

Servicemembers and veterans of the U.S. military—and their family members who support them—deserve a better life than worry and fear.

In March, just a few weeks ago, James and Sharon came to Washington. They came with hundreds of other immigrants who are concerned about being deported. They are concerned about immigration reform. They know the system is broken and needs to be fixed. This is what James said:

I did what my country asked me to do. Now I'm asking my country to keep us together for the sake of humanity and freedom.

James spoke about keeping his three American children together with the mother of those three children, his wife.

When I heard James and Sharon's story, I was recommitted to doing something to help them. And I did. Not only is Sharon a wonderful mother and wife, she is also caretaker to her disabled husband. Her family needs her.

Last month, James and Sharon learned that immigration officials have deferred her status, her deportation. She is no longer in immediate danger of being separated from her family.

See, Mr. President, she was a DREAMer, and that is who President Obama stepped forward to help. In effect, what this did is it allowed her to stay and care for her husband and three children. Her children are 16, 11, and 8 years of age.

While I was happy to help James and Sharon, it is unfortunate that they needed any help in the first place. When our servicemembers are fighting overseas, they should be focused on the difficult and dangerous job they face—not worried about their family members back home.

Think about that. If she had been deported while he was overseas, what would the three boys do? Dad is overseas. They are Americans. They were born here.

No veteran of the U.S. military should have to fight to keep his wife, the caretaker of his children, by his side. Her story is compelling. Their story is compelling. But there are millions of stories just like it—stories of mothers and fathers terrified of being torn away from their U.S. citizen children; stories of young men and women fearful of being deported from the only country they know, they have ever called home; stories of families forced to live in the shadows despite coming to America in search of a brighter future.

There are 11 million reasons to pass commonsense immigration reform that mends our broken system—11 million stories of fear of being deported, fear of heartbreak, fear of suffering, and actual suffering they have facing them every day worrying about if they can go to the store, do they have to stay home. They certainly cannot travel. But for this fine young woman, that has been taken away because of President Obama.

These stories should motivate Congress to act. The bipartisan proposal before this body takes important steps to strengthen border security. It is remarkable what we already have there. We have drones, 700 miles of fencing. We have sensors. We have fixed-wing aircraft flying around with helicopters. We have 21,000 Border Patrol agents. But if there are ways people believe we could do better on security that is important, that is not just some reason to try to kill this legislation, let's take a look at it.

I spoke this morning with the chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, Senator CARPER. He has some ideas. He is preparing amendments. I like Senator CARPER always. He is very thoughtful, and I am sure he will do something that he believes would improve the situation on the border. He has gone, as a member of that committee and chairman of that committee, all over the southern part of this country looking at what is happening on the border.

So the bipartisan proposal before the Senate takes important steps to strengthen border security. It also makes crucial improvements to our broken immigration system so families like James and Sharon's are never subject to this kind of anguish again.

While this legislation is not an instant fix for families, it does provide a pathway to earned citizenship. It does not put them at the front of the line. It puts them at the back of the line. They have to stay out of trouble. They have to work, pay taxes, and focus on learning English. That is what it is about.

Passing meaningful immigration reform will be good for our national security, it will be good for the economy, it will be good for James and Sharon Courtney and millions of families just like them.

James is a veteran who sacrificed his time and his health to keep this Nation safe from harm. He is now disabled. We can at least thank him by keeping his family safe—and together.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

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

BORDER SECURITY, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, AND IMMIGRATION MODERNIZATION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 744, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 80, S. 744, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would ask the Chair at this time to recognize the

Senator from Hawaii, Mr. SCHATZ, who replaced Senator Inouye. I understand he is going to give his maiden speech in the Senate today. I would ask that the Chair recognize him.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii.

NATIVE HAWAIIAN GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, today, June 11, marks a public holiday in the State of Hawaii, King Kamehameha Day, celebrated since 1872. We hold a statewide festival and mark the day with lei draping ceremonies, parades, hula competitions, and other festivities. It is a day to honor Kamehameha the Great, who unified the Kingdom of Hawaii, and to celebrate the rich culture and traditions of the Hawaiian people.

I chose this day to come to the Senate floor to talk about an issue of great importance to me and to the great State of Hawaii: Native Hawaiian government reorganization. It was a top priority of my immediate predecessors in this body, Senators Inouye and Akaka. For more than three decades, they worked together in the Congress to advance priorities important to Hawaii and to the Nation.

They made history at almost every step of their careers—securing dozens of firsts in the House and in the Senate. But for the indigenous people of the United States, Senators Inouye and Akaka will be forever remembered for their work as members and then chairs of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, and for their advocacy on behalf of American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians.

I want to acknowledge their legacy and to thank Senator Akaka for the role he continues to play in our great State and in the Native Hawaiian community in particular. Here is the reason I have chosen to carry forward this fight on behalf of Native Hawaiians: Simply stated, it is right to seek justice.

Native Hawaiians are the only federally recognized native people without a government-to-government relationship with the United States, and they deserve access to the prevailing Federal policy of self-determination. Opponents have argued that Native Hawaiians are not "Indians," as if the word applies to native people of a certain racial or ethnic heritage or is limited to indigenous people from one part of the United States but not another. This is misguided.

Our Constitution makes it clear. Our Founding Fathers understood that it was the tribal nations' sovereign authority that distinguished them from others. It was the fact that tribes were native groups with distinct governments that predated our own that justified special treatment in the Constitution and under Federal law.

In what is now the United States, European contact with native groups began in the 15th and 16th centuries on the east coast, and the 16th and 17th

centuries on the west coast; while in Alaska and Hawaii, European contact was delayed until the 18th century. Throughout the centuries, a myriad of factors influenced how various native groups were treated.

The historical timeframe when policies and programs were applied to native groups may have been different, but what was consistent throughout were the Federal policies and actions intended to strip Native Americans of their languages, weaken traditional leadership and family structures, divide land bases, prohibit religious and cultural practices, and break communal bonds. These policies were as harmful and unjust to Native Hawaiians as they were to Alaska Natives and American Indians.

There was a thriving society that greeted Capt. James Cook when he landed on the shores of Hawaii in 1778. Prior to their first contact with Europeans, Native Hawaiians had a population of at least 300,000. They were a highly organized, self-sufficient society, and they had their own rules, laws, language, and culture.

In his journals Captain Cook referred to the indigenous people of Hawaii as "Indians" because it was the established English term in the 18th century to describe native groups—regardless of their race, ethnicity, or their governmental structure. But just like many Native Americans and Alaska Natives on the continent, the name "Native Hawaiians," chosen in their own language, was "Kanaka Maoli," "The People."

From 1826 until 1893, the United States recognized the independence of the Hawaiian Government as a distinct political entity. We extended full and complete diplomatic recognition and entered into five treaties and conventions with the Hawaiian Monarchs to govern commerce and navigation. These treaties are clear evidence that Native Hawaiians were considered a separate and distinct nation more than a century after contact.

But on January 17, 1893, the legitimate government of the Native Hawaiian people was removed forcibly by agents and Armed Forces of the United States. The illegality of this action has been acknowledged in contemporary as well as modern times by both the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government.

An investigation called for by President Cleveland produced a report by former Congressman James Blount. The report's findings were unambiguous: U.S. diplomatic and military representatives had abused their authority and were responsible for the change in the government. As a result of these findings, the U.S. Minister to Hawaii was recalled from his diplomatic post, and the military commander of the U.S. Armed Forces stationed in Hawaii was disciplined and forced to resign his commission.

In a message to Congress in December 1893, President Cleveland described

the events that brought down the Hawaiian Government as an "act of war, committed with the participation of a diplomatic representative of the United States and without authority of Congress." He acknowledged that "by such acts, the government of a peaceful and friendly people was overthrown." President Cleveland concluded that "a substantial wrong has thus been done which a due regard for our national character—as well as the rights of the injured people—requires we should endeavor to repair," and he called for the restoration of the Hawaiian Monarchy.

The provisional government refused to relinquish power and in July of 1894 declared itself to be the Republic of Hawaii. The provisional government advocated annexation of Hawaii to the United States and began to lobby the Congress to pass a treaty of annexation.

Hawaii's Monarch at the time, Queen Liliuokalani, presented a petition to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a formal statement of protest to the Secretary of State. The petition, signed by more than 21,000 Hawaiian men and women, represented more than half of the Hawaiian census population and was compiled in just 3 weeks. It also included the signatures of approximately 20,000 non-Hawaiians who supported the return of the islands to self-governed rule. The "Petition Against Annexation" was a powerful tool in the defeat of the annexation treaty.

In the next year, proponents of annexation introduced the Newlands Joint Resolution, a measure requiring only a simple majority. The annexation of Hawaii passed with the much reduced threshold of votes and was signed into law by President McKinley in July of 1898.

For almost two centuries after the founding of our Nation, Federal policies of removal, relocation assimilation, and termination decimated Native communities and worsened the economic conditions for American Indians, Alaska Natives and Native Hawaiians. The policy of banning native language used in the schools was adopted by the Territory of Hawaii. Native children were punished for speaking Hawaiian, just as American Indians and Alaska Natives were punished for using their own languages in school.

The policy of allotting parcels of land to individual Indians began in 1887 as a way to break up the reservations and communal lifestyles. In 1906, it was expanded to Alaska Natives and in 1921 applied to Native Hawaiians. In an attempt to reverse the damage done by these policies since the 1920s, Congress has established special Native Hawaiian programs in education, employment, health care, and housing. Congress has extended to Native Hawaiians many of the same rights and privileges accorded to American Indians and Alaska Natives.

The Congress has consistently recognized Native Hawaiians as Native peo-

ples of the United States on whose behalf it may exercise its power under the Constitution. In 1993, the Congress passed and President Clinton signed legislation known as the apology resolution, a formal apology by the Congress. This legislation recognizes that the overthrow of the Hawaiian government resulted in the suppression of the inherent sovereignty of the Native Hawaiian people and the deprivation of the rights of Native Hawaiians to self-determination.

It has been 20 years since the passage of the apology resolution. But the Federal Government has not yet acted to provide a process for reorganizing a Native Hawaiian governing entity. This inaction puts Native Hawaiians at a unique disadvantage. Of the three major groups of Native Americans in the United States: American Indians, Alaska Natives and Native Hawaiians, only Native Hawaiians currently lack the benefits of democratic self-government.

An extensive congressional legislative and oversight record created over the last two decades and dozens of congressional findings delineated in Federal statutes establish these facts: Indigenous Hawaiians, such as tribes on the continental United States, formed a Native community with their own government and this political entity existed before the founding of the United States and Native Hawaiians share historical and current bonds with their community. Similar to tribes in the continental United States, Native Hawaiians have certain land set aside for their benefit pursuant to acts of Congress, including 200,000 acres of Hawaiian Homes Commission Act land and share an interest in the income generated by 1.2 million acres of public trust lands under the Hawaii Admission Act.

Although the Congress has passed more than 150 statutes to try to address some of the negative effects of earlier Federal actions, data reveal persistent health, education, and income disparities. Native Hawaiians experience disproportionately high rates of unemployment and incarceration, and Native Hawaiian children are over-represented in the juvenile justice system. Hawaiian families rank last in the Nation in average annual pay and face high rates of homelessness.

Separate is not equal. That is why I urge the Federal Government to treat Native Hawaiians fairly. It is long past time for the Native Hawaiian people to regain their right to self-governance. Two years ago, the State of Hawaii passed a historic measure to explicitly acknowledge that Native Hawaiians are the only indigenous, aboriginal, maoli population of Hawaii, and to establish a Native Hawaiian Enrollment Commission. My good friend and the former Governor of Hawaii John Waihee was appointed as chairman and is leading the effort to register Native Hawaiians. This landmark effort is

widely supported by the State of Hawaii, our congressional delegation, and our citizens.

