

600 men at the age of 23. Our friend and colleague was truly a remarkable man.

After serving our country so valiantly during the war, Lloyd returned to his native Rio Grand Valley in Texas where he became a county judge and then ran successfully for the House, where he served for three terms. In 1955, he decided to leave public service temporarily and began an impressive career in business and finance in Houston, which ended in 1970 when he decided to run for the Senate.

Mr. President, Lloyd Bentsen was one of the modern giants of the Senate. Of course, I did not always agree with him, or him me. However, I respected him. He was respected on both sides of the aisle, and by all who came to know him.

Many words come to my mind when I think of Senator Bentsen. He was bright. He was fair. He was serious. He was dedicated. He was dignified. The State of Texas and all America have lost a great son.

My heart goes out to Lloyd's wife, Beryl, and to their children, grandchildren and other family members. May they find peace and joy in their memories and in knowing of the great contribution Lloyd gave to his country.

Mr. AKAKA. I join my colleagues in tribute to my dear friend and tremendous public servant, Congressman, Senator, and Secretary Lloyd Bentsen, on his recent passing. His tenure in Federal service is notable and well documented three terms in the House of Representatives and four terms in the Senate representing the people of Texas and 2 years as Secretary of the Treasury under former President Bill Clinton.

I remember Lloyd as a giant in the Senate leadership when I first came to this body in 1990. He wielded the gavel at the Finance Committee and had already ascended to national recognition as a formidable Vice Presidential nominee in 1988. He was a Senator who worked hard every day to benefit the people of Texas and of this country.

As a distinguished World War II veteran, Lloyd was always supportive of our veterans and fulfilling their urgent needs. He fought to preserve and protect women's rights, including the Equal Rights Amendment. He understood the needs of America's entrepreneurs and business owners and carried his acumen in economic policy from the Senate into the Clinton administration.

Millie and I remember Lloyd and his wife B.A., from our years in the Senate together, with fondness. We join others in extending to his family our warmest wishes in this difficult time. We say farewell to a true statesman. This Nation is richer for his life and poorer for his loss.

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 489) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 489

Whereas Lloyd Bentsen was born in Mission, Texas, on February 11, 1921, to the children of first generation citizens of the United States;

Whereas Lloyd Bentsen began his service to the United States as a pilot in the Army Air Forces during World War II;

Whereas, at the age of 23, Lloyd Bentsen was promoted to the rank of Major and given command of a squadron of 600 men;

Whereas, because of his heroic efforts during World War II, Lloyd Bentsen was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross, the highest commendation of the Air Force for valor in combat, and the Air Medal with 3 Oak Clusters;

Whereas, after his service in the military, Lloyd Bentsen returned to Texas to serve as a judge for Hidalgo County and was then elected to 3 consecutive terms in the House of Representatives;

Whereas, after a successful business career, Lloyd Bentsen desired to return to public life;

Whereas, in 1970, Lloyd Bentsen was elected to serve as a Senator from Texas, and did so with distinction for 22 years;

Whereas the illustrious career of Lloyd Bentsen also included a Vice Presidential nomination in 1988;

Whereas Lloyd Bentsen retired from the Senate in 1993 to serve as the 69th Secretary of the Treasury;

Whereas Lloyd Bentsen was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1999 for his meritorious contributions to the United States;

Whereas the record of Lloyd Bentsen demonstrates his outstanding leadership and his dedication to public service; and

Whereas Lloyd Bentsen will be remembered for his faithful service to Texas and the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Senate honors the life and legacy of Lloyd Bentsen;

Resolved, that the Senate extends its warmest sympathies to the family members and friends of Lloyd Bentsen;

Resolved, that when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Lloyd Bentsen.

SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL AUTHORIZATION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 490 which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 490) to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of Lannak v. Biden, et al.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a pro se civil action filed against all three members of the Delaware congressional delegation, Senator JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Senator THOMAS R. CARPER, and Representative MICHAEL N. CASTLE. Plaintiff complains that the defendants violated his

rights under the Age Discrimination Act, by not actively assisting him in his quest to have the National Institutes of Health analyze and prove his research regarding the cause of a spine condition he terms "equilibrium scoliosis." Plaintiff seeks damages for this alleged failure to help him in his dealings with the National Institutes of Health.

This suit is subject to dismissal on various grounds, including failure to state a claim against the defendants under the Age Discrimination Act. This resolution authorizes the Senate Legal Counsel to represent the Senator defendants in this suit and to move for its dismissal.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 490) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 490

Whereas, in the case of Lannak v. Biden, et al., No. 06-CV-0180, pending in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware, the plaintiff has named as defendants Senators Joseph R. Biden, Jr. and Thomas R. Carper;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. 288b(a) and 288c(a)(1), the Senate may direct its counsel to defend Members, officers, and employees of the Senate in civil actions relating to their official responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Senators Joseph R. Biden, Jr. and Thomas R. Carper in the case of Lannak v. Biden, et al.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO ESCORT HIS EXCELLENCY EHUD OLMERT, PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort His Excellency Ehud Olmert, Prime Minister of Israel, into the House Chamber for the joint meeting tomorrow.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 2006

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 24, 2006. I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time of the two leaders be

reserved, and the Senate resume consideration of S. 2611 as under the previous order; provided further that second-degree amendments be filed no later than 10 a.m. under rule XXII.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, tomorrow morning we will be debating Senator MCCONNELL's amendment related to ballots. That vote will occur at approximately 9:30 a.m., and that will be the first vote of the day. That will be followed by the cloture vote on the immigration bill. We have an agreement in place that will allow other amendments to be offered, and therefore everyone can expect another lengthy day of votes. I do thank everyone for allowing us to line up amendments as agreed to over the course of the day. I expect that cloture will be invoked tomorrow morning and that we will then finish this bill later on Wednesday or Thursday at the latest.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment as a further mark of respect for our former colleague, Senator Lloyd Bentsen, following the remarks of Senator SESSIONS.

