

money comes from taxpayers, and taxpayers expect us to do the right things with their money, and that means protecting life at all costs.

One of the things that I want to say before I wrap up—and we talked about polling—is that there have been multiple polls conducted on the subject within the last year of Federal funds and abortion. Two that I want to highlight were conducted by CNN and Quinnipiac. Now, CNN is hardly a right-wing organization. But the CNN poll showed that 60 percent of Americans oppose public moneys going to fund abortion. That's well over a majority. The Quinnipiac poll shows 72 percent oppose it. Wow, that's a lot of Americans.

I believe that we need to do the right thing and end the public funding of abortion whether it's in the health care bill, any bill that comes here, or any moneys that go overseas.

Like the feminists, the pro-life women of the past, pro-life women today simply believe that we are all afforded the right to life. It is not a gift from our government; it is a gift from our Lord. He is the one that has allowed us to stand here in America and across the world. He is the one that has said to us, He wants us to be in His image and His likeness. It is our Lord that wants us to be the best person we can be. And if we are to be the best person we can be, we have to ensure that each other has that same chance whether it's a little seed in a womb that is 20 minutes old or it's an elderly person in a nursing home. All of us are equal in the Lord's eyes. All of us have the right to life.

So I am proud to stand here today, like my sisters before me—like Elizabeth Cady Stanton, like Susan B. Anthony and, yes, like Alice Paul—and say, enough's enough. Women's rights are women's rights, and if a woman has rights, those rights are the child's rights because everybody has the right to life.

#### CONTINUING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives and also to have listened in on the presentation over the previous hour, the Republican Women for Life, led by Congresswoman SCHMIDT, who has relentlessly stood up for the innocent unborn. I certainly support that cause and lend my voice to it, although I don't know that there's much to be added after the presentation that I've just heard. I'm just thankful that it's in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that your ear has been tuned to it, Mr. Speaker, and that the ear of the American people is tuned to that message as well.

I have a couple of subjects that I wanted to discuss here within the up-

coming 30 minutes that's been allotted. The first one is to speak to the vote that we've just had here on the floor on the continuing resolution for extending the funding for this government for an additional 3 weeks. It is known as a clean CR.

This House came together to work its will on H.R. 1. We debated that continuing resolution, which would be designed to fund this government for the balance of the fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's really important that you and the American people are reminded that we're in this condition of this debate over this continuing resolution because the Pelosi Congress didn't do business as directed and as framed under the Constitution of the United States.

The Pelosi Congress continued to digress when it first opened up here in January of 2007, after the majority and the gavel was passed right behind me where you are, Mr. Speaker. This Congress functioned for the first few weeks pretty much the same as it had under the previous Speaker.

But in that transition that took place, the rules began to get changed, and there were fewer and fewer opportunities for Members to weigh in. The committees began to function less and less. More and more bills were written out of the Speaker's office, and as this unfolded, the rules changed. They took away—one of the things was an open rule under the appropriations process so that Members couldn't offer their amendments and force a debate and a vote on an issue of their concern.

The appropriations bills have always been the tool that allowed Members to work their will on the package that came from committee. Well, that went away. That was taken away, I just presume it was, by order of the Speaker, Speaker PELOSI.

So the House was no longer able to work its will. Bills came down under a closed rule. Appropriations bills came down under, well, modified closed rule, and then they didn't come down at all. Then they turned into omnibus spending bills or they turned into continuing resolutions, and this government limped along, without having the opportunity to gather together from across this country the collective wisdom of the 435 Members of Congress, as informed by our constituents.

□ 1730

So the Congress became dysfunctional. One of the things that is a result of that is the legacy today of having to be in this business now of seeking to put Congress back on its tracks again in the fashion that the Constitution frames and the tradition of functional Congresses direct us. That has been the mission of Speaker BOEHNER, and he has been very clear about this to make this Congress work again. Because of that commitment, it brought about the debate on H.R. 1, which debated all the funding of the Federal Government for the balance of this fis-

cal year and allowed it under an open rule.

