

By the way, my colleague suggested, because I said you can almost always find a general to support a program at the Pentagon—that I denigrated generals. My point was not to denigrate generals. But every program that exists, and every idea, has sponsors and support. You show me a program, I will show you a number of people who are involved in that program, believe in that program, and want that program to move. It is the generals and colonels and captains and lieutenants, and that is the way the system works.

Now, I promised I was going to compliment the manager and the ranking member. I did it before, but let me do it again. This is a big piece of legislation, hard to put together, and not easy to manage. But they have been on the floor now for some while trying to move this legislation through. Much of it is very important for this country. I hope we can move to final passage in an expedited way.

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 I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3198

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3198.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. LEAHY. I make a point of order that it is legislation on an appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained. The amendment falls.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chair.

While I have the floor, I understand my good friend, the Senator from New Jersey, is concerned. There appears not to be parity between the northern border and the southern border. I share his concern about some of the issues of racism that have been floated into the debate regarding our southern border. I think he would admit that there are differences between the northern border and the southern border. We are blessed to have friends on both our northern and southern borders. The failure of the administration to take a truly bipartisan approach to comprehensive immigration reform and the failure of this body to go forward and work its way all the way through to a final immigration bill reflects some of the problems we have.

The way to solve them is not to close the border to a historic neighbor on the longest unguarded frontier in the world, one of our largest trading partners. We already have policies of this administration that are about to cost us hundreds of billions of dollars in jobs in the United States, which do nothing to enhance our security, with the cockamamie idea from the State

Department and the Department of Homeland Security requiring passports to cross between Canada and the United States. This will do very little to improve our security. Instead of working with Senators on both sides of the aisle to find a way where we could have safe, easy transfer between the two countries, keep commerce going, especially after this administration has so badly handled our economy that our dollar has slipped dramatically, the administration wants to hastily implement ill-conceived barriers to cross-border travel. We seem to want to poke our thumb in the eye of a good neighbor.

I do not fault the Senator from New Jersey for his amendment. I understand the reason he does it. As he can well understand, I disagree with the idea of a fence along the Canadian border, just as I voted against erecting a fence along the southern border last year. I wish we could show some sense in real immigration policy with our southern border. It is a fault in this country to pretend we don't have illegal immigrants looking for a better life and to think that we are going to solve the problem by denying them access to social programs, deny their children access to our schools, deny them access to assistance with food, deny them access to health care, and to threaten prosecution of our churches if they show their respect for the commandments and actually want to help the least among us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I appreciate the views of my distinguished colleague from Vermont. I particularly appreciate his support for comprehensive immigration reform for which he has been a champion. However, I must take the opportunity to note that the underlying amendment Senator SALAZAR and I were addressing, for which no point of order was raised against and which, in essence, was adopted by the Senate, goes to the very heart of this issue.

As a matter of fact, there was a colloquy between Senator TESTER and Senator GRAHAM that basically said to some degree that, in fact, the resources Senator GRAHAM had in his amendment, adopted by the Senate, could go to the northern border. What Senator SALAZAR and I want to make clear is that, in fact, either we protect all of the country or we protect none of it.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I am happy to.

Mr. LEAHY. I want to make sure: The Senator would have been within his rights to have made a point of order against the Graham amendment had he wanted to; is that correct?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Unfortunately, I didn't have notice of it before it was called up for a vote; otherwise, I would have had the opportunity.

Mr. LEAHY. I had heard about an hour before the vote that we were having it.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I would note for the Senator, however, that his concern was in the underlying Graham amendment as well. So here we are, where we as a body consistently pursue one course of action on one part of the U.S. border, and on the other border we actually say it is quite different. The reality is, some of us on this issue believe there has to be some consistency because, if not, some of us believe either it is about securing the country or it is not. If it is about securing the country, you can't secure one border and say the other border is free for people to cross undetected, as has been well documented by the Government Accountability Office, by the 9/11 Commission, and by the fact that the millennium bomber came through, and a host of other things. Either we are going to have security, which means north and south, or we are not going to have security. If it is only about the southern border, then it is about a lot more than security. It is about who happens to be crossing we don't like. What is the color of their skin? What is their ethnicity? Why is that such a threat when the only real terrorist threat we have ever had came through the northern border?

This Senator, for one, intends to ensure moving forward that as we have other appropriations bills, I will make it my business to be on the Senate floor to raise points of order because either it is about securing all of the country or it is about securing none of it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3146 WITHDRAWN

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, with the approval of Senator ALLARD, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 3146 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. That is the Allard amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Allard amendment.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President: I want to speak at this point with Senators INOUE and STEVENS on the amendment offered by Senator SALAZAR and myself designating \$5 million—the amount requested by the Pentagon and previously approved by the House—for the Missile Defense Space Experimentation Center, a facility within the Missile