

these numbers, and they conclude that the cost over the next 10 years to the taxpayers of this country—not including enforcement, fences, border patrol, all that stuff; just the cost from legalizing those who are here illegally—will be over \$30 billion.

Now, with my amendment I offered to delay the earned-income tax credit payments to illegal immigrants who are here, and to delay it until at least they became a legal permanent resident, we would reduce that to maybe \$25 billion. That passed by a narrow margin, which I was pleased to have passed, but all the rest of the benefits are there, so we are looking at perhaps a \$25 billion net drain on the U.S. Treasury, according to the Congressional Budget Office. They admit it will be much greater in the future.

In the outyears, the costs will increase because the way the bill is written, certain benefits are not made available initially to those who are given legal status, but their benefits will increase in the years to come. How much will those increases be? When asked if it would be a substantial increase in the future, the Congressional Budget Office—which did not score beyond the 10 years—said certainly, absolutely, it would be a substantial increase.

One institution has looked at this figure: the Heritage Foundation. The Heritage Foundation's senior fellow, Robert Rector, has spent months on this very issue. He used the best available statistics in calculating the costs to the American Government—State, Federal, and local treasuries—of amnesty. It is a picture that I think, as responsible legislators, as representatives of our own constituents, we have to think about, we have to acknowledge. The number he came up with is so large that many people have just tried to dismiss it without any thought. But Robert Rector is one of the foremost experts in this country on welfare and social programs. He was the architect of the welfare reform President Clinton vetoed two or three times and finally signed and took credit for for the rest of his tenure. How wonderful it was. It did work exceedingly well. Mr. Rector's analysis cannot be lightly dismissed. He concludes that the cost to Federal, State, and local governments from just retirement of the 12 million to their death would be \$2.6 trillion.

It is clear any short-term benefit—whatever the exact number is out there, whatever the exact number is—any short-term benefit provided to American businesses who would enjoy these low-skilled workers would be more than offset by the lifetime costs of tax credits, welfare, food stamps, Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare that will be picked up by the American public—the taxpayers.

Mr. Rector said: "This is a fiscal disaster."

Finally, I believe this legislation, because it will not reduce illegal immi-

gration and will double—only a 13-percent reduction—and will double legal immigration, will put even more stress than we currently have on working middle-class Americans. It will have a tendency to pull down wages of American workers. That is their asset: their labor. But workers are more than a mere asset; they are human beings. They are created with inalienable rights, according to our Declaration, and they are citizens who are the ultimate shareholders of America. Citizenship carries responsibilities for them and for us. We pay taxes. We serve in the military to the point of giving our lives for our country.

I have talked to a lot of mamas and fathers in the last several years who have had their sons—middle-class Americans who are serving our country in Iraq and Afghanistan who have lost their lives in service to our country.

We have an obligation to obey the law. We accept court rulings even if they are silly and absurd. That is what we do. We grumble, but we follow what the court says. We obey laws passed by this Congress, whether we like them or not, whether they make sense or not. That is the responsibility of citizenship in this Nation we have inherited.

Those of us now in Congress I submit have an obligation to those dutiful citizens who serve every day doing the right thing. We owe them something. One thing we owe them is consistent and fair application and enforcement of the law. Another is to make sure those who do the right thing are rewarded or allowed to prosper and those who do not are disadvantaged. This is the definition of a morally ordered society. We are a community of people, voluntarily bound together in many ways. It is the uniqueness of America. It is our strength. But do not ever doubt that that moral order, that proper balance, can be eroded if we are irresponsible in this body. It can even be lost.

Labor is more than barrels of oil, tons of iron ore, bales of cotton, or kilowatts of electricity. Our workers are our citizens, created beings of infinite worth. They have every right to expect, to demand, that their elected representatives protect their interests, their country's legitimate national interests, not just what might be seen as an immediate benefit to that abstraction we might refer to as "the economy."

So I believe in immigration. I support immigration. I do not want to end it. I support an effective temporary worker program. But let's tell the truth about immigration and wages in this country. The elites are doing very well in this boom period, corporations are making record profits, but what about our citizens of this Republic who are less skilled? What have their wages done?

