

within it will require reconciling between a general ledger and subsidiary ledgers.

A big problem is ongoing delay in implementing very expensive business computer systems called “enterprise resource planning” or ERPs, which perform a number of business-related functions vital to transforming the Department’s business operations. The ECSS system I mentioned a few minutes ago is one of these ERPs.

As of December 2009, the Department of Defense has invested over \$5.8 billion in these ERPs and will invest billions more before they are fully implemented. Most of them are over budget and behind schedule or haven’t provided promised capability. Yet these ERPs make up more than half of the Department’s entire expenditure in the area of business transformation, costing the taxpayers more than \$1 billion per year.

This is vitally important. If the Department doesn’t get ERPs right, like a system known as ECSS that cost \$1 billion dollars, not only will the Department have squandered monies that it had already sunk into these programs but it will also severely undermined its ability to improve the efficiency and the effectiveness of scores of business-missions such as logistics and supply chain management, et cetera, that are key to supporting those service-men and -women who defend the Nation.

What needs to be done? From the top down, lines of authority must be clarified. The relevant workforce must be well-versed in government accounting practices and standards and be experienced in related-information technology. Given how vitally important these ERPs are to this mission, people who have actual experience successfully implementing global business systems must be properly mixed into the workforce, and contractors hired to integrate these business systems into the Department must be the best-qualified partners and held to the same high performance standards that should apply to any other major defense acquisition.

Within this overall structure, there must be sufficient oversight and accountability vis-a-vis a well-defined and federated business enterprise architecture that ensures that, in terms of organizational transformation and systems modernization, all the different elements of the Department are moving in the same direction toward a single goal. These kinds of issues need to have the day-to-day attention of the Department’s Chief Management Officer, that is, the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the chief management officers within the military departments.

At this point, I am of the view that, with all of the congressional reforms and mandates in the area of financial improvement over the past few years, the Department of Defense has all the tools it needs to have in its tool-kit to achieve audit-readiness on time and on budget. The issue is leadership and exe-

cution. As the House Panel on Financial Management and Auditability Reform noted, a vital part of that is “ensuring that senior leaders are held accountable when audit readiness goals are not met, and conversely, rewarded when goals are achieved”. Also, defense financial improvement must no longer be regarded as an activity important only to the Department’s financial community. Field commanders have to be fully engaged and interested in driving change outside the Pentagon. If Senator Hagel is confirmed, his setting this tone from the top will be vitally important.

Is all this enormously challenging? It absolutely is, as befits an organization of the size and complexity of the Department of Defense. With an annual budget equal to the 17th largest economy in the world, as the Institute for Defense Analyses recently noted, the Department’s “business” of achieving its unique and disparate missions worldwide on an ongoing and contingency basis equates more to an economy than a commercial business.

Be that as it may, with an annual federal budget deficit of \$1.3 trillion and defense reductions of at least \$487 billion and possibly, with sequestration, another \$500 billion over the next 10 years, the Department needs to have reliable financial management data to help it distinguish between defense budget cuts that are prudent and necessary, and those that may impinge on military readiness and, therefore, endanger our national security.

Only a Department that can be audited can give us the assurance that the Department is moving in the right direction in terms of identifying the right opportunities to save defense dollars and eliminate waste, and redirecting increasingly scarce defense dollars to higher defense priorities.

All I have discussed today illustrates how important sound leadership at the top of the Department of Defense is to “buying smarter” and getting the Department ready-for-audit. Without leadership fundamentally and unalterably mindful of the Department’s responsibility to the American people to use defense dollars wisely, this cultural change will forever remain elusive. For this reason, this body’s consideration of the President’s nominee to serve as the next Secretary of Defense will be more important than it has been in recent memory.

I would like to give credit to the present Secretary of Defense, Mr. Leon Panetta, who brought his knowledge and expertise on budgetary matters to his work at the Pentagon. I will say more about him later on, but I am very appreciative of the outstanding service present Secretary of Defense Panetta has provided to this Nation, with many long years of service both in elected as well as appointed office. We are proud to have Americans such as Secretary Panetta serving our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senate is now having some discussion among Members not yet on the floor about the issue of immigration because it is a very important problem that we have to deal with. I look forward to the debate that I think is coming up this year on immigration, and I would like to share my thoughts and my past experiences on this issue. I particularly want to share my personal experience from the 1980s amnesty law and what we can learn from that debate.

But before I go into that history, I wish to commend many Senators who are working together to forge a consensus and produce a product on this terribly difficult issue. I commend them for sitting down and agreeing to a set of principles that were put forth in a news conference last week. As ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, I expect to play a role in brokering an even broader consensus with additional Members.

