagues indicating that, for reasons wholly apart from the requirement to secure our aims in Iraq, we should aim at a troop presence much lower than 50,000. We have spent enormous amounts of American blood and treasure in Iraq. We all know that. After all the tragic losses of life, after the hundreds of billions of dollars spent, after all the other costs our country has absorbed as a result of the conduct of the war, we are finally on a path to success. Let us have no crisis of confidence now. Instead, let us welcome home our fighting men and women, not only thanking them for serving in Iraq, not just for ending the war in Iraq but thanking them for bringing us victory in Iraq.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. 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.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for such time as I may consume.

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

FINANCIAL BAILOUTS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this morning's newspapers, once again, chronicle the difficulty that exists in this country. There is obviously a financial crisis, a collapse of the banking system, particularly on Wall Street.

Just to name two, today's paper says there is a place in the budget that is a holding pattern for a potential \$750 billion of additional funding that might be necessary for the big bank bailouts in this country. We also know from the newspapers and from news this morning that Citigroup has reached some sort of a deal with the Federal Government in order to make Citigroup viable. So each day we see more and more discussion about these kinds of issues. It begs the question about who is doing what? What do we know about all of this? How open is this? How much

should the American people know about how their money is used?

I have come to the Senate floor today to talk about just one part of it. At a time when there is so much discussion here about hundreds of millions of dollars, billions of dollars, tens of billions, hundreds of billions of dollars, and now trillions of dollars, I wish to trace just \$3.6 billion. That is a lot of money: \$3.6 billion that the American taxpayers paid in bonuses to some big shot executives that steered their institution into the ground. Let me tell my colleagues about the story.

This is a story about Bank of America buying Merrill Lynch. Our previous Secretary of the Treasury was concerned about Merrill Lynch having serious problems. He let Lehman go bankrupt, believed that was a mistake, and so Merrill Lynch is adrift and we have to find a marriage for Merrill Lynch. Apparently, the Treasury Department worked to get Bank of America to agree to buy Merrill Lynch. By the way, Bank of America had already purchased Countrywide Mortgage, which was a complete mess and a collapse and one of the big mortgage companies that, in my judgment, has caused much of this problem. Bank of America already had purchased Countrywide and the assets of Countrywide Mortgage. Now it was being encouraged to purchase Merrill Lynch. So that marriage was arranged by the Treasury Secretary and others, and that marriage was announced, by the way, last September and consummated in early January of this year.

Now what we discover is that Bank of America got substantial amounts of taxpayers' money in TARP funds and other guarantees. So Bank of America has taxpayers' money, and \$10 billion of the taxpayers' money that went to Bank of America would have been destined for Merrill Lynch had Bank of America not purchased it. Merrill Lynch, it turns out, when they were taken over, had just suffered a loss of some \$15 billion in the fourth quarter of 2008. That caused problems for Bank of America which had agreed to purchase Merrill Lynch because Bank of America, before buying Countrywide and Merrill Lynch, was a healthy company, and now all of a sudden it is not a healthy company and needs substantial funds from the American taxpayers. But now we find that Merrill Lynch paid bonuses to its employees in December of last year just before the takeover by Bank of America was completed.

Now, as I indicated, Merrill Lynch lost \$15 billion late last year, and they paid \$3.6 billion in bonuses in December. Let me describe the magnitude of these bonuses. Six hundred ninety-four employees at Merrill Lynch, according to reports, received bonuses in excess of \$1 million. Let me say that again. Nearly 700 employees in that failed company—a company that lost \$15 billion in the fourth quarter of 2008 received bonuses of over \$1 million. It is

unbelievable. Four top executives in that bank received \$121 million. The top 14 employees in that institution got \$250 million. Think of that: \$3.6 billion paid in bonuses in December to people at an institution that lost \$25 billion in the year. That \$3.6 billion could have just as well been transported through a pipeline from the pockets of the American taxpayers to these 700 people who got over \$1 million apiece because that is taxpayers' money. That money from TARP funds—\$25 billion and further money which guaranteed bad assets—that comes from the American taxpayers.

