

© 2010, CBS Broadcasting Inc. All Rights Reserved.
PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS CBS
TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "CBS NEWS' FACE THE NATION."



July 4, 2010 Transcript

GUESTS: SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM
Republican-South Carolina

JAN CRAWFORD
CBS News Chief Legal Correspondent

PETER BAKER
The New York Times

ANNE KORNBLOT
The Washington Post

GUEST MODERATOR/
HOST: Mr. John Dickerson
CBS News Political Analyst

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

TRANSCRIPT

JOHN DICKERSON: Today on FACE THE NATION, the way forward in Afghanistan. General David Petraeus took over as commander of U.S. forces in Afghanistan this weekend, but he's not the only VIP who spent July 4th in the region. Vice President Biden made a surprise holiday visit to the troops in Iraq, where he ran into some top members of the Senate Armed Services Committee. We'll talk to one of them: South Carolina Senator Lindsey Graham from Afghanistan, as he gets an update on the war that's not going so well. Will that July 2011 date for the start of withdrawal of U.S. forces really stick?

And we'll turn to the politics of the war, fallout from Elena Kagan's Supreme Court confirmation hearings, this week's bad news on the economy, and the latest on the battle over immigration with Peter Baker of the New York Times, Anne Kornblut of The Washington Post, and CBS News chief legal correspondent Jan Crawford.

But first, the war in Afghanistan on FACE THE NATION.

ANNOUNCER: FACE THE NATION with CBS News chief Washington correspondent Bob Schieffer, and now substituting for Bob Schieffer, CBS News political analyst John Dickerson.

JOHN DICKERSON: Good morning and welcome to FACE THE NATION. Senator Lindsey Graham is with us from Kabul, Afghanistan.

Good morning, Senator Graham. I want to start in a very broad way and just ask you, is the United States winning the war in Afghanistan?

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM (R-South Carolina/Armed Services Committee; Kabul, Afghanistan): Well, I think we've got the best chance to win. I don't-- I don't think we can afford to lose the war. General Petraeus, when I asked that question, said counterinsurgency is not so much about winning each day as about making progress. And he thinks we are making progress. I can tell you this, John, this country, our nation, can't afford to lose in Afghanistan. And this is our last best chance to win.

JOHN DICKERSON: That so in your mind, not-- not quoting General Petraeus. But in your mind are we winning?

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: I think we've got the-- the formula of winning. I-- I-- I don't want to say that we've won or we-- you know, that's a very good question. I asked General Petraeus the same thing. I see progress and I see great areas of concern. I think we've got the right strategy now. And with the right team, we can win and we are making progress. And that's about the best I can say.

JOHN DICKERSON: Senator Graham, there's just been, of course, upheaval in the command in Afghanistan--General McChrystal is out, General Petraeus is in. Based on what you've seen, how-- how's that going? What's the mood there with the troops?

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: Well, people are very disappointed that General McChrystal left. He was beloved by the troops. I'm very sad for him. But General Petraeus has hit the ground running. He's a hero among the troops. He knows the region better than any person I've ever met. So people are now focused, they're re-engaged and they're all behind General

Petraeus. The civilian side, I've had concerns about. Ambassador Eikenberry questioned whether or not the surge would work? He has a rocky relationship with President Karzai. But I was briefed by Petraeus and-- and Ambassador Eikenberry. They seem to have a good working relationship. If everybody works together I think General Petraeus'-- presents our best chance to win in Afghanistan. And the troops think we can win. Morale is-- morale is pretty good right now.

JOHN DICKERSON: There's some question in Washington whether there might be a change in the civilian leadership there, whether the Ambassador Eikenberry might, in fact, stay. Based on the meeting you just had, do you think that they are going forward as a team together?

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: Yeah, they seem to be working very well, but this is the-- the last best chance to get it right in Afghanistan. So I would urge the President and his White House team to make sure that they look at every aspect of Afghanistan--military and civilian, and make sure we've got our best team on the field. But they did give us a very good briefing. They seemed to be on the same sheet of music. And, you know, Ambassador Eikenberry was a general over here in Afghanistan. He's a fine man. But General Petraeus needs unity and common purpose. And I hope we'll get that.