I have read the bipartisan framework for immigration reform this group has written, and the one thing that struck me—in fact, it is the last sentence in the preamble—is this:

We will ensure that this is a successful, permanent reform to our immigration system that will not need to be revisited.

In other words, the group understands we need a long-term solution to the problem. We need a serious fix so future generations don’t have to deal with 11 million or 15 million or 30 million people who have come illegally. That sentence is the most important part of that document, and we must not lose sight of the goal expressed by the eight Senators who enunciated that.

But we need to learn from our previous mistakes so we truly don’t have to revisit the problem. So let us discuss the 1986 amnesty under President Reagan. There are few of us in the Senate today who were present during that debate. In 1980, President Reagan campaigned on a promise that he would work to reform our immigration laws and legalize foreign workers in the United States. The President’s policies were further shaped by the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy that was created in 1978 under President Carter.

President Reagan signed a bill into law on November 6, 1986. So 6 years after he first ran for President, he signed a law. This law was known as the Immigration Reform and Control Act. The process to finalize the bill was long and arduous. It took years—6 years, to be exact.

In 1981, when I was a freshman Senator, I joined the Judiciary Committee and was a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy. Back then, subcommittees did real work. They actually sat down and wrote legislation. We had 100 hours of hearings and 300 witnesses before we

marked up a bill in May 1982—a mark-up 4 years before the President ever signed it.

Senator Simpson chaired the subcommittee, and other members included Senators Thurmond, Kennedy, and DeConcini. Senator Thurmond was called to the White House and Senator DeConcini had just been hospitalized, so Senators Simpson, Kennedy, and I brought up amendments and we actually voted on them. Senator Kennedy, on that day, said:

Immigration reform is one of the most complicated and difficult issues; it involves human beings, it involves families, it involves loved ones, children and the separation of those individuals.

His words would still resonate today.

In 1982, I told my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee that I wanted to do the right thing for the United States, and this is what I said at that time:

The real issue here is what is best for United States citizens. In trying to maintain that perspective, I have come to the conclusion through the course of attending many hearings on this issue, that increased border and interior enforcement along with employer sanctions and a secure worker eligibility identity system is necessary to regain control of our borders.

This is a philosophy that continues to guide me on this issue of immigration yet today. But I expressed my concerns with the legalization component at the time. I echoed the recommendations of the Select Commission on Immigration. That Commission said a legalization should, No. 1, be consistent with U.S. interests; and, 2, the program should not encourage further undocumented migration. The commission believed that a legalization program should not begin until new enforcement measures had been instituted.

The Commission knew then, as I did and as I know now, that “without more effective enforcement, legalization could serve as a stimulus to further illegal entry.” Those are the words of the Commission. You see, I didn’t think permanent residency should be granted until we had a worker eligibility system. I offered an amendment on that point in 1982, but that amendment failed.

The Judiciary Committee and the full Senate passed a bill in 1982, but it did not pass the House of Representatives. We tried again in the next Congress. The Senate passed a bill in 1983, and the House followed in 1984. We convened a conference committee between the House and the Senate, but Walter Mondale came out opposed. So we adjourned for the elections and failed to finalize a bill that year—2 years before President Reagan finally signed a bill.

We returned in 1985 to pass our bill again. That year, Senator Simpson included a provision to trigger the amnesty program only after enforcement measures to curtail illegal immigration were in place. Doesn’t that sound familiar? Congress passed a final bill in November 1986. The vote in the Senate was 63 to 24 and the House vote was 238 to 173.

Over the years, many Members have offered amendments to water down the enforcement provision in the Simpson-Mazzoli Act. That was the name of the legislation. Senator Simpson and Congressman Mazzoli were the leaders of that effort in 1986. There was a lot of opposition to employer sanctions, especially by Senator Kennedy. He wanted, in his words, “criminal penalties to be based only upon injunctive finding of a pattern or practice.” He tried to sunset the employer sanction. Senator Kennedy also fought hard to move the legalization cutoff date from 1980 to 1982 so more people could benefit from the amnesty.

The 1986 bill was supposed to be a three-legged stool: control of illegal immigration, the first leg; a legalization program, the second leg; and the third leg, reform of legal immigration. We authorized \$422 million to carry out the requirements of the Immigration Reform Act and created a special fund for States to reimburse their costs. The 1986 bill included a legalization program for two categories of people: one for individuals who had been present in the United States since 1982; and the second for farm workers who had worked in agriculture for at least 90 days prior to enactment. A total of 2.7 million people were given amnesty.

