

© 2007 CBS Broadcasting Inc.  
All Rights Reserved

*PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS CBS  
TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "CBS NEWS' FACE THE NATION. "*

*CBS News*

# ***FACE THE NATION***

*Sunday, June 3, 2007*

**GUESTS: Sen. KEN SALAZAR (D-CO)**

**Rep. PETER KING (R-NY)**

**JOHN HARRIS**  
Politico.com

**DAVID SANGER**  
The New York Times

**RAYMOND KELLY**  
Commissioner,  
New York Police Department

**MODERATOR: BOB SCHIEFFER - CBS News**

*This is a rush transcript provided  
for the information and convenience of  
the press. Accuracy is not guaranteed.  
In case of doubt, please check with*

***FACE THE NATION - CBS NEWS***  
***202-457-4481***

BOB SCHIEFFER, host:

Today on FACE THE NATION, another terrorist plot revealed. It's Republican against Republican and Democrat against Democrat on immigration. And is the administration working quietly on a plan B for Iraq?

Yesterday authorities in New York broke up an alleged terror plot to bomb fuel tanks and pipelines at the JFK Airport. How close did they get? And is there any connection to al-Qaeda? We'll ask New York's police commissioner, Raymond Kelly.

Then we'll turn to the divisive issue of immigration. We'll talk with Republican Congressman Peter King of New York, who opposes the president's immigration plan, and Democratic Senator Ken Salazar of Colorado, who favors it.

We'll talk politics and the administration's next steps in Iraq with John Harris of politico.com and David Sanger of The New York Times.

Then I'll have a final word on one weird week.

But first, terror and immigration on FACE THE NATION.

Announcer: FACE THE NATION, with CBS News chief Washington correspondent Bob Schieffer. And now from CBS News in Washington, Bob Schieffer.

SCHIEFFER: And good morning again. Well, yesterday authorities in New York had some shocking news. They announced they had broken up what they called a terrorist cell which was plotting to blow up fuel tanks at Kennedy Airport. Three men have been arrested, we're told they were motivated by hatred for Israel and America. The New York police commissioner is with us this morning to talk about it, Ray Kelly.

Commissioner, let me ask you first, these people apparently had no money and they had no explosives. How close were they to pulling this thing off?

Mr. RAYMOND KELLY (Commissioner, New York Police Department): Well, it wasn't for want of trying. They tried to get money, and they tried to get explosives. I think the investigators took this case down at the appropriate time. We don't want them to get close to money or close to explosives. There was enough here to go forward with a criminal prosecution, and that's good news.

SCHIEFFER: Well, do you believe they had any connection to al-Qaeda, or was this just some sort of homegrown group?

Mr. KELLY: Well, al-Qaeda is a philosophy now. They were reaching out to a militant group in Trinidad, they were looking to get money from this group. So we see no direct connection to core al-Qaeda, but clearly, as I say, it's a movement, it's a--it's a philosophy, and they're motivated by the same hatred that motivates al-Qaeda.

SCHIEFFER: Well, I guess the question that I would have, Mr. Commissioner, is was this just a group of sort of malcontents, weirdos who had some fantasy or were they really close to pulling off something very dangerous?

Mr. KELLY: Well, when you say close, it's difficult to say. You're not certain what it's going to morph into. But what they did do is visit Kennedy Airport on several occasions, take films of the airport. This one individual, Russell Defreitas, had in-depth knowledge of the airport. They made trips back and forth to Guyana and to Trinidad. They were meeting with people, discussing a plot. So it was a lot of manifestation of their intention to commit a terrorist act. Did they have explosives in their possession? No. But clearly there were explosives available in Guyana. And as I say, we don't know exactly what this case could have changed into, could have morphed into if they were able to successfully create a partnership with this militant group.

SCHIEFFER: Well, where are you on this now? It's my understanding that there's still one person that you're looking for?

Mr. KELLY: There's one individual who we believe is in Trinidad. He's Guyanese, but he is in Trinidad. Three others are in custody. The Trinidadian authorities are cooperating. Extradition proceedings will be moving forward in Trinidad for the two that are in custody there. And one is in custody here in New York.