I wish to acknowledge the commission, commend its vital work, and urge Native Hawaiians to take advantage of this opportunity to help reorganize a representational government. The actions and commitments of the State of Hawaii and the Enrollment Commission are crucial. But in order to reach our goal, we must all work together. That is why today, on King Kamehameha Day, I call upon all of us to join in the fight for justice for Native Hawaiians.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the proponents and opponents, with the Senator from Alabama Mr. SESSIONS controlling up to 1 hour.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to Senator CORNYN such time as he would consume.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this afternoon we will have an important vote, some might say even historic vote, on the motion to proceed to the immigration reform bill. I was here in 2007, the last time that subject was on the floor of the Senate. It proved to be a divisive and tough issue that we could not get through.

But I think if there is one thing that I sense, in terms of my constituents in Texas and sort of the impression I get generally speaking, it is that the American people believe that the status quo on immigration is unacceptable. Some of our colleagues have actually called the status quo *de facto* amnesty because essentially there is lawlessness in our broken immigration system. What we need to do is restore law and order and predictability and make sure our immigration system works in the best interests of the United States. That is true in a number of ways that are included in the underlying bill as it was voted out of the Judiciary Committee.

So I will vote yes on the motion to proceed because I think it is important we take up this debate. The majority leader has indicated we are going to be debating this and offering amendments over the next 3 weeks. I think that is a good period of time for the American people to understand what is in the bill and to listen to pro and con debates and to make up their mind how they want their elected representatives to proceed.

Yesterday I talked a little bit about an amendment I will offer to the underlying bill which would ensure that the Federal Government finally makes good on its promise—its perennial promise, but it is an unkept promise—to secure America's borders. This will not be any surprise to the Presiding Officer or my colleagues that coming

from a State such as Texas, with a 1,200-mile common border with Mexico, this is a subject near and dear to my heart and that of my constituents. It is something we need to get right.

The Democratic majority leader, in an interview with the press, called my amendment a poison pill. But I thought that was unusual and even curious because we had not shared the language of the amendment with him or anyone else at the time he gave it that characterization. But I believe the opposite is, in fact, true. If we do not guarantee results on border security, if we do not guarantee to the American people that we actually are going to get serious about stopping the flow of people illegally crossing our southwestern border or the northern border, for that matter, I think we guarantee the failure of bipartisan immigration reform.

That is the real poison pill, failing to solve the problem and guarantee the results that the American people deserve and I think demand when it comes to dealing with our broken immigration system. If, in fact, by defeating sensible border security measures which guarantee implementation of border security, if by denying that, bipartisan immigration fails. Then the opponents of these sensible border security measures will have no one to blame but themselves, and that will prove to be the true poison pill.

For more than 25 years the American people have been told by Washington that it is actually serious about securing our borders. Of course, this became more urgent after 9/11 when we finally realized that although we were removed from places such as the Middle East, Europe, and Asia, we were not insulated by virtue of our proximity or a lack of proximity to these places. So we learned we are not safe in America just by ourselves; that we are vulnerable to attacks.

So this has given greater urgency to the importance of securing our borders and making sure we have a lawful immigration system that actually will work in the interests of the American people. We have also heard since 1986, when Ronald Reagan signed the first amnesty for 3 million people, it was premised on a promise of enforcement, and this would never ever happen again. The American people justifiably feel that the rug was pulled out from under them on that one when Congress and others undermined the enforcement measures that would make sure any future amnesties would no longer be required.

It is understandable and I believe justified for the American people to be skeptical about Congress when it makes promises without any means to implement guaranteed results. Back in 1996, Congress and President Clinton authorized a nationwide biometric entry-exit system to reduce visa overstays. Why is this important? Forty percent of illegal immigration occurs when people enter the country legally as tourists, students or other-

wise, and they simply overstay their visa because we have not yet, in the 17 years since President Clinton and Congress authorized, indeed demanded an entry-exit system—it still has not been implemented.

In other words, the Federal Government has always said the right things when it comes to reassuring the American people, but it has never been able to translate those promises into results that are actually implemented. No wonder the American people are profoundly skeptical. Do not take my word for it. As of 2011, the Department of Homeland Security had achieved operational control of less than 45 percent of the United States-Mexico border. That is according to a GAO report; 45 percent of the southwestern border with Mexico is operationally secure, in the opinion of the GAO. More recently, radar surveillance by a new technology called VADAR was reported in the Los Angeles Times to have been successful in showing situational awareness along the border where it was tested but that, in fact, the Border Patrol detained less than half of the people crossing the border.

That seems to be consistent with this idea of 45 percent operational control, where less than half of the people crossing were actually detained. A recent Council on Foreign Relations report showed similar security results—or failures I should say. Members of the Gang of 8, who I think have done the country a public service by bringing this matter to us, believe our goal should be 100 percent situational awareness of the southern border and a 90-percent apprehension rate of illegal border crossers.

This may surprise my colleagues, but I actually agree with those metrics and those standards: 100 percent situational awareness, 90 percent apprehension rate. Members of the Gang of 8 who brought us this legislation also believe we should implement a national E-Verify system so employers do not have to play police, and they can get a card they can swipe through a reader which will verify that a person who applies to work at their workplace is legally qualified to work in the United States.

I think absolutely that is good requirement. I agree with the Gang of 8's proposal. So I wonder why it is, why can they not take yes for an answer? If we agree on the standards they set, why can we not agree on sensible measures that will guarantee the implementation and the success of accomplishing the very goals they themselves have set?

The difference is simply that my amendment would require national E-Verify and a 90-percent apprehension rate and full situational awareness along the border, a biometric entry-exit system before immigrants transition from the registered provisional immigrant status—we will hear a lot about RPI—to legal permanent residency. This is the leverage Congress

and the American people have that will demand implementation of these security measures at the border and elsewhere.

Meanwhile, while my results amendment would guarantee implementation of these provisions that have been long promised but never delivered by Congress, the Gang of 8 bill would authorize permanent legalization regardless of whether our borders are ultimately secured, according to their own standards. In fact, their bill requires only substantial completion of a plan whose contents we haven't even seen yet. This is something that is supposed to be proposed by the Secretary of Homeland Security, but we don't know what that plan is going to be. There is no lever. There is no means of forcing the Department to actually implement it and to achieve the goal the Gang of 8 themselves have set.

My amendment contains a real border security trigger, while the Gang of 8 bill promises success but has absolutely no means to compel it. My amendment demands results, while the Gang of 8 bill is satisfied with just more promises, promises that historically have never been kept.

I want to reiterate: We agree on a number of things. We agree on the objectives for border security. We agree on the importance of worksite verification of the legal status of people who apply to work. That is an important part of immigration reform.

We agree on 100-percent situational awareness for our southwestern border, and we agree that the Department of Homeland Security should apprehend at least 90 percent of the people attempting to illegally cross the border. We agree on all of these realistic goals. The difference, once again, is that my amendment guarantees results, while the Gang of 8 proposal does not.

I will ask my colleagues who have done, as I said earlier, good work bringing this proposal to the floor why is it if we agree on the goals that you would disagree on the means to enforce those goals? It makes no sense to me. We don't disagree about as much as I think some people might suggest.

Another reason why I think this is not a poison pill is this is doable. The Gang of 8 said it is doable. I agree it is doable, but we need the leverage to compel the bureaucracy, Congress and everybody else, to actually make sure the American people aren't fooled again and the results that are part of the basic bargain contained in this bill are actually delivered.

Let me note a couple of other issues that I think need to be fixed in the underlying bill. Where the Gang of 8 would actually make it harder to prevent visa overstays by changing existing law, laws that have been on the books since 1986, my amendment has a border security trigger that will require a fully operational biometric entry-exit program at all seaports and airports.

Where the Gang of 8 bill would allow some criminals with violent histories

to attain immediate legal status, my amendment would prohibit such criminals from gaining the benefits of RPI status or earn citizenship. Why should we reward people who demonstrated their inability or unwillingness to comply with our criminal laws? Why should we reward them with a pathway or a possibility of earning American citizenship? These people ought to be disqualified. The hard-working otherwise honest people who want to come here and seek a better life should be granted the benefits of this bill while excluding violent criminals.

Where the Gang of 8 bill would prevent law enforcement from sharing information, my amendment would give law enforcement access to critical intelligence about threats to national security and public safety.

One of the great failures of the 1986 immigration bill was that law enforcement was banned from gaining access to information in the applications of people who applied for amnesty that was clearly fraudulent, that would have reflected organized criminal activity and that would have rooted it out. Unfortunately, this current bill, underlying bill, contains the same prohibitions against information sharing that were contained in the 1986 bill, which unfortunately resulted in massive fraud and criminality. We need to stop that and learn from the mistakes of the 1986 bill and not repeat that again. Adopting my amendment would address that.

Finally, where the Gang of 8 would do absolutely nothing to bolster infrastructure and personnel at land ports of entry along the southern border, my amendment would make sure resources are available to significantly reduce wait times, improve the infrastructure, and increase the personnel at our land ports of entry.

This is important because this personnel and this infrastructure serve the dual purpose. No. 1, it makes sure legitimate trade in commerce crosses our borders. Why is that important? Six million jobs in America depend on lawful cross-border trade. These people are dual use. What I mean by that is they are also available to make sure illegal crossing doesn't occur and that drug dealers can't move bulk drugs and other contraband across, and that human traffickers are stopped trying to exploit our land ports of entry.

One of the underlying premises of this approach is we need to separate the legal and the beneficial from the illegal and the harmful. When we do that, we can let our law enforcement personnel focus on the illegal and the harmful, while allowing those who are complying with our laws and are engaging in beneficial commerce with America. This creates jobs here in America and greater prosperity, and law enforcement won't have to spend or waste its time focusing on them so much.

I don't know how any objective observer could look at my amendment

and call it a poison pill. I think it is a mistake, again, because at the time the majority leader called it that, we hadn't even released the legislative language. I hope he and others will look at it carefully and work with us, because I think there is actually a path forward to bipartisan immigration reform that will secure our borders, eliminate the criminality in our system, and provide a legal means for America to be true to its values. It will look to its own economic self-interest in providing a pathway for legal immigration from the best and brightest, whom we ought to welcome with open arms.

I don't know how any objective observer could look at my amendment and call it a poison pill, especially because it embraces so many of the metrics included in the underlying Gang of 8 bill. All my amendment does is to guarantee results, rather than be satisfied with more promises that will never be kept.

This is the bottom line. Americans are tired of hearing endless border security promises without seeing any realistic mechanism for guaranteeing results. My amendment would guarantee such a mechanism, and it would guarantee the results Washington has long promised but never delivered.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak to the bill that will soon be before us, a bill to allow us a once-in-a-generation opportunity to tackle the complex challenges facing us in comprehensive immigration reform.

Immigrants have always played a central role in America's history, in our economy, in our culture, in our success as a Nation. Their importance cannot be overstated, but the system that makes it possible for immigrants to come here and contribute to that role is clearly in need of fundamental repair. America's immigration system today is badly out of sync with our values, and I believe it is up to us in the current Congress to fix it.

The earnest work of the group of eight Senators, the so-called Gang of 8, has given us, in my view, a once-in-a-generation opportunity that we must embrace. We cannot squander this moment and allow partisan politics, fearmongering, and mischaracterization of the underlying bill to get in the way of what we must accomplish in order to mend the rich fabric of our country and create a predictable pathway for legal immigration going forward.

I rise today to reflect on this historic opportunity to pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill that will make our country stronger, safer, and more vibrant for generations to come.

The legislation soon to be before this Chamber has earned such strong support in large part because it started as a bipartisan effort with Senators from

both sides of the aisle and different regions of the country drawing upon their own years of experience to produce a first draft. It confronted a wide array of problems with our badly broken current immigration system. It wasn't perfect, but it was a strong start, and I am extraordinarily grateful to the group of these eight Senators who put so much time and effort into laying that groundwork.

In the Judiciary Committee, Chairman LEAHY and Ranking Member GRASSLEY then led a markup, probably the first in my nearly 3 years here as a Senator, a full, robust, and historically open markup that achieved its goal of making the bill that comes before us stronger. They led an open and transparent process. They posted every proposed amendment online before the markup began so that each one could be thoughtfully considered by Senators, their staffs, and outside groups concerned about the bill.

