

were in the country illegally, and they complained about that. So, apparently, according to the article, the Obama administration itself seemed “taken aback by the raid by the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency.” The new Secretary, Janet Napolitano, was “vowing to Congress that she would get to the bottom of it.”

The article goes on to say that an official with the agency said, “The Secretary is not happy about it.”

Well, that is troubling to me. In 2008, under the Bush administration, which was not, I think, particularly aggressive—as a matter of fact, not aggressive enough, ICE made 5,173 administrative arrests at work sites. Additionally, ICE made 1,101 criminal arrests in connection with worksite investigations. Those arrests represented criminal activity, gangs or drugs or other kinds of criminal activity. They were doing that, and periodic enforcement actions were taken because a company does not have a right to have hundreds and hundreds of illegal workers who perhaps certainly are working for less money than Americans would work for.

That is not good and creates unfair competition and undermines our lawful immigration system. But this worried me even more. According to the Washington Times article, immigrant rights groups said they had discussed this with the administration some time during the last election. They did not discuss it publicly, but they apparently had discussions with the campaign, and they said this:

This was a fixture of our conversations and demands with him during the campaign. It has always been one that there would be a hold on the raids or a stop to the raids.

The National Council of La Raza has urged supporters to call the White House and demand that Mr. Obama lay out his immigration policy. In criticizing this, they said:

What are Latino and immigrant voters to think? They turn out in massive numbers and vote for change and yet the change we can believe in turns out to be business as usual.

Well, I think maybe the American people need to make some demands on this administration. Maybe that is the way you get things done; you make demands on the administration that they actually enforce the law and that they do not conduct investigations of the law enforcement personnel who were doing what the law required and who were, by all accounts, legitimately identifying illegal workers in America.

So now, according to this article, the Secretary of Homeland Security is investigating our law enforcement officers for simply doing their duty in response to some secret demand and agreement they made back in the campaign to undermine law enforcement in America. I do not think it is good.

This is why people are upset with Washington and upset with Congress. I believe in lawful immigration. I think we need to stop all of this. But what do

we do? Nothing. Whenever something starts happening and has some possibility of being successful, well, politicians intervene and stop the law enforcement officers from doing their duty.

I am really concerned about it. The Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency says in their statement about the operation that they were investigating criminal activity, and they apparently discovered in the course of that the hiring records revealed a significant number of people were using bogus Social Security numbers and counterfeit identity documents. That is why they did their jobs. They went and checked it out and found 28 people at this company who were not here lawfully.

So now the Secretary of Homeland Security has promised to get to the bottom of it—not to the bottom of why this company was hiring 28 illegal workers, not asking whether this company ever used the E-Verify system, they are going to get to the bottom of why the law enforcement officers of the U.S. Government, paid for by the taxpayers, had the temerity to actually go out and investigate criminal activity and detain people in the country illegally.

So I have to tell you, this is not going to fly. We are not going to go quietly about this issue. We need a vote in the Senate, and we need one soon to extend E-Verify. It is unthinkable that this highly successful, proven system that over 100,000 businesses voluntarily are using would be allowed to expire.

The only reason it would be allowed to expire would be we do not want the laws enforced. And, by the way, E-Verify does not raid any businesses. E-Verify does not call for a single investigator, not a single detention facility. All it says is the business owner could check and not hire someone if they did not have good documents. That is all. They do not arrest them. They do not call the police. Nothing happens. You just eliminate the jobs magnet, as the Border Patrol people tell us, that is causing people to come to our country illegally to get jobs, and that magnet is a factor. E-Verify would diminish that.

I wished to share those thoughts. I believe this is a troubling event. We need to consider it and not go down this path. It signals a further erosion of the efforts to bring a lawful system to this unlawful system we have today.

The Secretary does deserve credit for one statement she made, that businesses do need to be held accountable for exploiting the illegal labor market. I thought that was a good statement. She went on to state that there is an impact of illegal workers in the country and “that has impacts on American workers, and it has impacts on wage levels, often has undue impacts on illegal workers themselves.”

This is also true. There are costs to the American worker in terms of

wages, the ability to get a job, when we allow huge numbers of illegal workers into the country.

I hope our colleagues will consider this issue. The American people have a different view than some about the need to enforce our laws. The American people would like to see that, before we start talking about amnesty and a lot of other things. If we are not going to enforce the law, why should we go forward with some of these expansive programs that have been proposed to allow persons who only recently broke into the country to be placed on legal status? The American people are not naive about this. They want something done, and they have a right to expect it. We in Congress have to figure out a way to be responsive to their demands and not focus only on the demands of special interests, certain big businesses, and certain activist groups, but to focus on legitimate demands of the public for good public policy. Good public policy requires the end of the illegality in immigration and the establishment of a lawful system of immigration that honors our great heritage of immigration of which we have always been proud.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware.

SUPPORTING SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. President, America's economy is in crisis. We can either drown under the weight of the problem, or we can ride the wave of opportunity that it offers.

To do that, we must put science, engineering, and innovation back in their rightful place in our economy.

If every cloud has a silver lining, this economic crisis can benefit America, we use this opportunity to restore our leadership in the world, if we create anew the industries, businesses and products that will shape the new economy.

As the only Senator holding an engineering degree, I remember when engineering ranked far ahead of business administration as the premier college degree for those who had ambition and the determination to succeed.

After the Soviet Union's 1957 surprise launch of Sputnik 1, American leaders spurred the Nation to catch up, to increase our national commitment to science.