We have had a series of witnesses, including Dr. Chiswick from the University of Illinois. We had Professor Borjas of the Kennedy School at Harvard. We had Alan Tonnel at a Senate

hearing. We had a hearing and all of them testified and all of them agreed that large numbers of immigrants are, in fact, reducing wages of American citizens.

I left this Senate Chamber Friday after talking about this issue, and I mentioned wages. I went out, and right on the corner there was a gentleman with a homemade cardboard sign. He had white hair and gray in his beard.

I said: Well, what brings you here?

He said: Well, I wanted to come up and have my say about this immigration bill. He told me he was a master carpenter and that he was from Melbourne, FL, and that in the 1990s he made \$75,000 a year. He said he can hardly stay in business today because of the large flow of immigrant workers that has pulled down his ability to have the kind of income he would like.

Now, some may think that is too much money for a carpenter. I don't, not if he works hard and not if he is good. Don't think there are not millions of Americans who have given their lives to developing a skill and a craft and that, in the blink of an eye, can be made less valuable by an unwise, ineffective, inappropriate immigration policy.

So there is a lot we need to think about as we debate this bill. I am absolutely convinced it will not do what it promises, and what it will do may be adverse to our country. I am very worried about it. There is no reason whatsoever in the face of overwhelming public opposition that we should be bringing it up, and there is no reason whatsoever that the majority leader should be utilizing this clay pigeon procedure which, apparently, he will execute tomorrow, that will allow us to vote only on the amendments he chooses and to craft this procedure for handling this bill to minimize to the *n*th degree the amount of time we have available to debate it. I think that is a mistake. I object to that and urge my colleagues to vote tomorrow not to proceed to the legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein.

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

#### IMMIGRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, before making my closing procedural remarks and turning the floor over to the Senator from Indiana, I would like to use morning business for a brief moment to respond to the Senator from Alabama.

Our views on the immigration issue are much different. I happen to believe

the current immigration system is a disaster. It is unfair to the people of America to allow 800,000 or more undocumented people to come into our country each year, three-fourths of whom will remain in our country, as they have over the last 20 years.

Today there are about 12 million undocumented people. We have to stop the flow of undocumented across the border. The underlying immigration bill focuses on enforcement. The version that will be before us this week for the very first time invests \$4 billion in enforcement. Those who argue we need to have stronger borders instead of broken borders, those who argue we should have enforcement in the workplace, should support this bill. It creates the laws and the tools to do that.

I might also add I don't believe the procedural arguments are valid. First, let me say this bill has been on the floor pending, available for scrutiny for weeks—4 weeks, 5 weeks, at least. Anyone who argues they haven't had a chance to look at this bill, it isn't for lack of opportunity, as everyone should for a bill of this consequence.

The second argument that somehow this process we are about to embark upon is so unusual as to be unfair, what the Senator failed to note is that the amendments which will be considered this week are an agreed-upon list of amendments on a bipartisan basis. Democratic leaders, Republican leaders came together and are offering over 20 amendments which will be debated on and considered this week. There are amendments offered by Senators who are going to oppose this bill no matter what it says and amendments offered by those who support it.

There will be ample opportunity for more debate on a bill that has already been debated for weeks—a bill which has been subjected to almost 40 amendments. I think most people understand the gravity of this bill, the importance of this bill, and the complexity of this bill. It is the effort of the majority leader, HARRY REID, to finally bring this matter to closure and a vote.

There are some, who for a variety of different reasons, oppose this bill who have said: We will do everything within our power to stop this matter from coming to a vote. That is their right as Senators in this Chamber. It is the right of those who want to bring it to a vote to use the rules for their purposes. That is the nature of this body. That is what the Senate is all about. So I think it will be a fair process.

At the end of the week, we will have considered this bill in its entirety and subjected it to amendment and debate. That is what the Senate should be about, and that is what this bill is concerned with.

#### SUPREME COURT RULING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 6 years ago I took to this floor to express the view that any campaign finance law must be written within the boundaries of the first amendment. It states:

Congress shall make no law, respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people to peaceably assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

This very amendment adorns the facade of the yet-to-open Newseum a few blocks from here on Pennsylvania Avenue—a building constructed, both philosophically and physically, upon the cornerstone of our first amendment rights.

