

remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest guided by justice shall counsel.

Why forgo the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rival-ship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world—so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it, for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements (I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy)—I repeat it therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectably defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed—in order to give to trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them—conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied, as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another—that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character—that by

such acceptance it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to dis- card.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish—that they will control the usual current of the passions or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations. But if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good, that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism—this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far in the discharge of my official duties I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April 1793 is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of your representatives in both houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take—and was bound in duty and interest to take—a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time

to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions and to progress without interruption to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations, I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat, in which I promise myself to realize without alloy the sweet enjoyment of partaking in the midst of my fellow citizens the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kaine). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 o'clock today. At 5 o'clock the Senate will proceed to the nomination of Robert Bacharach, of Oklahoma, to be a U.S. circuit judge for the Tenth Circuit. At 5:30 we will vote on his nomination.

We expect to reconsider the cloture vote on the Hagel nomination to be Secretary of Defense tomorrow.

We also expect to consider the nomination of Jack Lew to be Treasury Secretary and the sequestration legislation before the end of the week.

SENATE AGENDA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate has a great deal to accomplish, including the long-delayed confirmation of former Senator Chuck Hagel to lead the Defense Department.

This week the Senate will also consider two plans to avert devastating across-the-board cuts to military spending as well as domestic initiatives that keep our American families and businesses strong. To give our economy a foundation for growth, Congress must replace these cuts—the so-called sequester—with a balanced approach to deficit reduction.

Democrats would temporarily replace this harsh austerity with a combination of smart spending reductions and measures that close corporate tax loopholes, end wasteful subsidies, and ask the wealthiest Americans to pay a little bit more, and it would avoid harmful cuts that will hurt American families, harm military readiness, and hinder our economic recovery. Families and businesses in every State of the Nation—in red States and blue States—are at risk because of these haphazard cuts.

In the Presiding Officer's home State of Virginia, 170 teachers who work with disabled children could lose their jobs. That doesn't count any other teachers. Thousands of children will go without lifesaving vaccines—they will go without lifesaving vaccines—and 90,000 Pentagon employees will be furloughed. It is easy to talk about furloughs unless you are one of those people being furloughed. We don't know how many days a week it will be, how many days a month it will be, but it will be days.

In Nevada 120 teachers could lose their jobs. Local law enforcement agencies will lose essential funding to prosecute crime, and thousands of Defense Department employees will be furloughed, losing wages that support their families and our State's economy.

Residents of the Republican leader's home State would also suffer. Kentucky will lose Federal funding that helps police catch and punish domestic abusers, buys meals for needy seniors and keeps at-risk children in Head Start programs, and more than 11,000 Kentuckians who work for the Defense Department will be furloughed.

Nationwide, sequester cuts will cost more than 750,000 jobs. More than 70,000 boys and girls will be kicked out of their Head Start programs. Meat inspectors, air traffic controllers, FBI officers, and Border Patrol agents will be furloughed. Small businesses, which create two-thirds of all new jobs in this country, will lose access to crucial Federal loans. Thousands of researchers working to cure cancer, diabetes, and scores of other life-threatening diseases will lose their jobs.

But Congress has the power to prevent these self-inflicted wounds. We have the power to turn off the sequester, protect American families and businesses, and ensure our national defense.

In the House and in the Senate, Republicans and Democrats voted to impose these cuts. It will take Republicans and Democrats working together to avert them. Twenty-eight Republicans in the Senate and 174 Republicans in the House voted to impose these painful cuts. To say this is President Obama's sequester is absolutely wrong: 174 Republicans in the House voted for these cuts—that is more than 70 percent—and in the Senate more than 60 percent of the Republicans voted for the sequester. So it is unfair to say it is the President's sequester. We did this together. This would not have passed but for the overwhelming vote of the Republicans in the House and in the Senate.

If those same Republicans would work with Democrats to find a balanced way to reduce the deficit, Congress could avert the delayed sequester today—now. Unfortunately, Republicans would rather let the deficit cuts go into effect than close a single wasteful tax loophole. They would rather cut Medicare, education, and medical research than ask a single millionaire to pay a single dollar more in taxes.

The overwhelming majority of Americans wants us to compromise before their neighbors, friends, and family members get pink slips or notices that they can only work a few days this week or this month.

The overwhelming majority of Americans—including 56 percent of Republicans—supports Democrats' balanced approach. It is all over the country. All over the country Americans favor this approach, a balanced approach, by a large margin, including 56 percent of Republicans.

So once again the only Republicans in the entire country rejecting a reasonable, balanced compromise are Republicans in this building—Republicans in Congress.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Has the Chair announced the business of the day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, last week, about the time Congress recessed, the President's immigration plan was leaked to the press and was commented on generally. A group of

Senators here have been trying to work on a comprehensive plan and expressed dismay at what it contained and said it was not acceptable.

A brief review of the enforcement section of the President's immigration plan confirms, I think, what my concern has been all along. It is a smoking gun, in truth, that demonstrates this President is not serious about enforcement. That is where we are. Any immigration plan this Nation implements has to be founded on the simple legal principle that people can come to our country in generous numbers, as they always have done, but they should wait their turn. There should be a lawful system. You can't have a lawful system if you are not prepared, not willing, and not committed to ensuring that the laws are enforced.

What we have seen for the last several years is very dramatic. In point after point, I, formerly a Federal prosecutor for almost 15 years, can tell you it effectively neutralized the ability of our current laws to be enforced.

This bill is confirmation the President hasn't had a change of heart. He hasn't had a change of heart. They are continuing to talk as if they expect and plan to establish a lawful system of immigration. When you get down to it and read the language of the legislation, it is not there.

Here are some examples of what the President thinks amounts to enforcement. This is so sad. I will say, with absolute confidence, if the President of the United States had done what he sort of said he was going to do in 2008 when he was running for office, he would make this legal system work. If he had invested time, effort, leadership, moral authority, and maybe a little more money—but it won't take a whole lot of money—and begin to show the kind of progress we need to have, show a commitment he would work to enforce the law in the future, he would be in a much better position to ask for a large reform of law.

Let's look at what his plan reveals. It explicitly, openly, and directly prohibits State and local governments from enforcing immigration laws and from even asking someone for their immigration status.

We have former Governors here in the Senate, former State police superintendents—and I have dealt with this issue for a very long time—that is a stunning development. There are only about maybe 20,000 Federal agents dealing with immigration. There are 600,000 State and local law enforcement officers, in every county, city, hamlet, and town in America who are the ones who come in contact every single day with people in their areas for drunkenness, fighting, burglaries, and drugs. When they find somebody in the course of doing their duties, they discover people who are here illegally.

We want to have a relationship with them and to utilize their capabilities. The Federal Government can then respond, identify the person, and see