Had they not paid the \$3.6 billion in bonuses to these folks, their loss in the fourth quarter of 2008 would not have been \$15 billion, it would have been \$11.4 billion. Taxpayers would not have had to come up with that kind of funding through the TARP program. So I know where \$3.6 billion went; American taxpayers were asked to pay that \$3.6 billion in bonuses to the 700 people who got \$1 million apiece from a failed institution. Now Bank of America has this issue because Bank of America purchased Merrill Lynch. Bank of America now has serious financial trouble, and they have received even more funds as well. One of the questions about this is, How do we know the details about these bonuses? It is because an attorney general in the State government in New York had the guts and the intelligence to subpoena this information and demand that it be turned over to him. Question: Why is it that some committee in the Congress doesn't have this information? Why is no subpoena coming from the Congress on these issues? Why is there no systematic, significant investigation here? After all, this Congress is the institution that has triggered the funding. Yet these investigations are occurring with an attorney general in State government.

This Congress needs to do a lot more. There needs to be investigations and accountability. I have offered those amendments. We ought to get to the bottom of who did what, who got the money, and who left town with the cash from the American taxpayers. This morning's news about Citigroup being rescued—do you know what? We are told Citigroup is too big to fail. How did it become too big? The Federal Reserve Board, Alan Greenspan, Treasury folks, and both Republican and Democratic Members pushed legislation that allowed them to create big holding companies and become too big to fail. I understand you need banks, and I understand you need big banks. But the big banks don't have to be so big that they are too big to fail, so when they make reckless decisions, the American taxpayers are told: We are too big to fail and you must bail us out. There is no inherent right for the biggest financial institutions in this country to continue to exist. I understand the circulatory system in this country and that a necessary part of it

is the banking institutions. I understand how critical that is.

My point is not that we can do without banking institutions. My point is that there is no inherent right to exist for those banks that have their current names and are declared too big to fail. What about putting them through some sort of a "bank carwash" and getting rid of all that tar—those bad assets—and sell the good assets to an institution that is reconstituted as a new bank? What inherent right is there for banks that have run this country into the ditch and destroyed their financial capability—what inherent right do they have for them to continue to exist?

I am not suggesting we shut down the banking system. But perhaps this lesson ought to suggest to us that "too big to fail" is a doctrine that is a failure, because if you have decided you are going to allow institutions to become too big to fail, you have sent yourself down a road that is a dead end, in my judgment.

The culture, it seems to me, that is on Wall Street, and the culture in this town—precisely in Treasury and some in Congress—is a culture that suggests that what was is what has to be in the future. That is not the case at all. I have talked ad nauseam about 1999 on the floor of this Senate, when both Republicans and Democrats steered a different course and said let's get rid of those old protections we put in place after the Great Depression—Glass-Steagall and those things, those old-fashioned notions—and let's dump them and create the Nation of one-stop shopping for securities and virtually everything you want to do in securities, real estate, and finance. So the Congress did dump all those old-fashioned rules and laws that were put into place after the Great Depression. I was one of eight Senators who stood on the floor and said no—one of eight who voted no. I said then on the floor of the Senate that I think within a decade we are going to see massive taxpayer bailouts. It was a disastrous decision to have done it. Now we must reconnect it. There is no discussion here, and there needs to be about what do you reconnect? Do you go back to some semblance of whether it is Glass-Steagall, or some approach to Glass-Steagall, in which you begin to separate the essential functions of banking from other areas of substantial risk? If you don't do that, what do you do to provide protections that this would not happen again?

There is a culture here that suggests you cannot do that, it is impossible. There is a culture here that suggests we have to keep bailing out whatever it is. We have pumped \$700 billion out of this Chamber into something called a TARP fund to be used for the big banks. Now we are told there needs to be a marker to protect the potential of another \$750 billion. That is nearly \$1.5 trillion pumped into the top of our banking institutions, like putting oil

in a crank case—and these are failed institutions. Yet the only investigation I see happening is coming out of an office in the attorney general's office in Albany, NY. It is unbelievable to me.