SCHIEFFER: All right. Well, congratulations to all of you there. We thank you, commissioner, and thanks for bringing us--bringing us up to date.

Mr. KELLY: Good to be with you, Bob.

SCHIEFFER: We want to turn now to the issue that has turned Democrats against Democrats and Republicans against Republicans, and that is this whole question of immigration and immigration reform, the issue that has stirred fierce debate. It's caused Republicans to start using rhetoric on each other that they used to use only on Democrats, and Democrats are saying nasty things about each other, too. Yet--and here is the surprising thing to me--the American people seem much more relaxed about all this than their leaders and opinion makers. The CBS News/New York Times Poll shows 62 percent believe illegal immigrants should have a chance to apply for legal status. Sixty-seven percent believe illegal immigrants should be allowed to apply for a visa, and 66 percent, another big majority, support a guest worker program.

Now, those are some of the features in the president's immigration reform proposal. I want to go now to Congressman Peter King.

You are a Republican, Congressman. Why are you against the president's plan?

Representative PETER KING (Republican, New York): Because, Bob, it's not going to work, and no matter how they try to disguise it, this is amnesty. And in those poll numbers you're talking about, let me tell you, I have gotten

five, 600 phone calls, at least, since this bill was announced. There's been one person has come out in favor of this legislation. And when you look at the poll numbers, when you get down to all the questions, there's also another question which said the overwhelming majority of Americans want illegal immigrants deported. Now, the bottom line is here, if we're serious about illegal immigration, what this bill does is not a serious bill because it promises less than we already have. It provides less border fencing, it provides maybe the same amount of border patrol agents. But, at the same time or almost immediately, gives legal status to 12 million illegal immigrants living in this country. They can get that within 24 hours, and that will give them the right to work, the right to go to college, the right to stay in this country for the rest of their lives. That's the reality. And remember, 12 million illegal immigrants, that's more than the population of 44 different states in this country.

SCHIEFFER: Well, it also raises a question, if you tried to get them all out, I mean, how would you go about doing that? I mean, we had trouble getting thousands of people out of New Orleans, and you're talking about getting millions of people out of this country? It seems to me that that's just an impossible task.

Rep. KING: No, Bob, I'm not talking about deportation. I'm saying the overwhelming majority of Americans said they wanted deportation. What I'm saying we should do is enforce the laws we have right now. Don't give amnesty to illegal immigrants. Go after the workplace. Go after the employers who are--who are hiring illegal immigrants. That will result in voluntary deportation. And then we can come back in three or four years, if the border is secure, if illegal immigration has been stopped and if we've gone after the workplaces, then we can address the remaining illegal immigrants who are here. I'm not anti-immigrant. I come from a family of immigrants. I grew up in neighborhoods where immigrants were both legal and illegal. But the world changed on September 11th. We right now have a situation that's out of control. This bill does not address it, it only exacerbates it.

SCHIEFFER: All right, well, we want to go to Senator Ken Salazar now, who's with us in the studio here in Washington. He is one of those who worked with the group to get this compromise legislation together that the president is now supporting.

Senator, you've just heard Peter King, who makes a very good case for why this is not a good bill. Tell me why you think it is a good one.

Senator KEN SALAZAR (Democrat, Colorado): I think it's--I think it is a good bill because, for the first time, what we have here is legislation that addresses three fundamental points. First, it strengthens our border. We have 370 miles of fencing, we have a doubling of the number of border patrol officers, we do a whole host of things on the border that will secure the border. Second of all, we provide the capacity to be able to enforce our laws within the country. That's something which the United States has not done for over 20 years. We need to start enforcing our laws, including tough employer sanctions. And third, we deal with the realistic provisions on the 12 million

undocumented workers in America. You know, if you listen to my friend, Representative King, though he--what he would try to do is to be part of the round-them-up-and-deport-them crowd. I mean, how're you going to round up 12 million human beings, all of them with hearts and souls, most of them are hard-working people here in America, and ship them out? And essentially, those who are in Representative King's camp are people who don't want to find a solution to the very fundamental problem of the 21st century here in America.