The markup lasted 5 full days across 3 weeks, during which each Senator was permitted an unlimited opportunity to speak and offer amendments. This is the regular order of which so many more seasoned Senators speak with fondness, something more characteristic of the Senate's past than its present.

It led ultimately in the Judiciary Committee to 37 hours of markup debate. A great many of the amendments offered were accepted, Democratic amendments and Republican amendments. More than 300 amendments were filed. More than 200 amendments, if you consider first and second degree, were taken up, considered, and disposed of. More than 100 were offered by Democrats and Republicans. Ultimately, 136 of these amendments were adopted, all but 3 on a bipartisan basis. The bill was, as you know, ultimately reported out of committee with a healthy bipartisan vote of 13 to 5.

I am a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I too like all of my colleagues' amendments, studied my colleagues' amendments, debated those amendments, and ultimately I voted for this bill. I am proud of what the committee has accomplished.

I am proud that the bill is coming before us today, and it is stronger than the original bill, exactly because of the hard work done by the Judiciary Committee and the great leadership of our chairman, Senator PATRICK LEAHY of Vermont. It is stronger on border security. It is stronger when it comes to efficiency and using taxpayer dollars well, and it is stronger when it comes to fundamental fairness.

First, on border security, even the first draft of this bill offered by the bipartisan Gang of 8 contained historic levels of investment in improving border security. The bill's provisions to require control over the southern border and to mandate employment verification nationwide were already groundbreaking before the markup in the Judiciary Committee began.

Still, amendments were adopted in committee that strengthened these measures even further. Despite the protestations of some that this was a partisan or a lopsided markup, let me briefly detail some that were adopted that I think strengthened this provision of the bill.

Senator GRASSLEY, Republican of Iowa, the ranking member, offered an amendment that expands the bill's border security goals and metrics to cover the entire southern border, so that all border communities will benefit from the enhanced security investments made by the bill, not just those that are considered high risk.

Senator HATCH, Republican from Utah, offered an amendment that will mandate biometric exit processing at airports, beginning at the 10 largest international airports in the United States and soon thereafter 20 additional airports.

The committee also adopted amendments to strengthen background requirements in the bill.

An amendment by Senator FLAKE of Arizona required those in RPI status to undergo additional security screenings when they apply to renew their status.

An amendment offered by Senator GRAHAM requires additional national security screening for applicants from countries or regions that pose a national security threat to the United States or that harbor groups deemed to pose a national security threat.

Some in this Chamber have claimed this bill does not do enough to strengthen the security of our borders. That is simply and clearly not the case. This bill will make our country safer, and I believe it will make our country stronger.

In terms of efficiency, something we talk about a great deal in the budget climate today, the amendments considered during markup also resulted in substantive changes to the efficiency of our immigration system and to the implementation of the changes demanded by this bill. Already the bill as drafted makes important steps to clear the long backlogs of immigrants waiting for green cards who already have been approved by the Department of Homeland Security. Removing the senseless, current, per-country caps is one part of the solution I am proud to see in this bill.

One of my adopted amendments will streamline, for example, discovery procedures in immigration court to cut down on the needless cost of responding to each and every discovery request currently done through the less efficient Freedom of Information Act rather than a discovery process more typical in court proceedings.

Senator GRASSLEY offered amendments that required audits of the comprehensive immigration reform trust fund established by the bill and of all entities that receive grants under this bill. These amendments will ensure the significant cost of enhanced border security is spent efficiently and appropriately.

Senators LEAHY and CORNYN offered an amendment that gives the Department of Homeland Security flexibility with respect to the fence strategy fund to leverage the best technology at our disposal to achieve that task. The amendment also requires consultation with relevant stakeholders and respect for State and local laws in the implementation of fencing projects.

Democrats and Republicans, coming together, working together, made this bill stronger. We did it in the Judiciary Committee, and we can do it here on the floor of the Senate.

Last, America's immigration system should reflect America's fundamental values, and right now, in my view, it clearly does not.

This bill does make our immigration detention and court systems fairer and more humane, but it does not fix all of the unfairness in our current system. Indeed, there are some painful sacrifices we have had to make in this bill, especially when it comes to families being united, families with their siblings, or the recognition of mixed-status LGBT families in our country who receive no Federal protection under this bill. But the Judiciary Committee did make progress in making the bill fairer on some fronts.

An amendment from Senator BLUMENTHAL will allow DREAMers serving in the U.S. military to apply for citizenship on the same terms as those under current law.

The committee also adopted an amendment that I cosponsored with Senator LEE to ensure individuals are notified when their name receives a nonconfirmation determination or further action notice in the E-Verify system—a protection for vital privacy concerns.

Two of Senator FRANKEN's amendments will make the E-Verify system fairer for small businesses by ensuring they won't be penalized excessively for innocent noncompliance. They will also provide incentives to keep the error rate as low as possible.

What we have now before us is a bill that has been thoroughly vetted, substantially amended, and supported by the broadest coalition ever before seen in comprehensive immigration reform efforts.

This bill strengthens border security.

This bill creates a path to legal status and strikes the right balance to encourage those here who are undocumented to come out of the shadows, comply with law, pay a fine, pay taxes, and become full participants in our national society and restore the primacy of the rule of law.

This bill makes advancements in worker protection. Through enhanced employment verification, we strike at one of the most pervasive problems for American labor: the widespread hiring of undocumented labor at substandard wages and working conditions.

This bill will have immediate and significant benefits for our economy. We should always remember that immigration has been and will continue

to be a real boom, a lifeblood to our Nation's economy along all points of the labor spectrum. In addition to bringing millions out of the shadows and welcoming them as full participants in our society and economy, this bill will go a long way toward fixing our current backward-looking policies toward high-skilled immigrants who want to remain in the United States after receiving their advanced education.

In conclusion, I am proud of what this bill means for our country and what it has shown about our ability in the Senate to work together to advance meaningful changes to improve our Nation. There are no perfect laws, but considering just how broken our immigration system is now, it is unquestionably a giant leap forward. I am confident that if we can continue to work together on the floor here as we did in the Judiciary Committee, we will be able to find more common ground and continue to strengthen this bill in the upcoming weeks. We can make the most of this historic opportunity and finally build a modern immigration system that reflects America's values and makes our country strong.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that time during the quorum call be charged equally to both sides.

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

Mr. COONS. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we have before us a 1,000-page bill that is extremely difficult to read and to understand. We are being asked to vote on it, and Majority Leader REID indicated that he wants a list of amendments, and presumably no more would be agreed to, and he is going to pick and choose which ones he would approve by the end of this week. I believe that is very premature. I do not believe that is the way we should be proceeding. We have to have the time to sufficiently analyze all the complexities that are here.

I have to say to my gang members who produced this bill, this tome, that you spent months working on it with special interest groups and lawyers and the Obama administration's staff, and you produced a bill, and now we have to rush it through the Senate, and I don't think that is the right thing to do.

Let me read from one of the sections in the bill. And I hope my colleagues know that if they begin to read the bill, they will know how hard it is. This is not an easy bill to read. You have to study it, and you have to have lawyers reading it, and you have to find out what the exceptions are and

what the limitations are and what the additions are. The lawyers who wrote it know. The Gang of 8 doesn't know, I assure you. They don't know all the details that are in this legislation. It is not possible for them to do so. The people who are writing it—the special interest groups, union groups, business groups, ag business groups, meat packers group, LaRaza, immigration lawyers association—all of them were working on it. They know what the impacts are.

But how about this section right here from the guest worker section. This is subparagraph (B), Numerical Limitation. This apparently has to do with the number of people who would be admitted: Subject to subparagraph (D), the number of registered positions that may be approved by the Secretary for a year after the fourth year referred to in paragraph (1)(A)(iv) shall be the equal of—get this—subparagraph (i), the number of such registered positions available under this paragraph for the preceding year, and, subparagraph (ii), the product of subparagraph (I), the number of such registered positions available under this paragraph for the preceding year, multiplied by subparagraph (II), the index for the current year calculated under subparagraph (C).

Do you think that is easy to understand? But it has meaning, and what it basically means is that this bill is going to allow more workers to come into this country than we have ever allowed before at a time when unemployment is extraordinarily high, our ability to reduce unemployment is down, wages are down, and our workers are falling below the inflation rate in their wages for years.

How about the second paragraph? Now, I am just reading this. So we are going to rush this through? Really?

Subparagraph (C), Index: The index calculated under this subparagraph for a current year equals the sum of subparagraph (i), one-fifth of a fraction, subparagraph (I), the numerator of which is the number of registered positions that registered employers apply to have approved under subsection (e)(1) for the preceding year minus the number of registered positions approved under subsection (e) for the preceding year and, subparagraph (II), the denominator of which is the number of registered positions approved under subsection (e) for the preceding year.

I am sure we all got that. I am sure we know exactly what that means.

And it goes on: Subparagraph (iii), three-tenths of a fraction, subparagraph (I), the numerator of which is the number of unemployed U.S. workers for the preceding year minus the number of unemployed U.S. workers for the current year and, subparagraph (II), the denominator of which is the number of unemployed U.S. workers for the preceding year.

And then it goes on: Subparagraph (iv), three-tenths of a fraction.

It goes on.

Somebody knows what that means because you had special interests in charge of writing this big monstrosity. They were there. They wanted their deal.

I would say to my colleagues and to those in the Gang of 8—and I know they want to do the right thing and have worked hard, but they got off on the wrong track.

The papers reported for weeks: Well, the unions are here and the chamber of commerce is here and the ag workers and ag industry people are here, and they want more workers for this, and this one is demanding more workers for that. And our Senators are over here somehow letting them all hammer it out, and that is how this writing comes up. It came from them. The Senators didn't write this.

They knew exactly what they were doing. They were putting in numbers to get certain workers that businesses wanted so they can have more employees and they can keep wages down. That is what the scheme was—more workers, less competition for labor, loose labor market, fewer pay raises, less overtime, fewer benefits because the employer has options.

Remember, these are guest workers. These are not people on a citizenship path. They are not here to form corporations and hire millions of people and cure cancer. These are workers who come in and work for existing corporations. I would emphasize that some thought needs to be given to that. We haven't talked about that yet. We are going to talk about it.

This large of an increase in immigration into our country has real impact, and a lot of the numbers and a lot of the data that is out there has not been challenged, and the data indicates that we are already at a point where the flow of immigrant labor into America is depressing wages, and it is a big factor in the cause of workers' wages today being 8 percent, in real terms, below what they were in 1999. Wages haven't been going up. Democrats used to talk about it. They used to hammer President Bush on it all the time. Now that Barack Obama has been in office for 5 years, you don't hear them talking about it anymore. Well, Senator SANDERS talked about it on the floor last week. I give him credit for that. Of course, he is an Independent. But I haven't heard my Democratic colleagues continue to repeat the fact that steadily we are seeing a decline in wage rates in America, making it harder for middle-class Americans to get by—and what about even finding a job?

So it is not a small matter. We are going to have to talk about this. We don't need to rush this through. It seems quite clear—crystal clear—to me that the Gang of 8 never discussed this. They certainly didn't call Professor Borjas at Harvard. Dr. Borjas is the leading expert on immigration and labor and the impact of it in America. He has written books on it. I believe his study says that a 40-percent fall in

wages for American citizens is attributable to the current flow of immigrant labor into America. It pulls down wages. It is free market. If you bring more cotton into America, the price of cotton falls. If you bring in more labor, the price of labor falls. That is the way the market forces work. He said this is a factor right now. But we need to understand that if 15 million people are legalized virtually immediately and the guest worker program appears to double the number of people who will come in and the immigrant flow, permanent immigrant flow of people who want to become citizens will increase 50 percent, then we will have one of the largest increases in flow of labor to America we have ever seen, and we cannot get jobs with decent pay for American workers right now.

That is real out there. People are worried about their families. They are worried about their children's ability to get a job. They are worried about their grandchildren's ability to get a job. They are about to graduate from high school. They don't have a college degree. Maybe they don't plan to go to college. They are willing to work. Jobs are not that plentiful. Did you see the article, in Philadelphia, I believe it was, that they said they had job openings to try to help people who have had a criminal conviction in their background. They expected 1,000 people and 3,000 showed up. They had to cancel it and reset the whole deal because they interviewed people who said you cannot find a job in Philadelphia.