Does anybody here understand that \$3.6 billion was put in a hose directly from the taxpayers' pockets to bonuses for 700 people in a failed banking institution, so each of those 700 people got \$1 million or more, and the 4 top people, by the way, got \$120 million. By the way, let me point out that one of those top four people in Merrill Lynch, according to a news article in New York, got \$24.9 million and was just hired in September of last year. So he got almost \$25 million for 3 months of work. Then he quit. The day he quit, according to the news record, his wife closed on a \$36 million luxury co-op on Park Avenue. Pretty unbelievable. By the way, another top executive, Thomas Montage, who headed global sales and trading at Merrill Lynch, was reportedly given a guaranteed payment of \$39.4 million for 2008. Does this sound like fiction? It does to me.

This week, we were treated to a rant on television by a guy I saw standing on a trading floor, a derivatives trader, who was ranting about losers and about reckless behavior, about the losers who might get help to stay in their homes. We have had millions of people lose their jobs, some 2.6 million people last year. A good number of them are also losing their homes. Somebody says maybe you can try to find a way to help some of them stay in their homes, and that derivatives trader stood and ranted about the losers who have lost jobs and are about to lose their homes. I wonder if that derivatives trader might stand on the floor of an exchange and describe losers as people who make \$24.9 million for 3 months of work in a failed institution. Are they losers? How about the nearly 700 people who got over \$1 million each in bonuses from the American taxpayer? Are they losers? Or is it just the little folks, the casualties at the bottom of this economic wreckage, the people who lost their jobs, their homes, and who are losing hope? Then they see these stories about "too big to fail." When 700 people get bonuses of \$1 million each in an institution that lost \$15 billion in just one quarter last year and the institution pays \$3.6 billion in bonuses, I wonder if the folks who are having an itch to rant today might want to rant about that kind of nonsense.

How about laying off the folks who don't have it so good, the folks who are struggling and trying to get by, hoping beyond hope that maybe they are not going to get laid off; or if they just got laid off, hoping beyond hope they might be able to find another job; or hoping beyond hope that if they got laid off and haven't yet found a job, they can find some way to scrape up enough money to make the next house payment so they will not be kicked out of their house. These people are losers, you say? I mean, of all the unbelievable

things I have heard, for a derivatives trader to stand on the exchange floor and rant about the losers at the bottom of the economic scale, shame on him, in my judgment. I will tell you where the losers are. The losers are the folks who have wallowed in big bucks, getting bonuses from institutions that have failed and then asking for taxpayer money and then asking us to pry those bonus numbers out of the bowels of their financial records. They didn't give them up exactly voluntarily. It was an attorney general of New York who forced that information into the open. Well, where is the outrage about these things? Where is the outrage? Let me hear a rant from somebody standing on a trading floor about that—just one.

This Congress has a lot of work to do. This Congress has not begun to do the investigations that are necessary. We should not learn these things from an attorney general in New York who is issuing subpoenas. We should learn them by substantial investigations here to find out what happened, who got the money, and what happened to the first \$700 billion.

I have used the term "bank robbery," and I understand it is a pejorative term. When we think of bank robbers, we think of Jesse James in Northfield, MN, with a mask over his face and a gun and a fast horse. Well, a whole lot of folks have robbed big banks in this country of their financial viability and of their strength, through horrible, bad decisions—even as they have taken massive amounts of money from the banks for themselves. That is bank robbery. I know it is a different kind—without violence and they are wearing suits and flying in private jets—but it is robbing America's financial institutions. As I have described, I think it also robs American taxpayers.

I want this country to do well. I want this financial wreckage to end. I want us to put America back on track. I want us to do the things that are necessary to prevent this from ever happening again. But you cannot do that unless you understand what happened. Accountability is looking backward and forward. I am talking about all this because when we have to discover by reading the newspaper that a State official has finally subpoenaed records to find out that a company that lost 25 billion last year gave out \$3.6 billion in bonuses, probably from \$10 billion of the American taxpayers' money, we have a right to know that. I have indicated on the floor of the Senate before that much of this is about economic recovery. If we are going to get by this and through this—and I think we will—it is about confidence. It is about restoring confidence in the American people about their future. When the American people are confident about their future, they do things that expand the economy. When they are not confident, they do things that contract the economy. It is as simple as that.