SCHIEFFER: Well, let me ask you this. You just heard me read those poll results, which I must say, after listening to the debate for the last year or so, I was really stunned to find so many people favor a guest workers program, favor a way for people who are in this country illegally to apply for citizenship or some sort of legal reasons to stay here. Where is all this coming from? I don't understand it. The rhetoric is so harsh among public officials and opinion makers and talk radio. And yet you have a poll that says most people really favor these things.

Sen. SALAZAR: You know, Bob, I think the noise is coming from the radical fringes on the right...

SCHIEFFER: On both sides.

Sen. SALAZAR: ...on the right and the left. And the fact is when you think about Secretary Chertoff and Gutierrez, and President Bush's leadership, working with somebody like Ted Kennedy to come up with a proposal that's comprehensive in nature, I think those public officials are where the American people are. They see a problem that we have in immigration, which is a huge national security problem, and an economic security issue with huge moral implications, and we need a fix. And for those in Washington who say, you know, we can go ahead and postpone this thing for another three or four years, I think they're wrong. I think it would be an abdication of responsibility on the part of our American leadership if we don't get to a solution on immigration reform, and we don't do it this year.

SCHIEFFER: Well, let me just show--I want to show something here. The president, among others, is going all out. He said that those who oppose his plans, and this is his quote, "don't want to do what's right for America". And I know a lot of Republicans took umbrage at that. He said that during a speech down in Georgia, which if there is Bush country, that would certainly be Bush country. Here's--he went on to say this. Listen.

President GEORGE W. BUSH: If you want to scare the American people, what you say is the bill's an amnesty bill. It's not an amnesty bill. That's empty political rhetoric trying to frighten our fellow citizens.

SCHIEFFER: Well, I'll go back to you, Congressman King. Are you trying to frighten people, congressman?

Rep. KING: No, not at all. I have great regard for President Bush, but I disagree with him on this. And as far as what Senator Salazar just said, I am

not saying deport all 12 million. I'm saying enforce the laws we have now. And this bill will actually weaken the law. The current law says we have to have 700 miles of fence, this bill says make 300 miles. Right now we're supposed to have 41,000 detention beds, this will give us less than 41,000. And as far as deportation, what I'm saying we should do is enforce the law, stop the immigration that's coming into the country now, the illegal immigration, go after the employers, and that will result in a good number of self deportations. Whoever's left after that, in three or four years, we can go back and address.

But right now this is not comprehensive legislation. You're taking 12 million illegal immigrants and saying they're legal, and somehow saying that that is addressing the issue. And I really--you know, I have to disagree with this whole idea that it's some radical group. If you went back in the streets talking to people, talking to real Americans who work day in and day out, they are strongly opposed to this bill. Maybe not the people in The New York Times, or the people in the media or, all due respect to Senator Salazar, people who run with six year terms. But those of us who are back in our districts talking to people--I come from a Reagan Democrat district. Bill Clinton carried it twice, Al Gore carried it in 2000. The people are overwhelmingly against this bill.

SCHIEFFER: Let me just cut...

Rep. KING: And even in your own...

SCHIEFFER: Yes, let me just...

Rep. KING: ... bill--Bob, Bob you can...

SCHIEFFER: Let me just cut to the chase here.

Rep. KING: Right.

SCHIEFFER: Would you rather have no bill than this bill, congressman?

Rep. KING: I would rather have the current law enforced. I will be introducing legislation of my own in the next several weeks. along with Congressman Smith. But this bill is worse than the current law because it weakens the enforcement provisions, and it gives amnesty to 12 million people who are here illegally. It sets the wrong precedent, it's the wrong thing to do. And even your own poll, Bob, would show that a massive number of Americans, when they ask the question they want deportation, they say yes. So that flies in the face of those first numbers that you already gave.

SCHIEFFER: Well, I guess I'm obliged to ask Senator Salazar, do you consider yourself a real person in the definition that Congressman King has just given here? Do you think you're on the same page with real people?