JOHN DICKERSON: I want to talk to you about this July 2011 deadline that's been much discussed. Tell us your view on it and why this is such a big deal to you?

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: Well, my view is that if the people in Afghanistan think we're going to begin to leave in July 2011 and the people in the ridge-- region think we're going to bend-- begin to leave, we have no chance of winning a counterinsurgency. Counterinsurgency depends on the population, getting off the fence coming our way. And if-- if you send a signal to your enemies you're going to leave at a certain date, they'll wait to that date and wait you out. And people begin to hedge your bets and make side deals. So it's imperative that we let the world know, let the Afghan people know, the Taliban, Pakistan, all of our allies, and all of our enemies that we're not going to leave this country in chaos. That we're going to leave Afghanistan secure and stable. And we've got to remember, John, why we're here. We're here because it is in our about-- vital national security interest to secure this country. This is the place we were attacked from 9/11. I'm glad more Afghan girls are going to school. I'm glad that the quality of life is improving. But the reason we came here was to secure America, and it is imperative that we show to our enemies and friends alike that we're not going to leave this country until we're more secure as a nation.

JOHN DICKERSON: The counterinsurgency strategy has been going slower by everyone's account than expected or hoped by the-- the military leaders. Has anyone in their briefings with you or in any conversation you've had--

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: Right.

JOHN DICKERSON: --said that this deadline of July 2-- 2011 for the withdrawal of troops has affected the pace of the counterinsurgency?

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: I think it has. We got briefed by people in Iraq. We stopped in Iraq, and we were told by Iraqi politicians that people in the region are-- are confused about what it means. I do believe next summer we can have transition in certain areas of Afghanistan. It-- no doubt in my mind that we'll be able to turn over part of Afghanistan by Jul of-- July of 2011. But there'll be other parts of the country that will still be fighting and need a-- a firm commitment. Yes, this idea of confusion and uncertainty about July 2011, it has hurt. It needs to

be clarified. But I'm-- I'm all for setting goals to transition to Afghan control. That's what we're here for. We're not as an-- we're not here as an occupier. But this confusion is heard. It's heard among our friends. It's emboldened our enemies. And we need to get it right and get it clarified. Leaving Afghanistan is about America being safe. And we can't leave this country in chaos. We'll never be safe. This is not just some place on the map. This is the place where 9/11 was planned and executed. If the Taliban ever come back and take over all or part of this country, we'll never know peace. No one will help us in the future. The people who helped us here will get killed and every jihadist in the world will be emboldened. So it's imperative that we win here. And the July of 2011 date is undercutting our efforts unless it's clarified.

JOHN DICKERSON: Senator Graham, you met with Vice President Biden there and so did you talk to him about this? The administration says that they-- all they're talking about is withdrawal based on conditions. The President's always said that from the beginning. So did you have this conversation with Biden, and what did he say?

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: Yes, I had a-- a pretty reassuring conversation with the Vice President. I think he's got the right solution for Iraq. You know, there-- they've had difficulty forming their government after the election. The Vice President is in Iraq today. I think he can get the parties together and help them form a new government. We won't pick the winners but we can help them form a government and-- and continue progress in Iraq. But when it comes to Afghanistan, he says he's completely behind General Petraeus. The problem is, you've had Rahm Emanuel, you've had David Axelrod, and other people saying that July 2011 is a firm date of withdrawal. What I want to hear from the White House and from the administration is, come July 2011-- 11, we can evaluate our progress and if you can transition, we will do so in certain areas. But everything will be conditions based. If we don't say that and mean it, people are going to hedge their bets and we're not going to be successful. But the Vice President reassured me that it would be conditions based.

JOHN DICKERSON: Right.

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: I take him at his word. And General Petraeus needs this monkey off his back. It's not fair to him and our troops and our civilian counterparts to be operating in Afghanistan with the belief that come July 2011, we're going to beg-- begin to withdraw no matter what. That can't be the-- the way we lead this.

JOHN DICKERSON: Sen--

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: That would be counterproductive. But I'm encouraged by what the Vice President told me.