I ask, how can Americans be confident when, day after day, they read

these stories about how folks at the top get off with a lot of money and then their friends call the folks at the bottom losers. That is hardly inspiring, in my judgment. We have a lot of things to do. First, is to investigate all this and, at the same time, to understand what has happened; we need to begin working to figure out what kind of a banking and financial future we want. We are going to try to put people back to work with the economic recovery package, building infrastructure, trying to put people back on the payroll. That will give confidence and also build an asset for our country. All those things are necessary.

The other steps that are necessary is for us to think, what did we do in 1999 to say let's allow big bank holding companies to be created and grow banks that are too big to fail, and let's decide we don't want to regulate anything. How are we going to put that back together? Should we not revisit that decision that turned out to be so wrong and the issue of Glass-Steagall or some form of it? Shouldn't we revisit exactly what we want in terms of future regulatory oversight?

Let me make one other point while I talk about this. I sat across the table from a North Dakota banker some while ago at what was called a sauerkraut festival. I said to him—this is a town of 1,200 people or so. I said to this community banker: Do you have money to lend?

He said: Oh, sure.

I said: If the biggest company in your town—which is a small manufacturing company—if that company needed some funding for an expansion, would you have money?

He said: Oh, sure, we have money. We have done banking the old-fashioned way. We take deposits and we make loans, but we do underwriting for those loans. We sit across the table from someone who wants a loan to be sure they are able to pay that loan. That is called underwriting. We bank the old-fashioned way.

Would it not have been nice if some of the biggest institutions banked the old-fashioned way?

I got a call the other day from a woman who runs a company that makes steel buildings. She has lost 80 percent of her business; 80 percent of her business is gone. Maybe they won't make it. But she asked the question: Is there any help for us? Is there any program out there that would help bail out our company because we were doing pretty well; this was a good economy for us; we were selling steel buildings, and it was not our fault this thing took a bad turn. Is there anything that can help us stay in business? We have people on our payroll. Is there anything that can help us because every day, she said, I read about the big banks getting all this money.

I assume she will probably read something I have said that not only do they get all that money in Merrill Lynch, they got \$3.6 billion in bonuses

for the very executives who helped lose \$25 billion last year.

The answer to that woman is, no, there is nobody here who has a program that says: You know what, let's pay as much attention to the Main Street business that is struggling this morning as is being paid to the biggest banks that are too big to fail. Nobody is talking about that small business.

By the way, when they lose, they lose everything. That small business, that dream, that risk of, in most cases, all the assets that family has, when that is gone, it is gone. Is there anybody here who has put together some structure that says: Let's help those folks. Maybe the economic engine also runs well when you help folks at the bottom. Maybe things percolate up in America.

I think it is a fair question to ask. It is a fair question to ask that many ask about rewarding reckless behavior, about what do you do in a country to try to put an economy that has been so savaged by bad decisions and, in some cases, bad luck, but also greed, a carnival of greed, what do you do to put it on track, to give people confidence about the future? There is not one solution. There is not one answer. There are a series of things to be done. It seems to me, first and foremost, we have to try to understand that the American people cannot continue to read this. They cannot continue to read that they are asked to come up with another \$750 billion because these institutions are too big to fail but apparently not smart enough to understand you don't need to give \$3.6 billion in bonuses to people who lost \$25 billion. There is no Main Street in America where that decision would be made.

