

programs save more than \$17 in other costs. That is what I call a smart investment. Many leading economists agree that funding high-quality pre-kindergarten is among the best investments government can make. An analysis by Arthur Rolnick, senior vice president and director of research at the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, showed that the return on the investment of the Perry Preschool Program was 16 percent after adjusting for inflation. Seventy-five percent of that return went to the public in the form of decreased special education expenditures, crime costs, and welfare payments.

To put this in perspective, the long-term average return on U.S. stocks is 7 percent after adjusting for inflation. Thus, while an initial investment of \$1,000 in the stock market is likely to return less than \$4,000 in 20 years, the same investment in a program like the Perry Preschool is likely to return more than \$19,000 in the same time period. William Gale and Isabel Sawhill of the Brookings Institution observe that investing in early childhood education provides government and society "with estimated rates of return that would make a venture capitalist envious."

With research as clear and compelling as this, I defy anyone to give me one good reason why we are not investing more—much more—in sound early education for our children.

I guess we shouldn't be surprised, though, that despite the evidence, this administration has gone in the opposite direction. Under this administration, cuts to early childhood programs have hurt hundreds of thousands of children and the numbers are only growing. Head Start has been cut 11 percent since 2002. The National Head Start Association calculates that by 2008 our country will have 30,399 fewer children in Head Start than in 2007—that figure includes nearly 1,100 children from Pennsylvania.

The President has also called for a freeze in funding for child care assistance—for the sixth year in a row. Currently, only 1 in 7 eligible children receives Federal childcare subsidies. Years of flat funding have already resulted in the loss of child care assistance for 150,000 children. By 2010, 300,000 more children are slated to lose out. In my own State, the current trajectory will mean the loss of \$14 million in childcare assistance by 2012.

This is, very simply, unacceptable. And it is profoundly wrong. And it is fiscally irresponsible.

I began my remarks this morning with the question, "How are the Children?" The current answer to that question is not acceptable.

It is my deep conviction that as elected public servants, we have a sacred responsibility to ensure that all children in this country have the opportunity to grow to responsible adulthood, the opportunity to realize their fullest potential, to live the lives they

were born to live. The Protect All Kids Act is a big step in that direction, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill. Everything we do in Congress has some impact—in one way or another and for good or for bad—upon the well being of our children. Our children are our future. With everything we do we must ask ourselves, "How are the children?" We cannot rest until the answer to this most fundamental of questions is: The children—all the children—are well.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is now closed.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM ACT OF 2007

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1348, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1348) to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid (for Kennedy/Specter) amendment No. 1150, in the nature of a substitute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, is recognized for up to 2 hours.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I thank the Chair for recognition and want to continue the discussion on the very important piece of legislation that is now before the Senate.

I do believe the immigration system is comprehensively broken. I have said for some time we need a comprehensive solution to it, to comprehensively reform it, but to reform it in a way that will actually work, that will do it with principles we can adhere to in the future, that will move us from a lawless system of immigration.

Most people may not know but 1.1 million people are arrested each year entering our country illegally. Think about the cost and personnel involved in processing that many people. It is a system that is not working. We know many people are getting by the border and not being apprehended.

It rightly causes the American people to question how serious we are in Congress when we say we want to do something about it. They believe we should do something about it. We say we want to do something about it, but eventually, as time goes along, for one reason or another, little ever seems to occur that actually works.

I have stated more than once we can pass a lot of legislation in this Senate dealing with immigration, but if you offer something that will actually work, to actually fix the problem, to actually be effective, we always have much wailing and crying and gnashing

of teeth, and usually those things do not become law.

Last year, I was very critical of the bill that was offered. I said it was fatally flawed. I said it should be withdrawn and urged my colleagues that if we drafted a bill for this session of Congress it should not be based on last year's fatally flawed bill but that we should start over and create a system that would create a genuine temporary worker program, not the flawed program that was there last year, that would move us toward a Canadian-based system where people all over the world could apply to our country, and they would be selected based on their merits and the skills and abilities they bring that would be valuable to our country.

I noted that we needed, of course, effective border enforcement as well as workplace enforcement, and we ought not to create a system that gives someone who enters our country illegally every single benefit we give to those who come to the country legally. The legal people do deserve to be treated in a different way than those who come illegally.

Now, I know as a matter of compassion and practicality we have to wrestle with the 12 million people here. I never doubted that. Nobody doubts that. How we deal with it, though, is a matter that will determine what policies we, as a nation, adhere to. It will send a signal to people all over the world that we are actually going to insist that we have a legal system of immigration and we intend to enforce it.

It is one thing to have a law, but if you are not prepared to enforce it and go through the process that is oftentimes painful to catch someone who violated the law and then have them deported—oftentimes that is a painful process—you either are going to do that or we might as well admit here we have no intention of enforcing any laws.

I do not think that is what we do. Almost every Senator has stated they want a lawful system of immigration, Republicans and Democrats. I do not think we have a problem. I would say yesterday and last week I had a very great concern that a plan was afoot to get cloture on the bill yesterday. The old bill, which I steadfastly believe is not an effective piece of legislation, would then be substituted by a new piece of legislation. That happened last night. It is approximately 300 pages of fine print and maybe 1,000 pages of the kind of legislative bill language we normally use here. It is one of the largest pieces of legislation to be introduced since I have been in the Senate. I think the Presiding Officer, Senator LANDRIEU, might remember some of the omnibus bills may have been that big, but I cannot remember a single piece of legislation since I have been in the Senate that would be 800 to 1,000 pages.

So the scheme or the plan was to try to move that through this week. I am