Sen. SALAZAR: You know, the United States senator, I'm with President Bush on this one. This is a national security issue, it's something that cries out

for solution, and we need to do it now. You know, on the substantive issue which Congressman King raises relative to amnesty, nothing could be further from the truth. If you think about what you're doing with these 12 million people, you're putting them in an eight year status of purgatory. They're not going to have the right to vote, they're going to be very--they're going to be here legally, but they're going to have a whole huge number of issues that are going to burden them during the eight year time frame that they're here. They're going to have to pay, overall--one person is going to have to pay \$8,000 in order to be legalized. That's a penalty, it's processing fees, it's three fee application fees, \$8,000. You know, I--I'm--I was an attorney general for--I was attorney general in my state, you know, prosecuted thousands of criminals, and I'm a proud member of the law enforcement community.

SCHIEFFER: Let me just ask you this quick question. Do you think this bill will pass the Senate?

Sen. SALAZAR: I think it will pass the Senate, and I expect that it will pass the House of Representatives, and it will be signed by the president because this is one of the most fundamentally important issues for America today.

SCHIEFFER: Do you think the president can deliver 80 Republicans in the House? Because that's what House voters are saying it's going to take to get this passed.

Sen. SALAZAR: You know, I hope so. I mean, I think the president has worked in a true bipartisan spirit here. He's rolled up his sleeves, and he's worked very, very hard on getting this thing through. And those people who are out there trying to put the label of amnesty on this bill, they're just wrong. If you think about have to pay \$8,000, \$8,000, that's a very significant penalty and fines and processing fees that these people are going to have to pay in order for them to get in line to ultimately be eligible for a green card eight years down the road.

SCHIEFFER: All right, I want to thank both of you for helping us shed some light on what this legislation is about. We'll see what happens.

Back in a moment with the round table.

(Announcements)

SCHIEFFER: And to talk about what we've just been hearing and some other things now, some astute observers: David Sanger, who is the chief Washington correspondent for The New York Times, and John Harris, who is the editor in chief of politico.com, the Web site that is all politics all the time.

Let me just start with you, John. You heard what Peter King and Senator Salazar just said. Do you think, if you just had to make a guess right now, is this immigration reform package going to pass?

Mr. JOHN HARRIS (Politico.com): It's got a chance, but it's--the hole of the needle is very small. As your CBS/New York Times poll shows, a lot of the--a lot of the elements of this bill are popular, but there's a much more intense minority that's opposed to it. It's caught up in Republican presidential politics. I think it's possible, but it's--not without significant changes, and the longer it delays the less possible it is.

SCHIEFFER: All right. Well, I want to shift to Iraq because, David, you have been writing for the last couple of weeks about something that I find very interesting and that is while the administration has continued to say there is no plan B once we get past this idea of putting more troops, the so-called surge, into Baghdad, but you've been writing that behind the scenes there is some work going on on a plan B. What is it and what do you--what do you think is going to happen here?

Mr. DAVID SANGER (The New York Times): You know, Bob, it's sort of a concept B more than a plan B, because I think that they've come to the conclusion at this point that being able to predict Iraq, even two or three months out, is very difficult given the huge rise of casualties we've seen even in the past month.

But there are two major elements to it. The first is, that there is growing talk both in the Pentagon and in the White House of getting to a position where you could cut the combat brigades that are in Iraq--we now have 20--down to about 10 sometime--well, sometime just around the time the of presidential elections are heating up next spring and summer. It would take a while, but you could bring out about a brigade a month. That would bring total number of sources down to about 100,000. Wouldn't cut the total forces in half, but it would get on a downward path.

The second and most interesting thing is, that they're beginning to talk about a long-term presence in Iraq, along the lines of the model of our troops in South Korea. To many, it's an analogy that doesn't really work.

SCHIEFFER: Well, John, we do have a presidential campaign coming on here. Can Republicans go before the voters and expect to win if there are still a large number of troops in Iraq? Because what David is writing about is something, you know, 100,000, where there's only 140,000 there now.

Mr. HARRIS: Right.

SCHIEFFER: Iraq is still going to be the issue, and troops in Iraq, it seems to me, are still going to be the central issue of this campaign.

Mr. HARRIS: So far Iraq is not immigration. In other words, the Republican base has not abandoned President Bush on this issue. But the candidates and the Republican elite, if you will, is desperately worried that they will head into 2008 with Iraq still on the table. So I think clearly what they're trying to do--and David's interesting piece this morning in The New York Times making the analogy to Korea--this isn't remotely like Korea. Korea's the world's most fortified boundary. Iraq is chaos, neighborhood by neighborhood.