In New York, one of the boroughs of New York, there was a very interesting article just 2 weeks ago about job openings for elevator mechanics. People waited 5 days—they took tents out—to stay in line to try to get those jobs. The number of people waiting in line was 20 times the number of jobs that were out there or more. So we are going to reward people who entered the country illegally? We have to understand in this bill right here, if the bill is passed, the people who have come here—many are in the shadows and that is correct and that is a sad thing and it is a difficult thing—but those individuals also will be able to go apply for the elevator mechanic job. They will also be able to compete for employment in Philadelphia, where right now they might not be so able to contribute. It raises real questions.

I wish to mention this. This is from this Saturday from the Washington Post. You heard that there are good job numbers, right? The job numbers were not so great it appears to me: 175,000 jobs were created last month, according to the Washington Post, based on new government data that was released Friday. The Labor Department said unemployment went up from 7.5 to 7.6, so the unemployment rate went up, even though the number of jobs was 175,000 created. What I wish to point out is this fact that is in the report:

The bulk of the gains in May were in the service industry, which added 57,000 jobs.

Still, about half of those were temporary positions—

Those were temporary, not real jobs. I continue—

suggesting that businesses remained uncertain of consumer demand.

Missing from the picture were production jobs in industries such as construction and manufacturing.

Those were not the kind of jobs being created.

Meanwhile, manufacturing shed 8,000 workers.

American manufacturers reduced employment last month and those are the better jobs with the retirement pay and with health benefits that come with a good manufacturing company. We are creating more and more competition for lower wage jobs. The article goes on to say this in addition:

Some economists have raised concerns about the types of jobs being created. Sectors such as retail, restaurants, bars have been adding plenty of jobs, but those positions tend to pay low wages. Friday's report showed workers' average hourly earnings rose only a penny in May, to \$23.89. For the entire year, wages have risen 2 percent.

Again, that is below the inflation rate. Again, we continue to have this situation in which wages trail inflation, which means the average American is having a hard time getting by and many of these jobs are part-time, not permanent. They are the kind of jobs a lot of people would look to advance from, whether working in a restaurant or something such as that. They will be looking to move forward. The kind of manufacturing jobs we would like to see more of are not there.

I mentioned the work visas in this process. Despite a huge increase in the numbers of those who are going to be legalized and put on a path to permanent residence and citizenship, we have a large number of people in this total number. For example, under the bill, it is widely conceded that we would legalize 11 million people. They would be put on a path to legal permanent residence and into citizenship, 11 million, all of whom entered the country illegally and are here in violation of the law.

What is not mentioned is that there is another 4.5 million who are in—they call it a backlogged status. They are basically chain migration members, family members who want to come, but under our current law we have a cap, a limit on how many family members are allowed to enter each year. As a result, the backlog, they call it, has moved up to 4.5 million. So now we have people say this. They have been saying we should not give the 11 million here illegally advantage over people waiting in line. That was a problem for the Gang of 8. I can see them sitting around, dealing with that. How can we give somebody here, waiting in line patiently and lawfully, status behind that of someone who has been here working in the country with false documents, illegally? That wouldn't be right.

How did they solve that? As Washington does, they legalize them too. You say 4.5 million are waiting? They just let them come in too. We will be initially processing 15 million people. Then what about the annual future flow? Now it is the most generous flow in the world. We admit a little over 1 million people a year under our legal flow into the country. What about that? In light of all this accelerated admissions and legal status, should we reduce the number of people who are coming here each year lawfully now for a while? Oh, no, that is increased—50 percent, according to the Los Angeles Times. It could be more. I will accept that number. So instead of 1 million a year, that is 1.5 million. Over 10 years, that is 15 million. That results in 30 million people in 10 years being given lawful permanent status in America.

Already that is 10 percent of the entire population of America, and overwhelmingly this group is low skilled. Over half of the people here illegally do not have a high school diploma from their own home country and they are not able to take the better jobs. They will be competing for the lower wage jobs in America. If they are legalized, legal immigrants who entered the country a few years ago, they are going to find—maybe they were legalized in 1986, maybe they have come legally since, but that immigrant population is going to find their wages pulled down by this large amount of flow of labor into the country. I do not think there is any doubt about that. We will go more into detail about that as we go forward, but we are talking about 30 million being given legal status on a path to permanent legal residence and citizenship over the next 10 years.

They will be given that status. We have not discussed that.

I asked Senator SCHUMER at the committee twice: How many will be admitted under your bill? He refused to answer. I am not sure they know because these numbers are not all the numbers. There is an additional group of people who will come under the chain migration theory, the family-based connection and other special provisions in here that have no caps, no limits on how many would come. He refused to answer. The sponsors who are producing legislation for us today will not say how many people they expect to enter into our country if their bill passes. Why not? You don't know or you will not say? Either one is an indictment of this monstrosity and that is why it cannot pass.

Even Senator RUBIO is now saying he can't vote for the bill unless it is improved. He was in the Gang of 8. This is legislation that is flawed legislation, fatally flawed, and it should not become law—it just should not. They said a lot of good things about what they expect the bill to do. If it did those things, we would be more interested in it. We would have a framework for a bill that could actually do some good. I would say that for sure.

As we go forward, we need to ascertain with absolute clarity what the best economic data shows about how many people this country can absorb in a reasonable way and be able to provide a decent place for them to work without pulling down the wages of an already-stressed American workforce. We need to talk about that. So far as I can tell, that was never discussed in the groups. What was discussed pretty much in the groups, it seemed to me, was businesses demanding more workers, La Raza demanding more people and basically open borders and they were the ones writing the legislation, in large part. There were some union objections to some of this. It needs to be listened to.

Republicans say that is a union objection. If they make a good objection, so be it. I think they made some points but went along with this in a way that is not effective.

We have to talk about the economic impact of it and we will. We need to ascertain the second aspect: The 30 million people I just mentioned, those 30 million are people who come permanently. They are on a path never to return to their country. They have a legal status that allows them to get legal permanent residence and then get citizenship.

Normally, as I say, we do 1 million a year, which would be 10 million over 10 years. This will increase it to 15 million over 10 years, and that does not count the 11 million, plus the 4.5 million who will be given legal status. It is pretty clear to me it is indisputable that we will have 30 million people put on the path to citizenship in the United States of America, and I ask my colleague, if they have a different number, they should share it with us. Maybe in these bills, subparagraphs, numerators and denominators and fractions and all, they have a different number. I would like to hear it. We think we figured it out. The Los Angeles Times agrees. The only analysis I have seen agrees with it, as best we can do in the time since the bill was introduced.

Then we have the worker programs. That is what I was reading about earlier. Let me mention those programs. These are programs that have generally been referred to as the guest worker programs. We believe, and I think data shows, that the bill doubles the number of guest workers who would be allowed into the country. Every year we bring in a certain number of people. Some work in agriculture, some work in landscaping, some work in others things. In a time of high unemployment, with Americans doing landscaping, Americans are working in meatpacking plants and doing farm work. But temporary, seasonal jobs are often hard to fill and guest workers can do that. I am not opposed to a guest worker program. But at this point in history, should it be double the number on top of the 30 million I just mentioned? This is an annual flow on top of that.

For example, it adds four times more guest workers than the 2007 bill that the American people and Congress rejected. There are four times the number of guest workers in that bill at a time when 20 million more Americans are on food stamps than in 2007. Teenage unemployment is 54 percent higher and median household income is 8 percent lower than in 2007?

Are we so desperate now we have to bring in twice as many guest workers? Where are they going to find work? Are we going to disappoint them? What if they cannot find work? Will they be able to say: Well, I will work for minimum wage?

What happens to the young American who is 20 and would like to do some work? Perhaps he has a child and is trying to learn a skill and get started as a carpenter, bricklayer, or equipment operator. Will that make his ability to find a job harder?

What if a young guy had a drug offense? I used to be a Federal prosecutor. Just because somebody was arrested and prosecuted for drugs, we don't want to make it so they can never get work again. Who is going to take care of them?

We know this: We know if people don't have a job, the government has transfer payments, such as food stamps, Medicaid, housing allowances, and other benefits. So now does the taxpayer have to pay for even more people who are subsidized by the government because they honestly cannot find a job?

My colleagues need to focus on this, and there has been almost no serious discussion about it other than what we hear from certain squeaky wheels and special interests.

How many of our colleagues know the difference between the H-1B visa, the H-1B-B1 visa, the H-2A visa, the H-2B visa, and the H-4 visa? How many will come in under each one of them? What standards will they use? Do we actually have to make sure we have advertised and offered the job to an American first before using this visa?

Those are just the H visas. What about the W-1 visa, the W-2 visa, and the W-3 visa? There is also the E-3 visa, the E-4 visa, and the E-5 visa. Let's not forget the X visa and the Y visa. It goes on and on. That is how we have a doubling of the number of people coming in under the guest worker program.

Our sponsors have spent 4 months bringing this up. Clearly, they should have spent much more time because the bill is fatally flawed. The only thing that clearly works in the bill—the only thing that is guaranteed to work—is the amnesty. Once this bill has passed, it is guaranteed that people who are here illegally will be given legal status. They will then be placed on a path to legal permanent residence and then citizenship. That is what is guaranteed. All we have, as in 1986, is a promise that we will have enforcement in the future.

A lot of us have been around here for several years, and we know that is not going to work. This promise is just that, a promise. We don't have the backing to make it sure. Senator CORNYN has an idea that he thinks will strengthen that, and I know it will strengthen it.

Well, I appreciate the opportunity to share these thoughts. Senator CRUZ is now in the Judiciary Committee dealing with some other important issues of which I am glad that able lawyer is there. He will be speaking about this later.

Mr. President, how much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 17 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Senator CORNYN indicated that the bill fails with regard to enforcement and enforcement at the border. I could not agree more. In 2007, Senator CORNYN spent a lot of time working on this bill. He proposed an amendment then that would have improved the border enforcement, and he is an expert at that. He is a Senator from Texas. He has wrestled with this over the years, and we should absolutely listen to him.

We also know this: The people who are out there enforcing the law every day are telling us the system is not working. They tell us changes and improvements need to be effected, and they are concerned this bill doesn't do it.

On June 10, the Rockingham County Sheriff's Office in North Carolina issued a press release stating that more than 75 North Carolina sheriffs warned Congress that the Senate immigration bill would endanger public safety.

Well, that is a pretty serious matter. They say this:

In a short time, over seventy-five Sheriffs from across North Carolina, serving counties both big and small across this great state, have signed the attached letter opposing the current Senate immigration plan.

Our first responsibility and highest duty as Sheriffs is to provide for the safety of the citizens residing in the communities we serve. Unfortunately, this flawed bill which was produced by the "Gang of Eight" puts the public safety of citizens across the U.S. at risk and hampers the ability of law enforcement officers to do their job.

They go on to say:

This Senate Bill should be opposed by lawmakers and instead, Congress should work with law enforcement on reforms that we already have, and were willing to propose, that will enhance public safety.

Kenneth Palinkas, American Federation of Government Employees Union president and affiliated with the AFL-CIO, wrote this letter:

There has been much public concern over the fact that the legalization occurs prior to any border enforcement. Indeed, from what I understand, every amendment offered in committee which made legalization contingent on first achieving border security was defeated. History tells us that future promises will not be kept and that our border agents will be left high and dry by the executive branch as they have so many times before, regardless of who writes the plan.

This is the head of a Federal employees union who represents law enforcement officers—I think the biggest one. He goes on to say:

But even if you completely rewrote your proposals to resolve the many border security concerns and changed the ordering to delay legalization, the legislation would still fail and would still endanger the public because of the fatally flawed interior enforcement components.

He goes on to say:

If passed, S. 744 would lead to the rubber stamping of millions of applications for both amnesty and future admissions.

He goes on to say:

Why should the Senate pass a bill that makes it even more difficult for the USCIS officers—

They are the citizenship and immigration officers—

to identify, remove, and keep out public safety threats.