There were hundreds of amendments that were offered by Members that had 4 years of pent-up frustration, Democrats and Republicans alike, that had a voice that wanted to be heard, votes that we wanted to see cast, and a message that helped shape, let's say, the political consensus of this body before a bill goes over to the United States Senate.

We worked through that bill for over 90 hours of debate. Of the hundreds of amendments that were offered, there were a good number that were passed, and some of them shut off funding to certain pieces of policy. But it was the will of the House wrapped up in the result of the passage of H.R. 1 that went over to the Senate. That was the first offer, and it was the best offer of the House so far, and it reflects the will of the House of Representatives and the House of Representatives designed, by definition, to reflect the will of the American people.

So I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that we are in this debate and in this discussion over continuing resolutions: the continuing resolution that was passed in the lame duck session that carried this Congress until March 4 of this year and the 2-week "clean CR" that funded this government for 2 weeks that is set to expire on the night of March 18. They've extended now a 3-week "clean CR" that extends the funding an additional 3 weeks under similar terms, not identical terms, to the previous continuing resolution.

That is the scenario that we are in, Mr. Speaker, and we are in this scenario because Congress wasn't doing its job from 2007 on up until we gaveled in here in January of 2011.

There is a 4-year period of time where, in 2007, it wasn't too bad when it started. It digressed progressively until it became as close to completely dysfunctional as the Congress has been, at least in my understanding of the history. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I have lived a fair amount, and I have studied the rest of it, although I wouldn't present myself as being a congressional scholar and historian on all of the detail, but that is generally what has taken place.

Now we have Speaker BOEHNER putting this Congress back on the tracks. And, yes, there were some growing pains going through those 90-plus hours of debate on the continuing resolution under an open rule. And, yes, some of us compromised. Many of us actually compromised to take our amendments down and negotiated a unanimous consent agreement that was negotiated in good faith. I appreciate all the effort that went into that. It was a very, very good exercise.

Democrats and Republicans alike, I heard no one argue that the process of open rules and open debate was a bad process or that it wasn't fair or that it somehow should not have been done, that we should have engaged in a

closed-rule process. No, Mr. Speaker, that was the right thing to do. And the subsequent continuing resolution, the first one for 2 weeks, was designed to buy some time for the Senate to digest H.R. 1. The one that passed here on this floor, over my vote when I voted “no” on it, is an extension of a similar philosophy with another little slice out of the cuts. So maybe, just maybe, the Senate will swallow this one bite at a time when the whole loaf seems to be too much. But, on the other hand, the leverage is diminishing as the pages on the calendar turn.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't come here tonight to belabor this issue but just to make the point that there is a reason that we are at this position with debates over continuing resolutions, and it is because the Congress didn't function in previous years and handed over this CR scenario to be taken up by March 4. We are trying to resolve this with a Senate that has been cooperative and complicit in the downward spiral of the functionality of the House of Representatives. I am not speaking on the functionality of the Senate; although, I might not be complimentary of that either, should I dig into that.

So that is the scenario that we are in. It has brought about some leverage points. It puts the House in the position where, if we choose to, we can hold our ground, and we can direct policy across to the Senate and through to the President of the United States.

We should all understand that when the majority leader in the United States Senate speaks, he is speaking in such a way that is designed to be, in a way, a mouthpiece for the President, a shield to protect the President from public criticism and to protect the President from the initiatives that start here in this House.

If Members of this House will make the argument that we can't pass legislation here that we believe in because HARRY REID won't take it in the Senate, we should be thinking in terms of: The proxy for the President in the Senate is resisting the Republican initiative, which is the will of the people that was brought about by the 87 new freshmen that have come here to support the incumbent Republicans. All the gavels in the United States House of Representatives were passed from the hands of one party into the hands of the other party. That is what has happened, the will of the people.

Mr. Speaker, we have the obligation to carry out this will of the people in conformance, though, with our best efforts and our best judgment. And that works in consultation with Democrats, as it should. It hasn't always been the case working across the aisle, and there have been times that I have been accused of that myself. I will be a little more open than I have in the past, but in the end, the House should work its will.