But they're trying to give hope to Republicans, saying, 'Look, we are making changes.' And I think come the fall there will be significant pressure from Republicans on Bush. He's lost his political flexibility on this, and very soon is going to be forced by politics to make significant changes.

SCHIEFFER: Well, one of the things we're seeing in this discontent in the Republican Party is the emergence of Fred Thompson. And there seems little question now that Fred Thompson, the former senator and the actor on "Law & Order," is about to throw his hat in the ring as a Republican presidential candidate. What do you all see? Is he going to make a difference, David?

Mr. SANGER: You know, he could well in that he gives the base something that they're missing right now. They've got a large number of candidates and nobody who has really seemed to seize all the elements of the base. But he's coming to this late. He could probably raise the money, but could he get the organization together? Remember, we have this extraordinarily shortened cycle in the primaries now where, by February 5th, we think there's a primary so big that it could all be decided. That's not a lot of time to get your team together to develop the kind of policy that you would need but also to develop the kind of on-the-ground game you'd need.

SCHIEFFER: Well, every poll suggests that the Republicans are not satisfied. They want to see some more candidates. Many Republicans think Giuliani is too--is too liberal. John McCain is tied to a very unpopular war. Romney still has not really started to move, although he's come up some. Fred Thompson, could he get the nomination, you think, John?

Mr. HARRIS: Oh, certainly he could. Certainly he could. There is a big vacancy. The electoral base of the Republican Party is the South. So far the race does not have a sort of mainstream conservative Southerner. We thought there was going to be one in George Allen of Virginia. Of course, he got knocked out. Bill Frist did not run. So Thompson has this opening. I think, clearly, it's a sign of dissatisfaction with John McCain. The two of their records, not all that different, and they were friends. So the fact that Thompson gets in and there's a lot of interest says to me John McCain's simply not closing the sale with Republican voters. Although they're the same on most issues. Significantly, again, immigration, they're different. Thompson was down at Richmond last night. That was his biggest applause line with the Republican activists there when he stood up against President Bush's position, against John McCain's position on immigration.

SCHIEFFER: Well, there're two more debates coming up this week. One thing we haven't talked about is Al Gore. He's getting a lot of attention. His book is coming out. He's taken some pretty tough stands against the other Democrats.

Do you see any chance, David, that he might get into this?

Mr. SANGER: I could see a chance if you--if you had a situation in which both Senator Clinton and Obama managed, you know, not to be able to motivate their people quite that way. You know, it's been quite remarkable when you

think about where the global warming issue was in the last presidential election and where it's likely to be in this presidential election, just how much there was about it. And, in fact, we saw President Bush step out two days ago and come out with a global warming plan, at least an initiative, that there's no reason he couldn't have done in 2001.

SCHIEFFER: All right. I'm sorry we have to end it there, but thanks to both of you for the insight. Back with a final word in just a minute.

(Announcements)

SCHIEFFER: Finally today, is it me or have we just come through one of the weirdest weeks ever? For the record, this was the week a US government border guard ignored a worldwide warning to detain that guy with possibly contagious TB and instead waved him through security, quote, "because he didn't look sick." With all this talk about improving border security, maybe we should start by instructing government employees to read the directions.

It was the week that Barack Obama launched his religious outreach Web site, and we learned that he not only embodies Judeo-Christian values, but also the basic ideals and values of most Hindus. I was glad to hear that, but was that an issue?

In a shift, the president said he's ready to take the initiative on global warming because he said science has deepened our understanding of climate change and opened new possibilities for confronting it. Apparently, NASA administrator Michael Griffin never got the memo. He volunteered that it was rather arrogant to suggest global warming is a bad thing.

And then there was the story in The Washington Post that four years after the fall of Iraq, the United Nations is spending \$10 million a year to train inspectors to search for what? For Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction. Now, mind you, those same inspectors concluded before the US invasion of Iraq that there were no weapons of mass destruction, and the invasion left the inspectors with no mission. But bureaucracies die hard, and this one is still churning along, apparently because UN officials can't agree on how to shut it down. What do you suppose we'll find out this week?

That's it for us. We'll see you next week right here on FACE THE NATION.