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

Mr. FRIST. 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. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I am going to take some time tonight to inform my colleagues about some of the problems with the legislation before us. It is worse than you think, colleagues. The legislation has an incredible number of problems with it. Some, as I will point out tonight, can only be considered deliberate. Whereas on the one hand it has nice words with good sounding phrases in it to do good things, on the second hand it completely eviscerates that, oftentimes in a way that only the most careful reading by a good lawyer would discover. So I feel like I have to fulfill my duty. I was on the Judiciary Committee. We went into this. We tried to monitor it and study it and actually read this 614-page bill, and I have a responsibility and I am going to fulfill my responsibility.

I think the things I am saying tonight ought to disturb people. They ought to be unhappy about it. It ought to make them consider whether they want to vote for this piece of legislation that, in my opinion, should never, ever become law.

I would also just point out I will be offering tomorrow, or soon, an amendment to deal with the earned-income tax credit situation that is raised by this legislation, focusing on the amnesty in the bill and what will happen after amnesty is granted, before they become a full citizen. The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that the earned-income tax credit will pay out to those who came into our country illegally \$29 billion over 10 years. The earned-income tax credit has been on the books for some time. It is a good bit larger than most people think. The average recipient of it receives \$1,700. Lower income people get a larger amount. Over half the people who we expect will receive amnesty are without a high school degree. They are receiving lower wages. They will be the ones who will particularly qualify for this. This is a score that has been given to us by the group that is supposed to score it—\$29 billion will be paid out.

If they go all the way and become a citizen they will be entitled to this like any other citizen, and they will be entitled to get it under my amendment. But I do not believe we should award people who have entered our country illegally, submitted a false Social Security number, worked illegally—I do not believe we should reward them with \$29 billion of the taxpayers' money. That is a lot of money.

I will also be offering a budget point of order, I or one of my colleagues will, in the next day or so. We have been working on that. We asked for a report. The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that the budget point of order lies in the first 10 years of this bill. It also concludes that it lies under the long-term provisions of the budget points of order for expenditures in the outyears. They didn't give us those numbers, but they said, without much work—they didn't have to do much work—the numbers are going to be much worse in the outyears. It clearly would be a detriment to the Government and these figures would exceed the budget, and a budget point of order would lie.

At the Heritage Foundation, Mr. Robert Rector, who is the expert who dealt with welfare, studied this. He was the architect of welfare reform who has done so much to improve America's welfare system and improve incomes for low-income families. It really worked beautifully. He was the architect of it. He says this bill represents the greatest increase in welfare in 35 years. With the provisions and benefits that will be in it, he estimates that year 10 through year 20, the cost could be \$50 to \$60 billion a year to the taxpayers because it takes some time for the people who are adjusting and be-

coming citizens and/or legal permanent residents to really begin to make the claims.

CBO admits the numbers are going to surge in the outyears. He says it is \$50 billion a year. If that is so—and he is not exaggerating the numbers, because that is based solely on the amnesty provisions, not the provisions that will allow 3 times to 4 times as many people to come into the country legally in the next 20 years as come in today, and many of them will go on welfare because that whole system is not based on identifying people with skills and educational levels that would indicate they would be more than low-wage workers—so it could really be more than that. But \$50 billion a year over 10 years is \$500 billion. That is a half a trillion dollars, and that is why Mr. Rector said this legislation is a fiscal catastrophe. This is a man whose opinions and ideas and research this Congress, and particularly the Republicans, utilized to hammer away, time and time again, year after year, to get welfare reform.

It finally happened. It worked just like he said. The predictions of disaster made against his recommendations proved to be false.

He is saying that about this. So this is not a technical point of order. It represents an attempt to save the fiscal soundness of the budget of the United States.

I want to take some moments here to deal with some problems with the legislation. The American people are suspicious of us. They were promised in 1986, after years of urging the Government, the President and the Congress, promised to fix our borders and end illegal immigration. In exchange for that they acquiesced and went along with amnesty in 1986. They said there were a million, 2 million here who would claim it. It turned out 3 million claimed amnesty after 1986. That ought to give us some pause about the projections that we would have. We have 11 million people here now and only 8 or so will seek amnesty under it. That ought to give us some pause there. It may well be above the number.

So the American people are suspicious and they are dubious and they are watching us carefully, and they should. Let me tell you some of the things that are in the legislation that indicate a lack of respect for the American people, really. Some of these are some of the reasons I said the other day the Senate should be ashamed of itself, the way we are moving this bill.

My staff, working up some of these comments, came up with a title—maybe at my suggestion—"Sneaky Lawyer Tricks" that are in the bill. I will let you decide if that is a fair description of what is in it. I will go down through some of the matters that are important. There are others I could complain about for which we will not have time.

First, the legislation talks about title IV of the bill. That title IV of the