bring in her parents; he can bring in his parents.

What about brothers and sisters? Each one gets to bring in their brothers, and then they can bring in their wife and their children.

This lady has one brother. She allows that brother to come in as a relative within the category, and then he can bring his wife and his children.

What about her? She probably has brothers and sisters, too. Once she gets in and gets in the system, she can bring her brothers and sisters and her parents into the system. The father here can bring in his brother or sister, and she can bring in her husband and her two children, or however many they have.

I believe somebody detailed once on the floor of the Senate that one family brought in 85 under this system. It is not at all impossible to imagine. Can you see how it can happen? One person comes in, and as a result of the family connections he brought in 85. I think that was Senator Allen Simpson in the debate 20 years ago in 1986.

It is a remarkable story, how the nuclear family, 5 years after they become citizens, can bring in their parents.

What can the parents do? The parents can bring in their parents, if they are still alive. They really can. Maybe they are 90. They can bring in their brothers and sisters. All the uncles can come in through the parents. The wife can bring in brothers and sisters. Then the wife brings in her brother, who brings in his wife and two children, and she brings in her parents. It just goes on and on.

We would like to do the right thing. We would like to be generous. Someone made the argument, I guess at one point in time it seemed like a good idea to have that policy. But every now and then, when we review a bill once in 20 years, you would think we would have discussed this. It has not been discussed, to my knowledge. Not a single Senator has discussed it on the floor of the Senate, to my knowledge. No amendment has been offered on it. It was not discussed, I don't think, but maybe just in passing in some of the Judiciary Committee debate of which I was a member. It is a serious matter.

Obviously, we ought to do a better job of thinking through who should come to America. I keep thinking about a valedictorian in the Dominican Republic, some small town in Colombia, Peru, or Brazil, top of his class, learned English, speaks it well, and wanting to come to the United States of America. We have a limited number of people who come. He can never get in because grandparents, great-grandparents, brothers and sisters and grand-nephews are coming in under migration, crowding those numbers out. With regard to all of these people, there is no requirement of any educational level, no requirement of any job skills or any other capability.

I think we need to make progress. There is no reason in the world we shouldn't be discussing that in an effective way. Over the past 5 years, approximately 950,000—almost 1 million—extended family members immigrated to the United States and immediately received a green card—lawful permanent resident who will never have to leave.

The numbers equal about 20 percent of all aliens who immigrated to the United States in the last 5 years. Immigration, therefore, makes up a significant portion of family-based immigration.

If we want to discuss the percentage of family-based immigration and increase the percentage of skill-based, it makes sense that we would deal with this issue. I think this amendment needs to be considered. I am disappointed that we really have not had time, with cloture being filed we will not have time to seriously discuss that.

Let's talk about one more issue. I don't mind saying I cannot be sure that we have dealt in years with a bill more important than this one. Mr. Rector of the Heritage Foundation said this bill is so significant it compares with the passage of Social Security and Medicare, in his opinion. He has been a student of these things for several decades. This is a huge piece of legislation.

What has happened, a group has gotten together. They have reached a compromise. We were told flatout the other night that one of the amendments could not be accepted because the people who put the compromise together would not accept it. They would not accept the amendment because they said it violated the compromise, the compromise would fall apart, and we could not amend it in that fashion. And it failed. The machinery around here is working.

We will have an opportunity to talk about this additional issue tomorrow. I will plan to do that then. I am proud at least to have had the opportunity to talk about this. The fact is, we are not going to be able to vote on this. We will be lucky to get a vote on one of them, and then this will be voted on. I assume it will be passed and sent to the House of Representatives. If we are fortunate, the House of Representatives will say it has to be better; we will not accept it; we are going to insist on that before we pass it.

Who knows what will happen in the political processes of our country?

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:45 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SESSIONS. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:22 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 23, 2006, at 9:45 a.m.