We also had enforcement. For the first time ever, we made it illegal to knowingly hire or employ someone here illegally. We set penalties to deter the hiring of people here illegally. We wrote in the bill that “one essential element of immigration control is an increase in the border patrol and other inspection and enforcement activities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in order to prevent and deter the illegal entry of aliens into the United States and the violation of the terms of their entry.”

So let me again repeat one of the principles the Gang of 8 included in their framework enunciated last week: “We will ensure that this is a successful permanent reform to our immigration system that will not need to be revisited.”

Unfortunately, the same principles from 1986 are being discussed today. Legalize now, enforce later. But it is clear that philosophy doesn’t work. Proponents of amnesty today argue we didn’t get it right in 1986. I agree the enforcement mechanism in 1986 could have been stronger. That is why they need to be strong this time around. But I am already concerned some will attempt to water down the principles that have been put forth on enforcement measures. President Obama doesn’t seem to favor triggers.

The senior Senator from New York said just last week that border security wasn’t going to stop legalization. In his words, he said:

We’re not using border security as an excuse or block to the path of citizenship.

Advocacy groups are already talking about ensuring that a border security commission doesn’t stand in the way or

have veto authority over a legalization program.

One theme from 1986 is shining through today. Some say we need to legalize the millions of people who are already on U.S. soil. They say we need to bring them out of the shadows, know who is here, and give them a chance at U.S. citizenship. They imply that this would be a one-time deal because we would get it right this time—like we thought we got it right in 1986 but didn’t.

In the 1980s Senator Simpson was convinced that what we did then would be a permanent solution to our immigration problems. He stated:

We are attempting to assure that this is a one-time only program. . . . The purpose of legalization is not to award or reward or include the largest number of persons available. It is to bring forward into a legal status those most deeply entrenched in a society they would be least likely to return home to when the job opportunities no longer are available.

Senator Simpson said that a one-time amnesty would prevent us from a continuing series of amnesties. He said:

The major reason for legalization is to eliminate an illegal sub-class within our society. This is the legislation that will eliminate this exploitable group. Some people like to say that they hope it will clean the slate; that is what we are trying to do is clean the slate.

Well, those are good intentions by Senator Simpson, but, as I said, they obviously haven’t worked. And it is an admonition to those who want to do it right, once and for all, to learn from the mistakes of 1986.

Senator Simpson also said:

The American people, in my mind, will never accept a legalization program unless they can be assured this is a one-shot deal and that this is it, this is a one-time occurrence. And the policymakers in this country are not going to allow it to happen again and will prevent the situation which gave rise to it.

Well, as smart as Senator Simpson is—and he is a smart person. I like to see him on television, particularly when he is talking about why the President didn’t back the Simpson-Bowles Commission on budget reform and fiscal reform. But here is a person who worked 6 years to get it right so we would never have to visit it again, when we had 3 million people who had come here, illegally violating our laws—get it fixed once and for all and thought he did. But I think now he would admit—and I have to admit because I was on the subcommittee—we didn’t get it right. I voted for that.

So now, as I am looking at a group of eight trying to say in the preamble of their working paper: We are going to fix this once and for all, well, you better check that it is not very easy to do that, and you better do it better than we did.

The INS Commissioner at the time in 1986, Alan Nelson, told the committee that the legalization program was “realistic and humane” and said further that “it is clear that this is meant to

be a one-time proposal, and not intended to recur.”

In 1986, the committee report said:

... the solution lies in legalizing the status of aliens who have been present in the United States for several years, recognizing that past failures to enforce the immigration laws have allowed them to enter and to settle here.

Also, according to the report, the committee “... strongly believes that a one-time legalization program is a necessary part of an effective enforcement program and that a generous program is an essential part of any immigration reform legislation.”

In 1986 the Congress passed the Immigration Reform and Control Act. At the time, President Reagan hailed it as the most comprehensive reform of our immigration laws since 1952. He stated that the legislation was a major step toward meeting the challenge to our sovereignty while at the same time preserving and enhancing the Nation’s heritage of legal immigration—a heritage of which we all ought to be proud.

What Congress, the public, and the President did not envision or did not want was another amnesty debate. The American people were told in 1986 that this would be a one-time shot. The incentive to buy in to the argument was the promise of enforcement.

In 1985 Senator Simpson said:

If legalization should occur before more effective enforcement is available, the illegal population is only going to grow very swiftly again, and that will create pressures for additional legalization. And it will not be a one-time only legalization; it will be a continuing series.