Maybe those people are criminals in their own countries. What does a person do if they are about to go to jail in another country in the world? Well, if they can flee the country and get to the United States, that is not a bad thing. Over the last decade, we are seeing more criminals who are a part of the mix of the very fine and decent people who come to the country because they are perhaps, in effect, fleeing prosecution in their own country.

What about the ICE officers, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Council? They wrote a letter with Pennsylvania and North Carolina sheriffs, as well as sheriffs nationwide, on May 29, and they say this:

Congress can and must take decisive steps to limit the discretion of political appointees and empower ICE and CBP to perform their respective missions and enforce laws enacted by Congress.

This is a bold statement. These people work for the President of the United States—or at least as part of the administration. Two years ago ICE officers voted no confidence in their supervisor, John Morton, because they said he spends more time dealing with pro-amnesty groups and directing them not to enforce the law than doing his duty. They have actually sued Secretary Napolitano and Mr. Morton for blocking them from executing plain congressional mandates. They believe they have no other obligation than to enforce this. They have to do it, but they have been told not to do it.

They say:

Rather than limiting the power of those political appointees within the DHS, S. 744 provides them with nearly unlimited discretion, which will serve only to further cripple the law enforcement missions of these agencies.

I have talked to these officers. They asked to be a participant with the Gang of 8 in writing this legislation, and they were refused. They asked repeatedly. They warned that this was not going to work. They never wanted to hear from the people who enforced the law every day. They wanted to hear from the amnesty crowd, and that is

who they met with. They wanted to hear from the big business guys who want more cheap labor, and that is who wrote the bill. They didn't listen to the people who deal with this and put their lives on the line.

This letter continues:

While business groups, activists, and other special interests were closely involved in drafting S. 744, law enforcement personnel were excluded from those meetings. Immigration officers, state, and local law enforcement working directly with the nation's broken immigration system were prohibited from providing input. As a result, the legislation before us may have many satisfactory components for powerful lobbying groups and other special interests, but on the subjects of public safety, border security, and interior enforcement, this legislation fails. It is a dramatic step in the wrong direction.

That is a pretty resounding condemnation, and I think that is fundamentally correct because I met with them. I asked that group of people to meet with them, and they would not do it.

Participants on the recent calls that discussed this bill and how to promote it include the heads at Goldman Sachs, the Business Roundtable, Evercore, Silver Lake, Centerbridge Partners, the U.S. Chamber of Congress, as well as the head of Washington trade groups representing banking industries, such as, the Financial Services Roundtable. They all had input into it and were involved. I guess they made contributions to it.

On June 10, Thomas Hodgson, sheriff of Bristol County—from Massachusetts—said:

I have grave concerns about illegal criminals being eligible for citizenship and gang members being permitted to qualify for RPI status, registered provision immigrant, legal status once they renounce their affiliation. Most troubling, however, is the fact that we do not have adequate systems in place such as biometrics to verify identification for people entering or leaving the United States. Announcing that biometrics will be available at our 30 busiest airports serves only to limit illegal entry at those locations, diverting illegal entry to those locations without the superior technology.

The sheriff said:

I ask you to make it known to your senators and representative that they vote no on passage of S. 744 until a comprehensive security plan is in place.

Peter Nunez, former U.S. attorney in San Diego, a great U.S. attorney whom I had the honor to serve with, said this:

But of greatest concern is the so-called "trigger" that we are told will delay the path to citizenship until the border is secure.

That is what they are saying. We have this thing in place, and until we guarantee the border is secure, the legalization doesn't happen. We have demonstrated already that is absolutely ineffective.

Mr. Nunez goes on to say:

This is an illusion meant to fool the public into believing that amnesty will only take place after the border is secure. Nothing could be further from the truth. Because on Day One, every one of the 11 million illegal aliens will be eligible for a temporary document allowing them to stay and work in the U.S., their two most important goals.

He was a U.S. attorney on the California border and he worked with these issues and understands them. He had the responsibility of prosecuting cases by the thousands—probably hundreds of thousands, frankly. Former U.S. Attorney Nunez is a very wise and experienced person.

Pinal County Sheriff's Office, Florence, AZ, Sheriff Babeu said to secure the border first or we will repeat history. Quote:

Pinal County Sheriff Babeu has announced his opposition to the proposed immigration reform offered by the so-called "Gang of Eight." Officially titled the "Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013."

Sheriff Babeu said:

We must secure the border first, prior to any discussion of green cards and a path to citizenship offered to nearly 20 million illegals and their families. This plan gives everything to President Obama up front, while border security is promised once again on the back end. We are about to repeat history, when in 1986 President Reagan gave amnesty to 2 million illegals. Now, the stakes are far higher, yet it seems we haven't learned our lesson. The failure to secure the border after the Reagan amnesty got us to where we are today with 11 million to 20 million illegals in our Country. . . . this plan will repeat history.

I think he is exactly right about that.

Chris Crane, the head of the ICE union, is outspoken about this. He has testified before the House. He has had press conferences here in which I participated with him. He has warned this will make America less secure, not more secure. He warns it makes the ability of the ICE agents to enforce the law, already handicapped, even more problematic. He says the bill gives to the Secretary essentially more discretion to violate the law than the Secretary has today. In fact, the orders and directives and policies they are giving to the ICE officers about how to do their job are currently in direct violation of the law. This bill ratifies that by explicitly giving statutory authority to the Secretary to make all kinds of waivers for other matters. That is not the way to give confidence to America.

Mr. President, I don't know what our time is. I see no one else on the floor. I don't want to take anybody else's time, but if I yielded the floor, I guess their time would run against them anyway.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair.

Our law enforcement officers are frustrated. We have three major law enforcement groups, including Border Patrol, which was given considerable funding after the failure of the 2006 and 2007 comprehensive immigration bill, and they have enhanced their efforts as a result of that, but we still are not where we need to be at the border. Indeed, since the announcement of this

possible amnesty, illegal entries have increased significantly on our borders. The number of people arrested is considerably higher this year than last year, and 55,000 of the 90,000 people—90,000 who have been arrested this year since January—were not from Mexico; this was primarily on the Mexican border—but from other countries. Some of the countries have a history of terrorism. Senator CORNYN has talked about that previously. We have a surge of it happening, and they are concerned about it, about protecting their officers.

Customs and the citizenship and immigration officers are the people who will process the amnesty claims and the requests to be treated as lawful residents that will occur after this bill passes. They are the people who deal with those who make application to come to the United States, and they are the people who process the pathway to citizenship for everybody. They have explicitly voted in opposition to this legislation. They say it does not work. I just read a quote from the head of their union. The ICE officers who deal with all of the interior enforcement—they apprehend people who have been convicted of crimes and are in State and local jails who are noncitizens or who are illegally here and they are supposed to deport them—have been consistently out front pointing out how they have been restricted in their ability to do their job, and that if this bill passes and the vast majority of those here illegally are legalized, they are not in the future going to be placed in a position where they can do their job. They are not going to be placed in a position where they can effectively manage the interior enforcement in America. They say the bill will make us less secure, not more secure. How wrong a direction could that be?

So those are the things we have to get a grip on here. That is why the legislation cannot become law, and I don't think—it won't become law as it is written today. That is the truth. One way or the other, it will not become law, because it is fatally flawed.

I thank the Chair for the opportunity to share these remarks as we begin the discussion on one of the great issues of our time: immigration. It has to be done right. The American people are rightly, as are these law officers, concerned that we are about to do another 1986, that we are going to give immediate lawful status to millions of people who came here illegally on the promise we will enforce the law in the future. But when we read the bill we can see that won't happen, and we will be sending another message worldwide that the United States is such that if one can get into our country illegally and hold on for long enough, that person too will be a beneficiary of the third major amnesty that occurs.

So that is where we are.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

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

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

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I am happy to be on the floor today as we get ready to proceed to the immigration bill and start to debate it. I wish to lay out a couple of points as we move forward on this debate which I fully anticipate we will do. We need to do so as a country, actually for many of the reasons my colleague from Alabama raised, because of these problems we face with regard to our immigration system.

Let's take a step back and analyze the issue a little while for the people who are tuning in for the first time or maybe people are visiting Washington and are perhaps listening to us talk about it, to provide a fundamental understanding of what we are addressing. Let's begin by saying the obvious, which is that all Americans understand immigration because it is their story, whether it is you, your parents, grandparents, great-grandparents, or great-great-grandparents. One of the defining characteristics of the United States of America is that it is literally a collection of people from all over the world or descendants of people from all over the world who have come here in search of a better life.

I think it is important to understand why that distinguishes us from the rest of the world and the attitudes of the rest of the world throughout history. If we look at the countries that have been organized throughout human history, the nation states, all of these countries have largely been organized because these people had a common ethnicity or a common race or they came from the same tribe or the same family clan or what-have-you. The United States is very different. The United States was actually founded on the notion that we are going to create a country that believes fundamentally in the God-given right of every single human being to go as far as their talent and work will take them. People such as myself who have been born and raised here our entire lives, sometimes we take that for granted, but we need to understand that throughout history it is a rarity. In fact, throughout history, what people have been told by their leaders is: You can only go so far in life because that is what your parents did, that is where your parents come from, so that is all you are allowed to do. But we were different, and thank God we were.

What we said is, We don't care how poor you were the day you were born; it doesn't matter to us that your parents weren't well connected and well heeled; we don't even care that you are from another country. If a person wants to work hard and build a better

life for him or herself, we want that person. That has been the history of the United States: a collection of go-getters from all over the world who have come here and built this extraordinary country and, as a result, the influence this country has had not just on human history but even to modern day is unbelievable culturally and economically, in terms of ensuring peace, especially in the aftermath of World War II. All of it is the result of this particular reality about who we are as a people and as a Nation. We have always had immigration, and we will always need immigration, to keep the nature and the essence of who we are as a people.

But times change and the immigration system has to change with those times. In essence, the immigration system we had 100 years ago, 150 years ago—people forget this: What was the immigration system of the United States? Not so long ago, this was the immigration system in the United States: If you got here, you were allowed to stay. If you made that dangerous voyage across the Atlantic, if you found your way to this country, if you were processed through Ellis Island or somewhere else, you were allowed to stay. We can't do that anymore. We have to have a controlled immigration system, especially in the 21st century, to measure who is coming here, who they are, and why they are here. That is the way it has to work now in the 21st century. We understand that.

Adding to that, by the way, is the reality that the 21st century is so different from the 20th. We are actively engaged in global competition. It wasn't so long ago, such as when my parents came in 1956, the United States was still a national economy. The people we traded with and sold with and competed against lived in this country, probably in one's own State or in one's own community. No more. Today we are actively involved in global competition for business, for clients, and for talent, so we have to understand our immigration system has to reflect these changes. The way people immigrate and who immigrates here now has to reflect the 21st century reality, which is reason No. 1 why this country needs immigration reform.

All the attention is being paid to illegal immigration, and, look, that is a serious problem. I am going to talk about that in a moment. But issue No. 1, the fundamental reason we have to do immigration reform, is because we do not have a 21st-century immigration system. Our immigration system today is largely built on the idea that if you have a relative living here, it is easier for you to come than if you have a special skill or talent that you are offering to the country to contribute.

We do not have a merit-based system, we have a family-based system. I say that as someone whose family came on a family-based system. My parents came here because my mom's sister

claimed her in 1956. But the country is so different, the world is so different—so different from 2006, not to mention 1956—and our immigration system has to reflect that.

The problem is we have a broken legal immigration system. It does not reflect the realities of the 21st century. The result is that even if we did not have a single illegal immigrant in the United States, we should be on the floor of the Senate debating immigration reform because we must modernize our legal immigration system. That, as much as anything else, is the reason my colleagues should be excited about the opportunity to have this debate, because we have to modernize our legal immigration system so it is a benefit to our country.

I give this anecdote because I think it is appropriate: We are in the NBA finals—which, by the way, the Miami Heat won game 2 in a resounding fashion, and we are very happy about that. We will see what happens tonight. But imagine for a second if there was now the hottest basketball player in the country, who played at some college in the United States—6 feet 10 inches, never misses a shot, just an unbelievable player. Do you think in your wildest dreams we would ever let that person go play in Italy or Spain or some other country? There is no way in the world we are going to allow the best basketball player in the world—no matter where they were born, no matter where they came from, no matter their immigration status—there is no way in the world we are going to let a future NBA star leave the United States and go play basketball in some other country, in a European league or the Greek league or whatever. They are going to stay here.