I stand on that principle, and I compliment the Speaker for laying that standard out. It is not going to be an

easy banner to carry. He knows that. He understands this organism of the House of Representatives. And, in spite of all of the stress that is going on here, the House is positioning itself to work its will on the Senate. Working its will on the Senate is working its will through the proxy for the President and on towards the White House.

If the President of the United States believes that all of the functions of government don't match up to his desire to protect his signature issue, ObamaCare, the American people need to know that that is his priority. My priority is to repeal it and defund it until such time as we can get a President to sign the repeal of ObamaCare. That has been my effort: to first kill the bill and then work to repeal it. We are about 1½ years into this effort, and I will continue my effort as intensively as I need to and for as long as it takes until the day comes when we can actually celebrate: free at last, free from the yoke of the socialized medicine policy called ObamaCare and free to exercise our liberty that I believe has been unjustly taken from us by the legislation. And something, too: two Federal courts have found it unconstitutional.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is my little editorial here. I haven't worked out a smooth transition into the next subject matter, but it occurs to me, as I stand here, that it has been a little while since I addressed you on the subject of immigration and that it has been a little bit quiet in the House of Representatives on the subject of immigration.

So I want to raise this point and have this discussion, and it is this: We are looking at numbers that show still millions of illegals here in the United States, about 60 percent of whom came across the border illegally, about 40 percent of whom overstayed their visas. And it is odd that the number of illegals is reported by the Department of Homeland Security to be less than it has been over the previous 8 years that I have been here in this Congress.

When I came here, the number was 12 million illegals here in the United States. I have gone down to the border many times. I have sat in on hearings year after year, week after week, where expert witnesses come forward and testify, and they will testify that, of the net numbers of people that are interdicted coming across the border, they would perhaps stop one out of four of those. And it is not too hard to extrapolate those numbers: 3 to 5 years ago would come to 4 million illegal border crossings in a year, of which they contend that they stop about one out of four. I think they said perhaps they catch one out of three or one out of four. That would be the under-oath testimony of one of the representatives of the Border Patrol. I think that number may or may not be higher now.

But I would go down to the border, and the agents down there would tell me, 25 percent? 10 percent has to come first, a 10 percent effectiveness rate.

Now, one could argue whether 10 percent is the right number, and I hear

numbers less than that, too, or whether 25 percent is the right number. What it says that, I don't think anybody contends that the effectiveness rate of the full list of Border Patrol officers we have all across our southern border is interdicting a number that would be approaching even half of those that attempt to cross the border. And those attempts to cross the border are probably down from the data that I have given you from 4 or 5 years ago.

But think of 4 million illegal border crossings. Think of those attempts. Think of stopping perhaps 1 million, and now there are 3 million in the United States in a year. And that 3 million number is going to grow. Now, some of them go back to their home country again, and they cross multiple times; that is true.

But if we had 12 million illegals in 2003 and we have less than 12 million illegals today, according to Janet Napolitano's Department of Homeland Security, what happened to all those people? We were accumulating people for all of these last 8 years. And if somehow by some miracle or some mystery of nature of humanity we don't accumulate illegals in America when we have large numbers of them coming in here, I suppose you could chalk it up to a death rate or a self-deportation rate.

But, Mr. Speaker, we got to 12 million somehow. They came from somewhere. And people agree that 12 million was the illegal number—at least it was the floor, not the ceiling. I have always thought it was higher.

□ 1740

But if in the years prior to 2003 we accumulated 12 million illegals, and if we are watching 4 million illegal border crossings a year, that might even be a peak, and maybe that number is down by a third or so now, and a large percentage get into the United States, and a significant percentage of them stay here, the 12 million gets to be a bigger number, not a smaller number.