Many believed that employer sanctions were the only way to curtail illegal immigration. One committee report stated that “unless employer sanctions are enacted, the Committee is concerned that the situation will continue to worsen.”

In 1985 Senator Metzenbaum of Ohio said:

When push comes to shove, there is only one realistic way that you can stop illegal immigration into this country, and that is by making it illegal and being tough enough that illegal immigrants cannot work in this country.

Knowing what we know now, an immigration reform bill must include tough enforcement measures. We must stop flow at the border. We must expand and enhance legal avenues so that people are not coming here illegally. We must have a strong employment verification program.

Unfortunately, we aren’t enforcing the laws we have on the books today. The American people don’t trust that we will enforce these laws in the future. We provided amnesty overnight in 1986 and didn’t fulfill the other parts of the equation. Border security, enforcement measures, and legal immigration reform need to be the first things on our agenda in 2013.

I chose to talk about this topic today because I believe we can learn from the past. We can learn from our mistakes. This isn’t just about our history, it is

about our future. Today, people in foreign lands want to be a part of this great Nation. We should feel privileged that people love our country and want to become Americans.

We must make sure the decisions we make with regard to our immigration policies follow our longstanding ideals. We want to welcome new Americans, but we need to live by the rules we have set. We cannot let our welcome mat be trampled on or our system of laws be undermined.

Let me end by echoing the words of President Reagan:

Distance does not discourage illegal immigration to the United States from all around the globe. The problem of illegal immigration should not, therefore, be seen as a problem between the United States and its neighbors. Our objective is only to establish a reasonable, fair, orderly, and secure system of immigration into this country and not to discriminate in any way against particular nations or people. Future generations of Americans will be thankful for our efforts to humanely regain control of our borders and thereby preserve the value of one of the most sacred possessions of our people: American citizenship.

My hope is that we will preserve the value of American citizenship, as President Reagan said. The path we take today will shape our country for years to come. It is my hope that we can find a solution while learning from our mistakes and ensuring that future generations don’t have to revisit this problem down the road.

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

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to be here today to highlight my support for a program that is improving life in Idaho and across the Nation—the Violence Against Women Act.

I appreciate joining my colleague Senator LEAHY, who will be here on the floor in a few minutes, to formally open debate on this legislation, and hopefully we will be able to get this over the finish line this year, as it is so critical to so many people in this country.

For nearly two decades, the Violence Against Women Act has been the centerpiece of our Nation’s commitment to ending domestic violence and dating and sexual violence. The Idaho Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence uses vital funds, among many other things, to promote the awareness of healthy relationships in middle and high schools in Idaho. It is heartening to hear that the number of Idaho high

school students reporting that they have experienced dating violence has dropped by 5 percent from 2007 to 2011. However, I am sad to report that since just January 1 of this year, four deaths have occurred in my State from the result of domestic violence. And even one is too many. These tragic events serve as a reminder that while we are improving, we are far from ending this terrible abuse.

I am a lifelong champion of the prevention of domestic violence because I believe that while we are improving, we can and will do better. I stand behind this act as it provides critical services to victims of violent crime as well as agencies and organizations that provide important aid to those who are often victims in their own homes. This legislation provides access to legal and social services for survivors. It provides training for law enforcement, prosecutors, judges, attorneys, and advocates to address these crimes in our Nation’s communities. It provides intervention for those who have witnessed abuse and are more likely to be involved in this type of violence. It provides shelter and resources for victims who have nowhere else to turn.

There is significant evidence that these programs are working not just in Idaho but nationwide. The U.S. Department of Justice reported that the number of women killed by an intimate partner decreased by 35 percent between 1993 and 2008. In 2012 it was reported that in 1 day alone, 688 women and their children impacted by violence sought safety in an emergency shelter or received counseling, legal advocacy, or children’s support.

While we may not agree on all of the specifics of this reauthorization—and there are portions we will continue to negotiate on and to refine—we all do agree on one very important idea; that is, violence should not happen to anyone. This critical legislation is very effective in helping to address that abuse in our society.

As I said, there are parts of this legislation about which there are still concerns. I am committed, as is Senator LEAHY, to working with those who have concerns to make the bill better and more workable so we can move it through to become law in this session of Congress. But after we debate and after we have worked and refined the legislation, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the authorization of this program and to continue the life-changing work this Chamber has been committed to for so many years.

I see my colleague Senator LEAHY is on the Senate floor. I started a little before he got here. I know he is here to open the debate on this legislation. I again thank him for his work on this issue and look forward to working with him in this Congress as we move forward.

Mr. LEAHY. I have enjoyed working with the senior Senator from Idaho. If he wants more time—