The Sputnik crisis led to the creation of NASA and other government research agencies, as well as an increase in U.S. Government spending on scientific research and higher education.

It doesn't seem that long ago, but I was one of the young students who were drawn by Sputnik and our leaders' call to seek an engineering degree.

More recently, though, more and more of America's best and brightest college students opted instead to take their “quant” skills in math and analysis to Wall Street.

From what I understand, of all the undergraduate majors in the 2008 class at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 11.4 percent took jobs in finance. This is the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, our leading engineering school, sending over 10 percent of its graduates to Wall Street.

The stark truth is that during the going years on Wall Street, America's engineering and innovation expertise declined.

And it is not just that engineers have been choosing finance over traditional engineering careers; fewer students having been choosing to study engineering, period.

Back in 1986—not that long ago—engineering and engineering technology students earned close to 10 percent of U.S. bachelor's degrees. Despite attractive starting salaries, often above \$50,000 a year, the percentage today is only about 5 percent.

Only about 121,000 people earned degrees in engineering in 2007, and that includes bachelors, masters, and doctoral degrees.

Today's financial crisis has given our young people an opportunity to take a hard look at how they want to spend their lives.

It gives America's political and educational leaders an opportunity to reorder their resources, to open a pipeline to produce students skilled in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, STEM.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, about 80 percent of the new jobs created in the next 10 years will require these critical STEM skills.

While America must remain a leader in finance, it is clear we must also be a world leader in energy, biotech, biomed and many other industries based on science, technology, and mathematical skills.

Here is what we should do right away:

We need to find more and better ways to marry public policy and engineering. Many universities have begun to do this, but we also must act on a national level, with the support and coordination of national policies.

To take one key example, our Nation, and indeed our planet, is facing a potential crisis in the supply and demand for clean energy and water.

How these issues are resolved will define our children's future. These problems require technical solutions, designed by scientists and engineers who also have an understanding of cultures, religions, and policy.

We also need to develop programs that allow students to "make a difference," to tap the idealism our young people are eager to express.

For example, we should create an engineering jobs corps—similar to the Peace Corps or Teach for America—to help channel the young talent emerging from our engineering schools.

The fields of biotech and biomed, energy and environment should attract socially conscious students who want to improve the quality of life for us all.

Prior to graduating, engineering students typically must write a final paper addressing a problem to solve. We should make those papers part of our national dialogue, publish them, and make them available to government and to the business community, with authors' rights kept secure.

Finally, we need to reach out to women and other students who have traditionally been underrepresented in engineering.

The United States cannot maintain its position as a technological leader nor can we solve the problems we face without the perspectives and participation of all members of our society.

We are in a struggle to define our nation's future. We must recruit all of the talent we can find.

We know our competitors in countries like China are throwing their resources into science and engineering. We can do no less.

When I went to college I wanted to be an engineer, in part because 52 years ago the United States was supporting science and engineering on an unprecedented level. America's competitive spirit helped us meet the challenges of those times.

Thousands of technical innovations created new products, new jobs, new industries, and new levels of economic productivity. We can do this again.

The financial crisis—and our recognition of the misplaced priorities and resources that created it—can help lead a cultural shift back to the strong foundations of innovation and know-how that have always been the American way.

The Federal Government can and should lead in supporting the basic scientific, medical and engineering research that will spur discoveries and innovations.

Our entrepreneurs have always been ready to build on those foundations, to create millions of new jobs and shape a bright American future.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and the administration to restore the prestige and leadership of science and engineering in our country.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 1105

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, March 2, at 2 p.m., the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 26, H.R. 1105, the Omnibus appropriations bill.

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

Mr. REID. I yield the floor and 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. KAUFMAN. 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.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS RULES OF PROCEDURE

• Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in accordance with rule XXVI.2. of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I submit for publication in the RECORD the rules of procedure for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, as unanimously adopted by the committee on February 26, 2009.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the rules of procedure be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 1.—Subject to the provisions of rule XXVI, paragraph 5, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, regular meetings of the committee shall be held on the second and fourth Wednesday of each month, at 10:00 a.m., in room SD-430, Dirksen Senate Office Building. The chairman may, upon proper notice, call such additional meetings as he may deem necessary.

Rule 2.—The chairman of the committee or of a subcommittee, or if the chairman is not present, the ranking majority member present, shall preside at all meetings. The chairman may designate the ranking minority member to preside at hearings of the committee or subcommittee.

Rule 3.—Meetings of the committee or a subcommittee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public except as otherwise specifically provided in subsections (b) and (d) of rule 26.5 of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

Rule 4.—(a) Subject to paragraph (b), one-third of the membership of the committee, actually present, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of transacting business. Any quorum of the committee which is composed of less than a majority of the members of the committee shall include at least one member of the majority and one member of the minority.

(b) A majority of the members of a subcommittee, actually present, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of transacting business: provided, no measure or matter shall be ordered reported unless such majority shall include at least one member of the minority who is a member of the subcommittee. If, at any subcommittee meeting, a measure or matter cannot be ordered reported because of the absence of such a minority member, the measure or matter shall lay over for a day. If the presence of a member of the minority is not then obtained, a majority of the members of the subcommittee, actually present, may order such measure or matter reported.

(c) No measure or matter shall be ordered reported from the committee or a subcommittee unless a majority of the committee or subcommittee is physically present.

Rule 5.—With the approval of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, one member thereof may conduct public hearings other than taking sworn testimony.

Rule 6.—Proxy voting shall be allowed on all measures and matters before the committee or a subcommittee if the absent