Today the U.S. Supreme Court decided that the U.S. Congress went too far 5 years ago in legislating restrictions on First Amendment rights. In its ruling this morning in Wisconsin Right to Life vs. FEC, the Court righted that wrong.

It took an important first step toward restoring the rights of organizations to petition the government and members of Congress.

The court rejected an intent-and-effect test for advertisements and instead went with a susceptible of no other reasonable interpretation than an appeal to vote for or against a candidate.

However, and most importantly, in a debatable case the tie is resolved in favor of protecting speech.

As the Chief Justice noted in his decision for the majority:

Where the First Amendment is implicated, the tie goes to the speaker, not the censor:

It is fitting that this opinion should come down as we approach the Fourth of July recess, when we return home to celebrate those freedoms for which our forefathers fought and died.

What better tribute to their efforts than the affirmation of our right—not just ability—but right of freedom to speech and the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

This afternoon, we will witness our new colleague from Wyoming be sworn, reminding us of the oath we all took upon election to this body to, "Preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States of America."

Chief Justice Roberts summed up this case and, in fact, the entire campaign finance debate so well that I would like to close with his words. He wrote:

These cases are about political speech. The importance of the cases to speech and debate on public policy issues is reflected in the number of diverse organizations that have joined in supporting Wisconsin Right to Life before this Court: the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Rifle Association, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Focus on the Family, the Coalition of Public Charities, the Cato Institute, and many others.

In his closing paragraph, the Chief Justice reminded us what lies at the heart of this issue. After quoting the language of the first amendment, he wrote:

The Framers' actual words put these cases in proper perspective. Our jurisprudence over

the past 216 years has rejected an absolutist interpretation of those words, but when it comes to drawing difficult lines in the area of pure political speech—between what is protected and what the Government can ban—it is worth recalling the language we are applying: when it comes to defining what speech qualifies as the functional equivalent of express advocacy subject to such a ban—the issue we do have to decide—we give the benefit of the doubt to speech, not censorship. The First Amendment's command that "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech" demands at least that.

It is a good day for the first amendment.

I yield the floor.

#### FURTHER CHANGES TO S. CON. RES. 21

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, last week, pursuant to section 309 of S. Con. Res. 21, I filed revisions to S. Con. Res. 21, the 2008 Budget Resolution. Those revisions were made for Senate amendment No. 1704, an amendment pending to Senate amendment No. 1502, an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 6, the energy bill.

The Senate did not adopt Senate amendment No. 1704. As a consequence, I am further revising the 2008 Budget Resolution and the adjustments made last week pursuant to section 309 to the aggregates and the allocation provided to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee for Senate amendment No. 1704.

I ask unanimous consent that the following revisions to S. Con. Res. 21 be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—S. CON. RES. 21; FURTHER REVISIONS TO THE CONFERENCE AGREEMENT PURSUANT TO SECTION 309 DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COUNTY PAYMENTS LEGISLATION

(In billions of dollars)

Section 101:	
(1)(A) Federal Revenues:	
FY 2007 .....	\$1,900.340
FY 2008 .....	2,015.841
FY 2009 .....	2,113.811
FY 2010 .....	2,169.475
FY 2011 .....	2,350.248
FY 2012 .....	2,488.296
(1)(B) Change in Federal Revenues:	
FY 2007 .....	- 4.366
FY 2008 .....	- 34.955
FY 2009 .....	6.885
FY 2010 .....	5.754
FY 2011 .....	- 44.302
FY 2012 .....	- 108.800
(2) New Budget Authority:	
FY 2007 .....	2,376.348
FY 2008 .....	2,495.957
FY 2009 .....	2,517.006
FY 2010 .....	2,569.530
FY 2011 .....	2,684.693
FY 2012 .....	2,719.054
(3) Budget Outlays	
FY 2007 .....	2,299.749
FY 2008 .....	2,468.215
FY 2009 .....	2,565.589
FY 2010 .....	2,599.173
FY 2011 .....	2,691.657
FY 2012 .....	2,703.260