So my question to you is, If that is how we approach sports—which is important, I guess, but it is a game—shouldn't that be the way we approach our economy? Should we be deporting the best graduates at some of our universities—world-class physicists and scientists and people in technology and engineering and math? Yet that is the way functionally our immigration system works right now. I am not making this up. We have heard the testimony. We have heard the people who come into our offices. There is not a Member in this body who has not had a meeting in their office, or their staff has not, with someone from the tech community who will come to you and say: We are going to college campuses, we are making job offers to the best and brightest, and we cannot keep them here—not because they do not want to stay here, not because they are not qualified, not because we do not have a job opening, but because we cannot get them a green card or a legal status. So they are learning at our universities, at the expense of the American taxpayer, and then they are leaving the United States to compete against us.

That makes no sense, nor does, by the way, the system of getting workers

for agriculture, which I would argue in many respects is skilled labor. If you do not believe me, go watch some of these people in the fields as they work, doing the work they do.

But American agriculture, you talk about energy security. If you want to cripple a country, cripple their food security, cripple their agricultural security. Agriculture is an important industry in most of the States of the country and certainly for the United States of America. That industry depends on a workforce, and there is a demand for labor in that workforce. The fact is, and has been for over 100 years, that the only way to fully fill all the jobs available in agriculture is through seasonal and temporary labor from abroad. There is a real demand for that labor, and there is a real supply of people who want to do that labor. Supply and demand will always meet. But because we do not have a functional legal immigration system that allows the supply of foreign workers to meet the demand of domestic jobs in agriculture, supply and demand are meeting, but they are meeting in a chaotic and broken way. That needs to be reformed, as well as a bunch of other aspects.

The immigration system is very bureaucratic and complicated. In fact, our broken legal immigration system is one of the leading contributors to illegal immigration. Over 40 percent of the people in this country illegally today came legally. They did not jump a fence. They did not sneak in. They came on some sort of temporary visa and they overstayed it. One of the leading reasons they overstay is they think it is too costly, too time-consuming, and too bureaucratic to come back again legally in the future.

So I guess my point is, even if we did not have a single illegal immigrant in the United States, we need to do immigration reform because we must modernize our legal immigration system, and it must reflect the 21st century.

The second point I will make to you is our immigration laws are only as good as our ability to enforce them. We do not have enforcement mechanisms that work. All the attention is paid to the border, and it should be, because the border is not just an immigration issue, it is a national security issue. That means the same routes that are used to smuggle in immigrants can be used to smuggle in weapons and terrorists and other things—and drugs.

So we must secure the border. That is not easy to do because there is no such thing as one border. The border is broken up into about nine different sectors. Some are doing much better than they ever have; others are not doing very well at all. We must secure the border of the United States for national security reasons as well as immigration reasons. I know it is hard to do it, and I know there have been efforts in the past that have failed, but I am telling you that I refuse to accept the idea that the most powerful coun-

try on Earth, the Nation that put a man on the Moon, is incapable of securing its own borders.

Our sovereignty is at stake in terms of border security. Border security is not an anti-immigration or anti-immigrant measure, it is an important national security measure. But it is also an important defense of our sovereignty. We must protect our borders.

Likewise, we have to understand that even if we protect our borders, the magnet that is bringing people to the United States is employment. So we have to create a system, which we are capable of doing in the 21st century, we must create a system that allows employers to verify that the person they are hiring is legally here; hence, all this talk of E-Verify. Last but not least, because 40 percent of the people who are here illegally entered legally, we have to have a system that tracks when visitors enter and when they leave.

My colleagues will tell you that is already required by law, and it is. The problem is that the way it is required right now will never work. That is why this bill deals with that. We have to have a system so when you are visiting the United States on a temporary visa—as a tourist, on business, whatever it may be—we track you. You log in when you come in and you log in when you leave.

Every hotel in America knows when their guests come in and when they leave. Every hotel in America knows that. Multiple businesses track people when they come in and when they leave. We do this every single day as a matter of routine in our lives. The Federal Government should be able to do that, and it must do that. This bill requires that they do that, and it creates a real incentive to do that, and I will talk about that in a moment. But, basically, the incentive is that the green card process, for those who are here illegally in this country—that does not start until that system is fully in place. By the way, it also does not start until E-Verify is fully in place. These are significant security measures we must undertake.

When you hear people say: Well, the bill weakens the status quo and the law, the problem is that the status quo is not working. There is a reason we have 11 million people here illegally, and it is because the status quo—the current law—there is a flaw in it. There is a flaw in E-Verify. The flaw in E-Verify is that you basically show up at your employer and you show them a Social Security card. It may not be your Social Security card, but that is all you have to show them. It is happening all the time. People are either falsifying the document or borrowing someone else's, and they are using someone else's legal documentation to find a job.

We have to create a new E-Verify, one that allows us to verify that the person holding that card is actually that person; otherwise, arguing in

favor of the status quo is arguing in favor of continuing the fraud. We have to stop that from happening. So we have to have security elements as part of this bill—border security, E-Verify, and entry-exit tracking.

The last issue—and it is the one that gets all the attention—is what to do with the people who are here illegally now. Let me begin by saying to you that I do not know anyone who is happy about the fact that we have approximately 10.5 million to 11 million human beings living in the United States illegally. I would also remind you that every one of their stories is different. I would caution people not to lump them all into one basket because they are all very different. Some came legally and overstayed, others entered illegally and have been here ever since. Some came in as very young children and did not even know they were illegal until they tried to go to college. The point is there is real diversity in that group of people.

So we have three options. Option No. 1 is we can ignore it, leave it the way it is, pretend it is not there. I think if this bill fails, or efforts like it fail, that is exactly what will happen. For those who oppose amnesty, I would tell you that is *de facto* amnesty. *De facto* amnesty is having 11 million people living among you illegally. The only consequence to it is they do not have documentation. Obviously, they are working somewhere because they are providing for their families. They do not qualify for any Federal benefits. They are all around us, everywhere you look, whether you know it or not. They are here. Most have been here for longer than a decade. We can ignore it, but if we do, if we leave it in place, if we do nothing—if we do nothing—if this bill fails and we do nothing, that is *de facto* amnesty.

The second option is we can make life miserable for them. We can basically put E-Verify in place, continue to secure the borders, and make life so tough on people that they will just leave on their own.

I do not think that is a practical approach. I do not think it works. I do not think most Americans would tolerate what we would have to do in order for that to happen. I do not think most Americans would tolerate the humanitarian costs of approaching it that way. At the end of the day, I still think many will not leave anyway. They will figure out a way to survive and endure. I do not think that is a practical approach. If someone else thinks it is a practical approach, I would encourage them to come to the floor and convince me otherwise, come here and explain to us why we should try to do that. I have not heard anyone make that argument. I am not saying anyone is, which proves my point.

What is the third option? The third option is to deal with it, to deal with it in a way that is reasonable and compassionate, but also in a way that is responsible and good for the country.

That is what we have endeavored to do as part of this bill.

So let's be clear what this bill does. First and foremost, this bill says to people who are here illegally: Come forward. We have a process for you that you are going to have to undergo if you want to be in this country legally. Here is the process: No. 1, you are going to have to undergo a background check. They are going to have to fingerprint you. You are going to have to undergo a background check for national security and for crimes. If you have committed serious crimes, you are not going to qualify for this legalization.

You are going to have to pay an application fee. You are going to have to pay a fine because that is a consequence of having violated our immigration laws.

When I hear the word “amnesty” used, it reminds me that amnesty means the forgiveness of something. We have seen amnesties all the time. I was recently in the great State of Hawaii. We had a great visit there, a personal visit. They have a box called an amnesty box. It allows you, when you get off the airplane, if you have any banned agriculture—plants, fruits, or whatever—to put it in the bucket, no questions asked. That is amnesty. Amnesty is turn it in and nothing will happen to you, no price to pay. That is not what this bill does.

This bill says: Come forward, and you are going to have to undergo a background check for national security, a background check for crimes. You are going to have to pay a fine. You are going to have to pay an application fee. You are going to have to get gainfully employed and start paying taxes. You are not going to qualify for any Federal benefits—no ObamaCare, no food stamps, no welfare, nothing. That is all you are going to be able to have for 10 years, which leads me to my second point about the legalization.

There is this notion out there that this is permanent legalization, that once you get this you are legal forever. Not true. This is like all other non-immigrant visas. This is renewable. Under the program we envision in this bill, every 6 years you are going to have to come forward and reapply. Every 6 years you are going to have to come forward and undergo all the same things again—another fine, another application fee, another background check. In fact, when you go renew it the first time, you are going to have to prove you have been gainfully employed and paying taxes for the previous 6 years.

The legalization that people are going to be able to get, the so-called RPI—registered provisional immigrant—the key word there is “provisional.” It is not permanent. There are people who are going to qualify for RPI at the beginning who, when it comes time to renew, are not going to qualify because they were not gainfully employed and paying taxes, because they committed a crime, or because they

cannot pay the fine. That is going to happen. We do not think it will be prevalent, but it will happen. It is not permanent; it is provisional.

The third aspect of it is that once you have been in RPI for 10 full years—after you have been in RPI for 10 full years, which means the first 6 years, and then you reapplied and qualified, and you have been in it another 4 years—then here is the only thing that happens: The only thing that happens is that you are now qualified to, you are eligible to, apply for a green card. It does not mean on the 10-year anniversary of getting RPI you show up at some office and say: I am here. Give me my green card. That is not true. You have to apply for it. You have to undergo the same green card process, with all the same checks and balances.

I have filed an amendment to improve it even further. I am saying when you apply for that green card, after the 10-year period and more has expired, you are going to have to prove that you are proficient in English because I think assimilation is important. I think assimilating into American society is important. I think learning English is not just important for assimilation, it is important for economic success. You cannot flourish in our economy, you cannot flourish in our country if you are not proficient in English. We are going to require that at the green card stage.

Now, what is the debate here going to be about over the next few weeks? Well, a couple things are going to have to happen.

First, like any other bill, there are some technical changes that are going to have to be made, and those will be made. I think there will be improvements to the bill on other issues, such as what I have just talked about, this amendment I have making English proficiency required at the green card stage.

Then I think we are going to move on and have a debate about the cost of this bill and ensuring that we truly tighten this. But look, the American people are very generous and open, especially to a process such as this, but they want to make sure it is not costing the American taxpayer. So we are going to have to make sure people are not qualifying for these Federal benefits. We have to make sure people who have violated our immigration law, one of the consequences of that is that they are not a burden on the American taxpayer.

If we talk to many of these immigrant groups and the immigrations themselves, they will tell us that is not a problem. That is not what we are here for. Good. Because you are not going to qualify for those things. We are going to make that even clearer in some of the amendments Senator HATCH and others are working on.

Then I think we have to get to the final point; that is, the security element of this bill. I personally believe that more than half of my colleagues

on the Republican side, maybe a little more, maybe a little less, want to vote for an immigration bill. They want to modernize our legal immigration system, they want to improve our enforcement mechanisms, and they want to deal with the 11 million people who are here illegally.

But they are only willing to do that if they can go back to their folks at home and say: We took steps in this bill to make sure this will never happen again; we did not repeat the mistakes of the past; this is not going to happen again. That is going to be the key to this bill passing. I think we can do that. That is in our principles, by the way. The guiding principles before this bill was unveiled talked about border security. One of the ways I think we can improve that is by not leaving the border and fence plan to chance.

Let's not leave it to the Department of Homeland Security. One of the objections we have heard from opponents of the bill is we do not trust Homeland Security to come up with a plan that works. Fine. Then let's put it in the bill. Let's put the specific plan in the bill, the number of fences, the amount of technology. Let's mandate it in the bill so we are not leaving it to guesswork, so when we vote for this bill, we are voting for a specific security plan.