JOHN DICKERSON: Senator, I now want to ask you about Michael Steele, the chairman of the Republican Party, on this issue of Afghanistan. Speaking to-- to some Republican candidates he said, quote, "...keep in mind again federal candidates, this was a war of Obama's choosing. This was not something that the United States has-- had actively prosecuted or wanted to engage in..." He then went on to say that if the President was, quote, "Such a student of history, has he not understood that you know that the one thing you don't do, is engage in a land war in Afghanistan?" Your reaction, Senator?

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: Dismayed, angry, upset. It was an uninformed, unnecessary, unwise, untimely comment. If you're a student of history, you would know that America cannot afford to allow Afghanistan to go back into Taliban control. We're not here fighting a ground war

to occupy this country. We're here to help Afghans who could live in peace with us. This is not President Obama's war. This is America's war. The deadline of July 2011 in terms of withdrawal has to be clarified but I want to separate myself from that statement. And the good news is Michael Steele is backtracking so fast, he's going to be in Kabul fighting here pretty soon.

JOHN DICKERSON (overlapping): Should he resign, Senator?

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM (overlapping): But I want to let my Republican Party know that we need to stand behind President Obama, criticize when we must. But this is America's war and we can win this war. We must win this war. And I-- I am glad to see that Michael Steele is retracting his statement because it's not the Republican Party's position, my Republican Party position.

JOHN DICKERSON: Sen--

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: And it was not helpful.

JOHN DICKERSON: Senator, yes or no. Should he resign, people have called for it?

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: It's up to him to see if he can lead the Republican Party after this comment. I'm going to leave it up to the Republican National Committee. But I do praise him for clarifying the statement and retracting the statement. But it couldn't have come at a worst time.

JOHN DICKERSON: Would you want him, if you were campaigning out speaking for you, should he be out there talking for Republican candidates in this election year?

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: I don't think he should be talking about Afghanistan in such uninformed terms. I hope he can get it behind him. We will see if he can get it behind him. It's not about Michael Steele. It's not about the Republican Party. It's about this country.

JOHN DICKERSON: Okay.

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: This is July the 4th. There are a lot of young men and women here spending July the 4th in Afghanistan for the second or third time. We all owe it to them to stand behind them--

JOHN DICKERSON (overlapping): Senator, I--

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: --and not turn this war into a political debate like Iraq was.

JOHN DICKERSON (overlapping): Senator--

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: I don't want to do to the Obama administration what happened to the Bush administration during Iraq.

JOHN DICKERSON: Senator, I'm sorry that we-- with-- with the delay here let's switch quickly to Elena Kagan. Are you going to vote for-- for the Supreme Court?

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: I have not made my mind up yet but I think she did a very good job. I know she is going to be a liberal in the mold of Justice Stevens--won't change the balance

of the court. I think she's very qualified. I think she acquitted herself well at the hearings. But I'll let you know in a week or so.

JOHN DICKERSON: What's left in your mind? You seemed to have a great back and forth with her. She seemed to be intellectually honest. You seemed to-- what-- what's left to-- to think about?

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: There're couple of various about partial birth abortion and the role she played on a-- a memo with a medical group about the policy statement they made. I need to look into that a little bit further. But-- but your point is well taken. I think we did have a good exchange. She was more candid than most nominees. And overall, I found her to be a very engaging, personable, highly-intelligent person. And again, I expect President Obama to pick someone who is a liberal person. And she didn't deny she was progressive in her thought. At the end of the day elections matter, so I'll let you know in a week or so.

JOHN DICKERSON: All right. Thank you, Senator Graham. Happy Fourth of July.

We'll be back in a minute.

(ANNOUNCEMENTS)

JOHN DICKERSON: And we're back with Peter Baker of the New York Times, Anne Kornblut of The Washington Post, and CBS News chief legal correspondent Jan Crawford.

Peter, I want to start with you. You-- we heard Lindsey Graham talk about this July 2011 deadline. On the one hand he said because of that deadline the counterinsurgency is going worse than expected. On the other hand he said Vice President Biden reassured him.

PETER BAKER (New York Times): Right.

JOHN DICKERSON: Are we going to be talking about this date until it actually happens?