As I conclude, let me say that I want this country to succeed so badly. The President said it the other day. He had a room full of Republicans and Democrats in a joint session of Congress, and he said: I know everybody in this room loves their country. And we do. This country is in a lot of difficulty. It is not some natural disaster. This was not some Hurricane Katrina. This difficulty was caused by a lot of terrible decisions. Some people can call our offices and look at this Government and they can say: It was all Government policies. Let me just make this case as well that the consumer debt by the American people has gone up, up, up, straight up. That is not Government debt; that is consumer debt. That is also a problem. Giant trade deficits through unbelievably incompetent trade agreements, at \$700 billion a year. We have a lot of problems, and we need to address them all right now and begin fixing them and putting this country on course so that we have an economy people can believe in and so they can believe life will be better for their kids than it was for them because this is a country that cares about expanding the middle class and lifting everybody up.

We can do this. We can do it. But we won't do it by ignoring the things

about which I just talked. We ought to face them and face them now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Ms. MURKOWSKI pertaining to the introduction of S. 503 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

E-VERIFY

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we have had a number of discussions in recent days about the E-Verify system that allows employers to do a quick computer check of an individual's Social Security number to validate whether it is a legitimate number before hiring them, an action that would help them avoid hiring people in the country illegally.

The discussion has been whether to extend that program which is currently set to expire in March. I offered an amendment to do that, an amendment similar to the one that passed in the House last year, 407 to 2, that would extend the E-Verify program for 4 years. There are 100,000 American businesses using it every day, and 1,000 to 2,000 new businesses a week are signing up voluntarily—just voluntarily because it protects them.

They want to follow the law, as most of our businesses do. When they go through this process, if someone were to say: You deliberately hired someone illegally in the country, they could say: Well, we checked it out on the system and they showed up to be legitimate and we felt legitimate in hiring them. So it protects them and helps them follow the law.

But for some reason there has been a resistance here. It passed the House. It was in the House stimulus bill, that \$800 billion stimulus bill. It also provided, in the House legislation which was accepted and the majority of the House Members all voted for it on final passage, that everybody who gets a contract from the U.S. Government as part of this stimulus package must use E-Verify. In other words, it was designed to create and protect jobs for lawful Americans. The amendment, which was unanimously accepted in committee, said that beneficiaries of stimulus money must use the E-Verify system, and that E-Verify system would help ensure that only legal people would be hired. They could be green card holders; they could be legal work-

ers; they did not have to be citizens. But they at least ought to be in the country legally. And this Senate systematically refused to allow us to have a vote on that amendment, so it was not in the Senate bill.

I asked three or four times to be able to have a vote on that amendment and was rejected. When they went to conference, sure enough, as I suspected, as I stated on the floor, the Senate version won. Our bill, which did not have this language in it, prevailed. They took the House language out at conference without any deliberation. This was a common sense amendment, and I think it would have passed overwhelmingly in this Senate had we been allowed to have a vote.

So this has caused me great concern. A lot of us have believed President Bush and his administration failed to aggressively enforce the law to ensure that jobs are going to American workers and not those in the country illegally. And I criticized him for that.

But it does appear this administration and this new Congress may be even more determined to not enforce the law. In fact, it appears they may be indeed taking steps to undermine some of the programs that President Bush and the ICE Agency and the Homeland Security Department have been taking that were at least making progress toward creating a system of lawful immigration that we can be proud of.

We are a nation of immigrants. Nobody wants to end immigration in America. Over 1 million people can enter our country lawfully each year and become citizens and contribute to our country in many positive ways. But since so many people would like to come to our country, and we recognize we have to have a certain limit on the number who come, we have a legal system that requires them to make application, and by various standards they are approved or disapproved in their application. Those who are approved get to come to America, and those who do not have to wait until maybe later or maybe they, for one reason or another, are permanently unable to come. Maybe they have a criminal record or have other problems that would make them unacceptable for admission. No one has a constitutional right to come to America. We cannot have an open borders policy so that everybody who would like to come and work, can come and work.

So this is the situation we are in. In light of that, I was particularly troubled, I have to say, and all Americans should be troubled by a recent headline article in the Washington Times this week. It was about certain activist immigration rights groups criticizing the Obama administration because some of the agents in the Immigration Enforcement Division had raided an engine machine shop in Washington State and actually went so far as to detain certain illegal immigrants. They are not happy they actually went into a business and detained some individuals who