I have heard people say we think the E-Verify portion should be improved. Let's fix it now. Let's put it in the bill. We think the entry-exit tracking system can be improved. Let's put it in the bill, so that when we vote for this bill, we are also voting for a plan. That is important. That is not unreasonable. I want Members to think about this for a second. The immigrant who is illegally here comes forward. They get legalized through this pretty difficult process. They are now here legally. They have qualified because they have met these conditions. They are now here legally. They are working. They are paying taxes. They are not in the shadows anymore.

But before we can move to a green card, which is permanent residency, all we are asking for is that we ensure that this never happens again. That is not an unreasonable request. Not only do I not think that is an unreasonable request, I think that is a very responsible request, because none of us wants to be here 5 years from now or 10 years from now saying: Boy, they truly messed up in 2013; we have to do this all over again. None of us wants to be here 5 years from now facing 5 million illegal immigrants more, another wave of illegal immigration. We can get that right. We can get it right in this bill.

If that happens, I believe this legislation will pass in a historic way out of this Chamber. It strengthens the chances it can pass in the House and be signed by the President. That is the opportunity we have to get something such as this right.

I could go on and talk to you about the economic benefits of legal immigration reform and what that will

mean for our economy. We will have plenty of time to have that conversation. Trust me when I tell you, I think we will work on it to convince you, it will be a net positive for America to have a legal immigration system that works.

That is why this debate is so important. I think we can do something that is good for the country and responsible and once and for all solve this problem so we do not have to continue to deal with it, so it does not continue to hold us back, so we, a nation of immigrants, built on a heritage of legal immigration, can have a legal immigration system that works, that we can be proud of, that helps our country, that takes this issue off the table, that gets rid of de facto amnesty, that protects our sovereignty and our borders and the security of our people. That is what we have a chance to do.

To the opponents of the legislation, I would say, look, I respect your views very much. I do. I think you raise very valid concerns, which we have attempted to address in this bill and which we will continue to address in this bill. I am not one of those take-it-or-leave-it-people with regard to legislation. I always think that no matter what idea I have, the more people who are exposed to it, the more input I get, the more suggestions I get, the better we can make it.

Ultimately, that is what I am interested in being a part of. I am not interested in being part of passing a bill as a talking point or a messaging point, nor am I interested in the political calculations of this issue. What I am personally interested in is solving a problem that is hurting America. That is how I will close. That is why I am passionate about this issue is because this thing is hurting America. The fact that we have 11 million people leaving here, we do not know who they are, we do not know where they are, they are not paying taxes, they are not incorporated into our economy, that is hurting America. It is bad for them, but it is very bad for our country. The fact that we cannot enforce our immigration laws because the systems we have in place do not work, that is bad for America. The fact that we have a legal immigration system that hurts our economy and hurts our future, that is bad for America.

What we have today on immigration in America is bad. It does not work for anyone, unless you are a human trafficker or someone who is benefiting at the expense of cheap illegal labor. Who else is being helped by the status quo? Who else likes what we have right now? The answer is nobody. Leaving this in place is not an alternative. It is not an option. This is a problem that is hurting our country. The only way I know how to solve a problem is to get involved in trying to solve it. That is why I came here. I did not come to the Senate to sign on to a bunch of letters and give a speech once a week on the

floor. I came here because I believe, I know, I know with all my heart, that what we have is a unique, exceptional, and special place. But to keep it that way requires us to take seriously, not just our constitutional charge but take seriously the opportunity we have to solve historic problems in a historic way. I think this bill done right gives us the opportunity to do that. I look forward to the opportunity to be part of it. I hope my colleagues who are openminded about it will remain openminded as we work to improve this product and give the American people something that helps our country, solves our problem, and makes us all proud.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP.) The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to deliver a floor speech on immigration reform in Spanish and that the Spanish and English versions be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, the Senate has begun a historic debate on comprehensive immigration reform. We have had and will continue to have hours of debate on this issue. I think it is appropriate that I spend a few minutes explaining the bill in Spanish, a language that has been spoken in this country since Spanish missionaries founded St. Augustine, FL in 1565. Spanish is also spoken by almost 40 million Americans who have a lot at stake in the outcome of this debate.

First, I want to applaud my colleagues in the "Gang of 8," who have worked tirelessly to come up with a bipartisan comprehensive bill. This issue deserves an open and fair debate on the floor. It has been over 25 years since we passed a comprehensive immigration reform bill. The next few days and weeks will not be easy; they will be a test for the Senate, and whether this body can debate, offer amendments, compromise, and ultimately come together on an issue that will move our country forward.

This debate is about Isabel Castillo.

This young woman from Harrisonburg, VA was brought to the United States by her parents at the very young age of 6. Her parents performed hard labor in order to support their family by picking apples and working in a poultry plant. All they wanted, like all parents do, was a better life for their children. Isabel did everything right—she graduated from high school and went on to attend college, where she graduated magna cum laude. She did not qualify for financial aid, due to her immigration status, and worked for a year to save money for college. After she graduated from college she was unable to legally find a job. Instead of giving up, this young woman organized the Harrisonburg Dream Act chapter to raise awareness about her situation in order to help other students.

This is one example of many as to why we need to pass an immigration bill. For students and families, such as Isabel's, this is about their future.

The last time Congress passed a comprehensive immigration bill was in 1986. Many of the concerns I hear from Virginians involve issues that the last immigration reform bill did not address—lack of sufficient border security measures and a way to address the large number of undocumented immigrants in our country. The last immigration reform bill also did not include spouses and children of legalized immigrants—which created a strong incentive for many to enter or remain in the country illegally.

This time around, things are different. I have been very impressed by the open process we have had in the Judiciary Committee:

212 amendments were considered in the Committee;

30 Republican amendments were accepted; and

12 full committee hearings on immigration and border security were held before mark-up.

I understand that some doubt remains as to whether or not this bill will fix our broken immigration system. While not perfect—I can confidently stand here today and say this bill will do more for border security, more to improve our current backlog, more to strengthen our employment verification system, and more to put measures in place to deal with the future flow of immigrants—compared to any other immigration bill in history.

This bill will first and foremost create a path to earned citizenship, not amnesty. Undocumented individuals will have to meet several stringent requirements such as, paying fees and fines, passing national security and criminal background checks, paying their taxes and learning English.

And before anyone can come out of the shadows, this bill requires a border security strategy and border fencing strategy within 6 months of enactment.

I am proud that this bill includes strong provisions to protect students who only know this country as their home, DREAMERS, as well as agricultural workers, who perform some of the most difficult labor—these individuals will have an accelerated path if they meet certain conditions.

In order for the U.S. to be the most talented country in the world, we must fix the current flaws in our immigration system. Our immigration system does not meet the demands of businesses that wish to attract and retain highly qualified immigrants.

It is not about just addressing the short-term needs of the STEM workforce but about investing in the future of our children. In order to ensure we remain globally competitive, we must increase our investments in education. This bill does just that by establishing a STEM education initiative—funded through fees collected from employers of foreign STEM workers.

According to the Council on Foreign Relations “60 percent of U.S. employers are having difficulties finding qualified workers to fill vacancies at their companies.”

This bill also creates a fair path for individuals who want to come into this country and start businesses, create jobs, and invest in the economy.

In Virginia, Asian-owned businesses had sales and receipts of more than \$13 billion and employed more than 92,000 people.

Virginia's foreign students contribute more than \$405 million to the State's economy in tuition, fees, and living expenses every year.

Immigrants' contributions in the high-tech sector are striking, with one study finding that immigrants started 25 percent of all engineering and technology companies founded in the United States between 1995 and 2005.

Through this bill individuals who earn a master's or other postgraduate degree in STEM fields from American universities can apply for legal permanent resident status. This bill also changes our current visa system from one based on arbitrary numbers to one that is market based and understands the needs of U.S. employers.

The Federal Government currently spends nearly \$18 billion on immigration enforcement every year, more than the combined budgets of all other Federal law enforcement agencies:

U.S. Border Patrol apprehension of foreign nationals between ports of entry fell to a 40-year low of 327,577 in FY2011; and

Removals grew from 30,000 in 1990 to more than 391,000 in FY2011.

This bill goes even further by allocating up to \$6.5 billion additional for border security. It requires a biometric exit system to be in place at the 10 largest international airports in the United States within 2 years, and 20 additional airports within 6 years.

It is not just about spending more money at the border, but about being strategic in how and where we spend our resources.

One of the key issues that we must address is to hold employers accountable and ensure that we have an effective employment verification system in place.

As of May more than 400,000 employers registered for e-verify. This bill will mandate that all employers use a verification system that ensures all employees are legally authorized to work in the United States, and fine companies that employ undocumented immigrants.

The State Department is currently processing visas for Filipino siblings of U.S. citizens who submitted their visa applications 24 years ago. I ask my colleagues to imagine if you had to wait over 24 years to see your family members.

This bill provides sufficient visas to erase the current backlog of family and employment-based visa applicants in the next 7 years, starting in 2015.

Lastly, and probably one of the most essential pieces of this bill, is how we

deal with future flow of immigrants wanting to come to this country. This bill creates a future immigration framework that is premised on a merit-based points system. The bill establishes a new non-immigrant agricultural worker visa, and sets forth provisions relating to the integration of new immigrants; and includes provisions to deal with the present and future workforce needs of the American agriculture industry, while protecting workers from being displaced or otherwise adversely affected by foreign workers.

In closing, I welcome this debate. English settlers who landed at Jamestown, VA in 1607 helped begin our Nation's great history as an immigrant Nation. And Virginian Thomas Jefferson, as he wrote the Declaration of Independence, expressed his clear understanding that immigration was a positive force for our Nation.

Today, Virginia has the ninth-largest immigrant population in the country, with over 903,000 foreign-born residents. Immigrants contribute greatly to the richness of our Commonwealth.

I hope that we will start a new chapter and send a strong message to the world that we are a country of laws but also of fairness and equality.

Let's not repeat the mistakes of the past but let's also remember that the perfect should not be the enemy of the good. Finding a perfect solution should not stand in the way of progress.

Let's show this country and the world that this is not a Republican bill and it is not a Democratic bill but it is a strong bipartisan bill. It is time that we pass comprehensive immigration reform. Thank you.

Mr. Kaine. El senado ha comenzado un debate histórico sobre una reforma migratoria comprensiva. Hemos tenido y continuaremos a tener horas para debatir este asunto. Creo que es apropiado que tome unos pocos minutos para explicar la legislación en español, un lenguaje que ha sido hablado en este país desde que misioneros españoles fundaron a San Agustín, FL en mil quinientos sesenta y cinco. El español también es hablado por casi cuarenta millones de Americanos con mucho invertido en el resultado de este debate.

Primeramente, quiero felicitar a mis colegas en el “Grupo de los Ocho,” quienes han trabajado incansablemente para ofrecer legislación bipartidista. Este asunto merece un debate abierto y razonable en el senado. Han pasado más de veinte y cinco años desde la última vez que pasamos una reforma migratoria comprensiva. Los próximos días y semanas no serán fáciles; serán una prueba para el senado, en como esta cámara puede debatir, ofrecer enmiendas, negociar, y al final unirse en un asunto que moverá nuestro país adelante.

Este debate es sobre Isabel Castillo.

Esta joven de Harrisonburg, VA fue traída a los estados unidos por sus padres a la edad de seis. Sus padres

trabajaban a mano de obra muy difícil cosechando manzanas y trabajando en una factoría avícola para poder mantener a la familia. Lo único que querían, como todos los padres quieren, era una vida mejor para sus hijos. Isabel hizo todo lo correcto—se graduó de la escuela secundaria y siguió adelante asistiendo la universidad, donde se graduó magna cum laude. Ella no califico para la asistencia universitaria federal por razón de su estatus migratorio y trabajo por un año, para ahorrar dinero para la universidad. Después de que se graduó del colegio, no pudo conseguir un trabajo legal. Envés de rendirse, esta mujer joven organizo el capítulo de Harrisonburg Soñadores para crecer el conocimiento de su situación en orden de poder ayudar a otros estudiantes.