PETER BAKER: We've got twelve months talking about it, absolutely, part of what's happening here is that this is the probably the murkiest deadline ever set by a government. What the President said when he sent more troops last December was we will begin to withdraw in July 2011. That's all he said. Begin to withdraw could mean you pull one battalion home and you keep a hundred thousand people there, or it could mean you really begin a real withdrawal. We don't know the pace. We don't know how long it would take or anything like that. And that's deliberate. The President wanted to leave this deliberate ambiguity. But that deliberate ambiguity has therefore been seen in different ways by different audiences. The Afghan people are wondering, as Senator Graham said, does that mean they're going to be gone? Of course, they're not going to be all gone. But that message hasn't gotten out. And so, you hear one message to anti-war people here in the United States, who want to hear that we're going to be getting out, another message to people saying no we have a long-term commitment there. And that's a problem the President has to figure out how to address.

JOHN DICKERSON: Anne, I want to talk to you about something Lindsey Graham-- another thing he said, he said there's needs to be unity and common purpose between the military side and the civilian. When President Obama replaced Stanley McChrystal, he said, everybody had to come together. David Petraeus, yesterday in Afghanistan, said there had to be cooperation. This is a big issue. It seems quite unresolved.

ANNE KORNBLUT (Washington Post): Well, it's really kind of amazing, in fact, that the President and Petraeus in getting over there has to say we want there to be cooperation. That should be the given, right? There was a common enemy ten years ago, nine years ago now, when we first went in there. In fact, they're having to reiterate this, especially after the Af-Pak review. Remember, this long process they underwent last year, months and months. They came out. They said we're all on the same page. Obviously, that was not the case. So now they are having to, once again-- the White House is pushing back very hard of this idea that any division-- they're saying now that McChrystal is gone everybody is on the same page. That's, obviously, not the case. There's still a lot of conflict internally. And we all hear it on the phone calls we make with the Pentagon and the White House and all the other players in this review. There's also division between the White House and the Democratic Party right now. And, in fact, it's going to be difficult for Obama to keep funding this war if the Democrats keep control of Congress, because we've seen this big debate over the last week over whether to keep funding it. It's really Republicans who are-- who are his staunchest ally at this point.

JAN CRAWFORD (CBS News Chief Legal Correspondent): Well, but it seems to be, I mean, as-- as Senator Graham said. I mean he said a lot of things in that interview. But I mean if-- if the Afghan people understand and if this countersur-- counterinsurgency strategy is going to work, the Afghan people have to understand that we are committed, that they can, as he put it, Senator Graham, I think he said they've got to be able to get off the fence and come over to our side. And it seems I think this is where these two things tie up. Number one, I mean, we've had this military surge but we haven't had the corresponding civilian surge where you've had your economic development, you've had this chaos in the leadership. So there has been this real sense of what is our commitment? Where are we getting the people on board with our side? And then when you've got chaos like you have in the leadership with no corresponding civilian surge that's where I think there are real problems. And the White House I think, as Senator Graham said in your interview, the White house has got to make it clear what is that commitment? What's the commitment to the Afghani people? What is the commitment to that country or that counterinsurgency strategy is not going to work.

JOHN DICKERSON: Then another area where we have chaos is in the Republican Party. I want to ask you quickly, Kornblut, about Michael Steele. Lindsey Graham sounded like he was reading a Thesaurus in all of the adjectives he used to distance himself from RNC Chairman Michael Steele. How does Michael Steele, who has had a lot of gaffes, this is his most serious. There are a number of conservatives who are calling for him to resign. How does he keep his job?

ANNE KORNBLUT: Well, quite technically, the RNC bylaws help him keep his job because there has to be a two-thirds majority who would vote him out and there's just not that will there yet. There is a-- an RNC meeting is in August, where this is, no doubt, going to come up. His term does actually expire next year. So it would be difficult to see him getting renewed. But at this point, this is just one great big distraction. He could not, actually, be worse to the Republican Party. And every-- it-- it seems like every time there's a problem for the Democrats there's some Republican out there willing to save them by making their own gaffe.

JOHN DICKERSON: Jan, I want to ask you now about the other big story this week which is Elena Kagan in front of the Senate Judiciary Committee for a number of grueling days. Is she going to get nominated?

JAN CRAWFORD: She's definitely going to be confirmed.

JOHN DICKERSON (overlapping): And she can get-- excuse me, confirmed?

