things, such as my good friend, the Secretary of Homeland Security, Mike Chertoff who is doing a great job—he frames the issue this way: It is a choice between Republican conservatives who want to block the bill by insisting on mass deportations or insisting on deportations that are just not going to happen.

Well, I am not aware of anybody on our side of the aisle calling for mass deportations. That is not so. That is a false setup. That is a triangulation, if you will, good friend, Mr. Chertoff, former U.S. attorney. We served together in the Department of Justice. He is one of the best members of the Cabinet. I do not appreciate it, Mike. You tell me who on this side said we want to have a mass deportation—zero. That is not the question.

The question is whether we will have a decent bill that will actually work. I know you have made recommendations that are critical, Mr. Chertoff, to the passage of the bill that were not included in it. In fact, I have to give him credit. He did criticize the liberal immigration rights advocates by suggesting they will prolong the anguish by holding off the bill also. But I do not think that is the right issue here.

All of us want a compassionate, legitimate piece of legislation that can work and will serve our long-term interests and will be consistent with the principles that are set forth by the people who worked on the legislation. But I am not given confidence. I will repeat again: I am not feeling confident at all there will be a legitimate, full, vigorous debate and a lot of amendments that go to some of the weaknesses in the legislation. I am afraid they are not going to be considered.

I say that because I see the tactics moving along. We have gone a week with only three, four votes. That is not enough time on a bill of this size and complexity. I think we had 40 or 50 votes on the bankruptcy bill. It was nothing more than an updating of bankruptcy law. It went on for weeks and months. It came through the Senate three or four times actually before it finally became law.

There were other bills that had far more extensive debate and discussion than this one. But none of those bills come close to having the impact on America or come close to having the attention of the American people to the degree this issue does.

The reason the American people are angry and upset is simple. They are not angry, they are not upset with immigrants. That is not what I read people to be saying. What I think they are angry and upset with is Congress and the President for absolutely refusing to listen to their natural and proper concerns about immigration. What I am hearing is they do not want to be taken to the cleaners once again.

They do not want to be victims of a bait and switch in which we promise we are going to create a system that will work for lawful immigration, that will allow us to have an immigration policy that serves the national interest, that allows millions of people to come to our country in immigration status—but it would be a number we can have jobs for, without pulling down the wages of hard-working American workers. It would bring in numbers sufficient to make sure we do not cause problems in schools and other areas that we cannot quite handle.

The number ought to be correct, and that they ought to be, insofar as possible, persons who are going to flourish in our economy, people who have the skills, language, and education levels that indicate they will likely be very successful here, like Canada does. That is what they do. We have a touch of that in this bill—far better than last year, I have to say—but I have been so disappointed to read the fine print and to see that movement to follow the philosophy that Canada does has not nearly been strong enough. It is discouraging to see it has not been.

So the individuals who thought they would meet and reach an agreement and plop it on the floor of the Senate—for which all the rest of us folks would just dutifully comply with and ratify and say: Thank you, my elite colleagues. We are glad you have worked out this immigration problem. Thank you so much. We know something had to be done—and it does have to be done—we are just overjoyed you got Senator KENNEDY and Senator KYL and everybody has agreed, and we are going to plop this bill down, and you guys will just ratify it. You can have a lot of little amendments if you want to, but, remember, if anything touches the core principles we have decided on, why, that would be something we just couldn't accept, and every one of us is going to stick together, and we are going to vote against it, even if we might agree with your amendment. We had to compromise that to get this agreement. Yes, Jeff, we like that amendment. I know you like that amendment. I really think you are right on that amendment, but I cannot vote with you because I have agreed with this group over here in this secret session which the public was not involved in. We made a commitment to one another, and we are going to stick together and vote you down.

Now, this is not the way old Bill was taught law was supposed to occur in America. It is unbelievable that you would have a piece of legislation of this historic nature not even go to committee and that this group just met. How quick did we have it? Oh, well, we were going to have the bill last Thursday so people could read it, and then it was going to be Friday. We promise we will have the bill Friday. Then it turned out to be Saturday morning, at 2 a.m., they emailed it and tried to say they put it out Friday. It was Saturday, at best, when the bill was out. They claim it is 300 and some pages. I believe this is it. They say it is 300 pages or whatever the number of pages it is in this stack of bills, but they didn't print it in the normal language. I have never seen a piece of legislation of any size go through here and not be in bill language. This is fine print. If you put this bill in bill language, it would probably be 1,000 pages. A good immigration bill needs to be 1,000 pages. There are thousands of issues involved that need to be clarified, hundreds and hundreds of complex situations that, if not properly addressed, will never work if we don't do it right.

That is all I would say to my colleagues and friends. I love you. I appreciate all your efforts to try to solve the American people's problems. I know you didn't want to bother with them while you met and had your discussions, except I guess the Chamber of Commerce and this special interest group and that special interest group and maybe some pollsters telling this and that; I don't know how that came out. But I don't appreciate the fact that we are not being able to have a full debate on it, and we are not going to be able to have very many amendments. We could probably, without—well, you say: You are trying to file amendments to delay. You want to slow down the process. Well, as Senator SPECTER said, in retrospect, we would have done better had the bill gone through committee, the Judiciary Committee. At least they did last year. It was rammed through the committee last year because I saw it when I was on the committee. This is what happened last year: They waited until the last minute. Senator Frist, the majority leader, says we are going to bring an immigration bill up next Monday. On the Judiciary Committee, we are working hard. We go to the Judiciary Committee, and Senator SPECTER has a bill that had some possibilities. It had problems, but it had some attractiveness to it. It wasn't long before Senator KENNEDY dropped his bill and substituted and the Specter bill was gone. We had an entirely new bill. Then they dropped an AgJOBS thing on top of that. Then they dropped the DREAM Act, which gives instate tuition to illegal aliens and things of that nature that all got dropped on, passed, pop, pop, pop.

Senator Frist says: Well, if you don't have the bill on the floor by Monday night, I am going to go with an enforcement only bill. So we rush and rush around there and they put the bill down on Monday night and here we go. Senator REID says we don't want any amendments. Senator CORNYN and Senator KYL had some amendments. They got their backs up and began to push back and people said: What are we going to do with a bill without any amendments? So finally, Senator Frist pulled the bill. He said: We are not going to bring it back up until the Democratic leaders agree we are going to have some amendments. It came back up for a couple of weeks of debate and cleared this body, knowing the House of Representatives had no intention whatsoever of ever considering it.