Este es uno de muchos ejemplos por cual tenemos que pasar una reforma migratoria. Para estudiantes y familias, tal como la de Isabel, esto se trata de sus futuros.

La última vez que el congreso pasó una reforma migratoria comprensiva fue en mil-novecientos-ochenta-y-seis. Muchas de las preocupaciones que escucho de Virginianos incluyen asuntos que la última reforma migratoria no resolvió—la falta de suficiente medidas de seguridad para la frontera y una manera de resolver el gran número de inmigrantes indocumentados en nuestro país. La última reforma migratoria tampoco incluyó esposos y esposas e hijas e hijas de inmigrantes legalizados—cual creo un incentivo fuerte para muchos en entrar o pertenecer en el país ilegalmente.

Esta vez, las cosas son diferentes. Estoy muy impresionado por el proceso abierto que hemos tenido en el comité judicial del senado:

Doscientos-doce enmiendas fueron consideradas en el comité

Treinta enmiendas republicanas fueron aceptadas; y

Doce audiencias públicas sobre inmigración y seguridad fronteriza fueron realizadas antes de que el comité judicial votara sobre la legislación

Entiendo que permanecen algunas dudas si esta legislación arreglará nuestro sistema de inmigración. Aunque no es perfecto—puedo pararme aquí hoy y decirles que esta legislación hará más para la seguridad fronteriza, más para mejorar nuestra lista de visas pendientes, más para fortalecer nuestro sistema de verificación de empleo, y más para establecer medidas para afrontar los inmigrantes que vendrán en el futuro—comparado a cualquier otra legislación migratoria en nuestra historia.

Esta legislación primeramente crea un camino a la ciudadanía merecida, no amnestia. Individuos indocumentados tendrán que satisfacer varios requisitos rigurosos tal como, pagando multas, pasando verificación de antecedentes, pagando impuestos y aprendiendo inglés.

Y antes de que cualquier persona pueda aplicar, esta legislación requiere

una estrategia de seguridad fronteriza y estrategia de prevención en la frontera dentro de 6 meses de ser promulgada.

Estoy orgulloso de que esta legislación incluye provisiones fuertes para proteger estudiantes que solamente conocen este país como su hogar, Soñadores, y también trabajadores en agricultura, quienes trabajan en unas de las manos de obra más difíciles—esta gente tendrá un camino acelerado si satisfacen ciertos requisitos.

Para que los estados unidos sea el país más talentoso en el mundo, tenemos que arreglar las fallas que existen hoy en día en nuestro sistema de inmigración. Nuestro sistema no satisface las demandas de negocios que desean atraer y retener inmigrantes sumamente calificados.

No se trata de simplemente afrontando las necesidades de corto plazo requeridas por los trabajadores en las más reas de ciencia, tecnología, ingeniería, y matemáticas, sino sobre invirtiendo en el futuro de nuestros hijos. Para asegurar de que sigamos competitivos globalmente, tenemos que aumentar nuestras inversiones en la educación. Esta legislación hace tal meta estableciendo una iniciativa—fundado por pagos colectados de empleadores que emplean trabajadores extranjeros en estas áreas.

Según el Consejo de Relaciones Exteriores, “sesenta por ciento de empleadores tienen dificultades encontrando trabajadores calificados para llenar vacancias en sus empresas.”

Esta legislación también crea un camino justo para individuos que quieren venir a este país y empezar negocios, crear trabajos, e invertir en la economía.

En Virginia, los negocios adueñados por gente asiática tuvieron ventas y recibos de más de trece-mil-millones de dólares y emplearon a más de noventa-y-dos-mil personas.

Estudiantes extranjeros contribuyeron más de cuatro-cientos-cinco millones de dólares cada año a la economía de Virginia a través de sus matrículas, pagos, y gastos de mantenimiento durante el año académico.

Las contribuciones de los inmigrantes en el sector de alta tecnología son grandes, con un estudio encontrando que inmigrantes comenzaron veinte-y-cinco por ciento de todas las empresas de ingeniería y tecnología fundadas en los estados unidos entre mil-novecientos-noventa-y-cinco y dos-mil-cinco.

A través de esta legislación, individuos que logran una maestría u otra matriculada avanzada in las áreas de ciencia, tecnología, ingeniería, y matemáticas de universidades estadounidenses pueden aplicar para residencia permanente. Esta legislación también cambia nuestro sistema de visas que existe hoy en día de uno basado en números arbitrarios a uno basado en el mercado y las necesidades de empleadores estadounidenses.

El Gobierno Federal ahora gasta casi diez-y-ochos-mil-millones de dólares en esfuerzo de inmigración cada año, más que los presupuestos combinados de todas las otras agencias de ejecución legal.

Aprensiones de la Patrulla Fronteriza Estadounidense de extranjeros dentro los puertos de entrada redujo por más de trescientos-veinte-y-siete-mil en al año fiscal dos-mil-once, un nivel no visto en cuarenta años.

Remociones crecieron de treinta-mil en mil-novecientos-noventa a más de trescientos-noventa mil en el año fiscal dos-mil-once.

Esta legislación va más lejos asignando hasta seis-y-medio mil-millones de dólares adicionales para seguridad fronteriza. Y requiere la creación de un sistema biométrico en diez de los aeropuertos internacionales más grandes en los estados unidos dentro de 2 años, y veinte aeropuertos adicionales dentro de 6 años.

No se trata de simplemente gastar más dinero en la frontera, se trata de ser estratégico en cómo y dónde gastamos nuestros recursos.

Unos de los asuntos centrales que tenemos que resolver es que empleadores sean responsables y asegurar que tengamos un sistema de verificación de empleo efectivo.

Desde Mayo, más de cuatro-cientos-mil empleadores se han registrado para e-verify. Esta legislación requiere que todos los empleadores usen un sistema de verificación que asegure que todos los empleados sean legalmente autorizados para trabajar en los estados unidos, y multara empresas que emplean a los inmigrantes indocumentados.

El Departamento de Estado ahora en día está procesando unas visas para hermanos Filipinos de ciudadanos estadounidenses quienes sometieron sus aplicaciones de visa hace veinte y cuatro años. Les pido a mis colegas que se imaginen si usted tuviera que esperar más de veinte-y-cuatro años para ver a miembros de su familia.

Esta legislación proporciona suficiente visas para borrar el atraso de visas de familia y empleo en los próximos siete años, empezando en el dos-mil-quince.

Últimamente, y probablemente unas de las partes más esenciales de esta legislación, es como afrontamos los inmigrantes que quieren venir a este país en el futuro. Esta legislación crea una estructura para los inmigrantes del futuro que es basada en un sistema de puntos de mérito. La legislación establece una nueva visa temporal para los trabajadores agricultores, y crea provisiones correspondientes a la integración de nuevos inmigrantes; y incluye provisiones para resolver las necesidades del presente y el futuro correspondiente a la industria de agricultura estadounidense, mientras protegiendo trabajadores de ser desplazados o afectados negativamente por trabajadores extranjeros.

En conclusión, doy la bienvenida a este debate. Colonos ingleses quienes aterrizaron en Jamestown, VA en mil-seis-cientos-siete ayudaron empezar la gran historia de nuestra nación como una nación de inmigrantes. Y el Virginiano Thomas Jefferson, mientras que escribía la Declaración de Independencia, expreso su entendimiento claro que inmigración era una fuerza positiva para nuestra nación.

Hoy, Virginia tiene la novena población de inmigrantes más grande en el país, con más de novecientos-tres-mil residentes que nacieron afuera de los estados unidos. Inmigrantes contribuyen una gran riqueza a nuestro estado.

Espero que podamos empezar un nuevo capítulo y que mandemos un mensaje fuerte al mundo y la nación que somos un país de leyes pero también de justicia e igualdad.

No hay que repetir los errores del pasado pero debemos también recordar que la perfección no debe ser el enemigo de lo bueno. Encontrando una solución perfecta no debería de bloquear el progreso.

Vamos a demostrar a este país y al mundo que esta legislación no es Republicana y no es Demócrata, es fuertemente bipartidista. Es tiempo que aprobemos una reforma migratoria comprensiva. Gracias.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

There upon, the Senate, at 12:36 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

BORDER SECURITY, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, AND IMMIGRATION MODERNIZATION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order and pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 80, S. 744, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Robert Menendez, Christopher A. Coons, Mazie Hirono, Dianne Feinstein, Bill Nelson, Benjamin L. Cardin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Al Franken, Richard Blumenthal, Ron Wyden, Jack Reed, Patty Murray, Michael F. Bennet, Tom Harkin, Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 744, a bill to provide for

comprehensive immigration reform, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 82, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 146 Leg.]

YEAS—82

Alexander	Flake	Moran
Ayotte	Franken	Murphy
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Baucus	Graham	Nelson
Begich	Hagan	Paul
Bennet	Harkin	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Pryor
Blunt	Heinrich	Reed
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reid
Brown	Heller	Rockefeller
Burr	Hirono	Rubio
Cantwell	Hoeven	Sanders
Cardin	Isakson	Schatz
Carper	Johanns	Schumer
Casey	Johnson (SD)	Shaheen
Chambliss	Johnson (WI)	Stabenow
Chiesa	Kaine	Tester
Coats	King	Thune
Cochran	Klobuchar	Toomey
Collins	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Coons	Leahy	Udall (NM)
Corker	Levin	Warner
Cornyn	Manchin	Warren
Cowan	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Donnelly	McConnell	Wicker
Durbin	Menendez	Wyden
Feinstein	Merkley	
Fischer	Mikulski	

NAYS—15

Barrasso	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Inhofe	Scott
Crapo	Kirk	Sessions
Cruz	Lee	Shelby
Enzi	Risch	Vitter

NOT VOTING—3

Coburn	McCain	Murkowski
--------	--------	-----------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 82, the nays are 15. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Under the previous order, the time until 4 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the proponents and opponents.

The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the comprehensive immigration reform bill we will begin debating later today and for the rest of the month.

I thank my colleagues for voting yes on the motion to proceed, which will let us debate this very important bill which is critical to the future of our security, our economy, and our society. This overwhelming vote—a majority of both parties—starts this bill off on the right foot.

First, I will begin by saying that this has been the most open and transparent process we have seen in the past few years. Unlike most bills where only 1 or 2 Senators draft them, this bill was drafted by 10 of us here in the Senate.

I thank each of the four Republicans and four Democrats in the Gang of 8—my seven colleagues in the gang—for their great work. The agricultural program in the bill was drafted by Senators FEINSTEIN and HATCH. We then held a number of hearings where we debated, considered, voted on, and adopted scores of amendments during the Judiciary Committee markup under the able leadership of Chairman LEAHY. Many of those amendments were bipartisan or were amendments offered solely by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. These amendments dramatically improve the bill. Our bill is better and stronger today than it was when we introduced it.

Before the bill was marked up, this bill had been vetted by the eight of us. Eighteen of us here in the Senate have already had the chance to make our mark on this bill and consider all of the ways in which it should be changed. Now we are here on the floor, where all of my colleagues will have the chance to further improve the bill and discuss the changes they feel need to be made. We readily admit this bill is not perfect and can always be improved. It is undergirded by one thought about the present situation and one about the future that we hope to change. In the present situation, our country—amazingly and counterproductively—turns away hundreds of thousands of people who will create jobs and improve our economy, and at the same time we let millions cross the border and take jobs away from American workers. The system is backward and the status quo is unacceptable.

Our bill is based on one simple principle: that the American people will accept and embrace commonsense solutions to future legal immigration and to the 11 million now living here in the shadows if—and only if—they are convinced there will not be future waves of illegal immigration.

Our bill does three basic things. First, it ensures that we will never again have a wave of future illegal immigration. Second, it fixes our completely dysfunctional legal immigration system to make us the most competitive Nation in the world for both this century and the next. Third, it contains a tough but realistic path for making sure that the people currently here illegally are held accountable for what they did, but it also allows them to join American society on our terms in a fair and honorable way rather than by the current amnesty-by-inaction we see today.

I wish to make it extremely clear that, first and foremost, we are committed to ending the waves of illegal immigration we have seen in the last 30 years. We will accomplish this goal by building a very sturdy three-legged