JAN CRAWFORD: No, I mean, there's no question about that. And again, I mean one of the other things Senator Graham said was, you know, I mean, he wouldn't tell anybody but he basically told you saying she was more candid than any nominee in the past. But I think the thing we have to think about when we're thinking Supreme Court confirmation hearings, is how they are so different now. I mean, the fact that we're even talking about is she going to get confirmed? How are you going to vote, Senator? Historically, she would have been confirmed like Justice Ginsburg was ninety-six to three, or Justice Breyer eighty-seven to nine. But things changed. I mean things changed ten years ago, when Democrats started filibustering President Bush's qualified nominees. I had a talk about-- about all this I-- I guess five or six years ago with Mitch McConnell. You know, he said memories are long in the U.S. Senate. People remember what the Democrats, including President Obama, Vice President Biden, Judiciary Committee Chairman Patrick Leahy did. They not only voted against Sam Alito who is just as qualified as Elena Kagan in really every way. He had liberal support. They voted to block his nomination. So in some ways what goes around comes around. She's going to get confirmed but there's also a little bit of payback here. And she's not going to get ninety-six votes like Justice Ginsburg. And that-- the-- the-- the problem with that is that it damages, ultimately, the loser. It's not Elena Kagan. She's going to get confirmed, it's the courts. I mean, it makes the Supreme Court look in the people's minds politicized. When you have these bipartisan votes on qualified nominees, the danger is the court itself looks political. And I think that's a real problem long term.

JOHN DICKERSON: And there were times where senators seemed to be making that case you were saying preparing for the next time this comes around--

JAN CRAWFORD: Mm-Hm.

JOHN DICKERSON: --saying we're going to use those quotes again next time.

JAN CRAWFORD: Mm-Hm. But, you know, I mean, listen. I mean in some ways it's like, you know, my nine-year-old will say, you know, she started it, referring to my six-year-old. At some point somebody's got to be a grown up and say listen I don't care who started it. We're going to stop it unless you realize what the stakes are here.

JOHN DICKERSON: We need some twelve-year-olds in the Senate. Peter Baker, I'm going to go now to you on the economy. There were some bad jobs numbers on Friday. The President tried to make it into some good news but he didn't. Is he and are the Democrats, basically, stuck until between now and the election, the economy is just not getting any better?

PETER BAKER: Yeah, traditionally, we've all often said that in a bad economic times, the numbers you need to see get better are by the summer, before an election. If you haven't seen them get better by summer, it's often too late to be-- to make a meaningful difference in the fall. That may or may not be the case this fall-- this fall. But it's, certainly, of great concern to the White House. And you saw the President today, this week, go to Racine, Wisconsin, and try to recapture control of this debate. He-- he said that the real problem is the Republicans for not supporting the kinds of initiatives that we want to do extending unemployment, helping the states, avoid layoffs and most importantly to him the financial regulation bill. And he took aim particularly at John Boehner, the House Republican leader. Very partisan campaign-style speech in which he mocked him for saying-- John Boehner, for saying that the financial regulation bill was like using a nuclear weapon on an ant. And, he says, wow that means John Boehner is saying the financial crisis is an ant. Do you feel like it's an ant? And John Boehner

came back and said stop being childish, stop whining, try to fix the country. So you have a very partisan debate this week about the economy in which shift-- blame is being shifted but not much is actually being done to create jobs.

JOHN DICKERSON: And we should just-- that we are a long way from when this President ran as a person who is going to do away with this kind of tit for tat. Are we basically in this mode where the President will be the chief-- one pressing the case against Republicans from now until November?

PETER BAKER: Well, there are not a lot of other things he can do. I mean, the limit-- the options are limited for the President to create genuine economic change at this point. He's not going to get a large stimulus bill out of this Congress at this point. The Fed has lo-- lowered interest rates about as far as they can go. They're almost in negative territory. So, you know, framing the debate is-- is a very important part of what he's going to be doing these next three or four months.

JOHN DICKERSON: Anne Kornblut, I want to switch to you now on the question of immigration. Peter was saying, you know, there's not much he can do on the economy. The President gave his first speech on immigration this week. Was-- isn't it late in the game? What-- what was this speech all about?

ANNE KORNBLUT: Well, and there's nothing he can do on immigration. This was an attempt by the White House to pull together a lot of disparate threads on immigration that are out there, this law in Arizona that was recently passed, pretty severe law allowing law enforcement to go after immigrants for their documentation. The White House has objected to it. But they haven't yet filed a lawsuit on it. That may come from the Justice Department. In the meantime, the White House is really hard pressed to figure out what to do and how to talk about it. They've got a very restive base, especially Hispanic voters who want to see some proof that the White House meant they-- what they said when he ran as a candidate that he was going to take these issues seriously. But there's no immigration bill. There's no real sign that one could move in Congress. And even the White House this week, when he gave this big-- big speech said this is basically reiterating our perspective. This is what we would like to happen. We are not pretending that there's going to be some big movement on the Hill, where not only do you have zero Demo-- Republicans at this point supporting it but a lot of Democrats who voted against it last time in 2007. It's not clear if they would this time even though they've said they had the votes. So he's basically giving a speech trying to stamp his own framework on immigration but we should not expect any real action this year.

JOHN DICKERSON: And that's a framework similar to what Peter was talking about, which is that is in this debate with Republicans, this is also to say they're not doing anything and--

ANNE KORNBLUT (overlapping): Those were the choice parts of the speech, in fact, where he singled out Republicans and said that they hadn't done anything and we should remember they're the ones blocking this, not mentioning that there hasn't really been a Democratic vote count on his side either but-- but very squarely trying to put it back in their terr-- territory ahead of the midterm.

JOHN DICKERSON: And just quickly on that point about Democrats. There are-- everybody talks about this in terms of building the base for-- for certain people running in-- in states that have a lot of Hispanic votes. But there are those Democrats in those swing tough states who don't want this to come up at all.

ANNE KORNBLUT: Im-- immigration is tricky. And it cuts across partisan lines this way. It always has been the case. We saw this in 2007, when it first came up. There are Democrats who are for some kind of bigger immigration overhaul and there are Republicans who are for it. It's not a clear-cut partisan issue. In fact, voters are of two minds when it comes to this. We've seen in the last Washington Post/ABC poll on this, we saw that most people favored the Arizona law.

JAN CRAWFORD: Mm-Hm.

ANNE KORNBLUT: Most people also favored some kind of path to legal immigration for illegal immigrants who are here now. So people have a lot of mixed feelings about it. And that shows up in the politics too.

JOHN DICKERSON: Jan, the-- the White House, the just-- the Justice Department has said they want to stop this Arizona law.

JAN CRAWFORD: Mm-Hm.

JOHN DICKERSON: That goes into-- into effect on the twenty-ninth of July. What are they doing on-- on that right now?

JAN CRAWFORD: Well, you know, I mean, the Secretary of State Clinton, famously, announced to-- overseas that the Justice Department was going to be challenging this law, which annoyed certainly the governor of Arizona finding out that way. But it's tricky because legally the issues are very complex, very dense. The governor tweaked that law, so it's not nearly as offensive as the initial reports came out. It essentially, it reflects the federal law on immigration and what's now state police in Arizona can do compared to what federal agents could do. So they're going to have to make this argument that, you know, basically, the state shouldn't be doing what the federal government does. The federal government has control of immigration policy. But-- and-- and they can make that argument if they file a brief and ask a federal judge to block it before the twenty-ninth, which they haven't done yet. But it seems to me, this is one of these issues where the legal arguments, again, because they're not a slam dunk anymore. You're going to use a legal case, a lawsuit, to advance a political argument. You're going to use this legal case to just really take shots at Arizona, say this law is extreme when, in fact, it's not nearly as extreme as it initially was. But just to keep that narrative going to show that the Republicans are out of step on immigration policy and try to draw some of those Hispanic voters for the long term for the Democratic Party.

JOHN DICKERSON: Okay. Jan Crawford, thanks so much. Peter Baker, thank you. And, Anne Kornblut, thank you.

We'll be right back.

(ANNOUNCEMENTS)

JOHN DICKERSON: That's all the time we have today. Bob Schieffer will be back next week, when he'll have an exclusive interview with Attorney General Eric Holder.

Thanks for watching FACE THE NATION and have a happy Fourth of July.