How did Janet Napolitano come up with a number lower than 12 million? That is a question I would like to ask her, if she would stop before the Immigration Subcommittee so we could have that conversation. But I think the number is larger than 12 million. I have always thought it was larger than 12 million since I have been in this Congress, and I don't think that reduction shows the real population that is here.

And as we look at the enforcement ratio that they show us on the southern border, it will show that they are stopping fewer and fewer illegals on the border. The Department of Homeland Security contends that because there is less interaction with our agents and illegals, that that says that there are fewer illegals. Well, that might be the case. But it also might be the case that there are just less arrests, fewer interdictions.

But I do think that when you double the number of Border Patrol agents,

which we have done and then some on the southern border, they are out there competing to be able to make those arrests and make those pickups. So I think the natural order of our law enforcement officers, they will still be doing the enforcement.

But also it pushes people out away from those highly concentrated enforcement areas, those areas like El Paso, for example, and puts them through places in the desert that aren't watched as closely.

So I ask the question: I used to hear testimony that would show that there were several hundred people that died in the desert trying to sneak into the United States, and as that number would grow, it would be 200 a year, then 250 a year, and a number that I recall that went up to 450 a year. Now, that is data that is more than 5 years old, and I haven't been able to get my hands on that old data, but I do remember.

So if the number of deaths in the desert is going down, that would indicate that there are fewer people going through the desert, if the climate hasn't changed and other factors being all the same. But if the number of deaths in the desert of illegals is going up, that would indicate the traffic is going up.

So in a number of the sectors we have seen those deaths go down, but in the Tucson sector most recently we have seen the number go up, which would indicate a larger number of illegals coming into the United States through the Arizona desert.

As I traveled across New Mexico, the people there in a town hall meeting in Columbus, New Mexico, said almost unanimously that they believe there are more drugs coming through and more illegals coming through than they have seen before, and they believe that it is more dangerous for them than it has been before.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the circumstance on the border. In any case, whether we have 1½ million illegals here or whether we have 20½ million illegals here, I don't believe the number is shrinking. I think the number still grows. We know we have a significant number of illegal entrants into the United States. We don't have operational control of the whole border. We may have operational control of segments of the border, but there is much of it that we do not have. We've got a long ways to go.

But I do believe, I believe that we can get operational control of the border, and I mean operational control of the border as defined in the Secure Fence Act that was pushed through this Congress by Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER of California, whose son now serves in this Congress, and I am grateful that he does. I want to do honor to DUNCAN HUNTER's work that passed the Secure Fence Act. I want to complete that project, because there are some other things I know.

We are spending about \$12 billion, let me see if I can get these numbers right,

about \$12 billion on our southern border, and that turns out to be about \$6 million a mile; \$6 million a mile.

Mr. Speaker, I think about, what is a mile? That is four laps around an old track. Where I live in Iowa, it is to my west corner, or any other corner, for that matter. Our roads are laid out in a mile grid pattern, every section, a mile to the corners, and there is a survey pin in the center of every intersection that is a mile apart each way. They surveyed the old way, and they got a lot of it very, very close.

A mile, \$6 million a mile for every mile, all 2,000 miles of our southern border. Six million dollars a mile. And we are guarding that border with a 10 percent or 25 percent or maybe even a higher efficiency rate, but not up to 50 percent. And we think we are getting our money's worth in doing that? It doesn't mean that the agents aren't doing their job. It is, tactically, are we investing the right dollars into the right resources to get the best results that we can?

So I look across my west mile, for example, and I think what if Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano came to me and said, STEVE, I'm going to make you an offer. I'll make you an offer for a contract for you to guard a mile.

How about a mile by my house? Guard that so that people that want to cross it cannot cross it unless they are authorized, and, if they are, direct them to a port of entry. And I'm going to pay you \$6 million next year to see to it that no more than, say, oh, 75 percent of the people that try get across.

That's what we're looking at. If it is a 25 percent efficiency rate at our southern border, that means that 75 percent of those that try are getting through. I admit, it is a little bit of old testimony, but not that old, Mr. Speaker, and it has changed in some of the sectors, but not all of them.

So I am thinking in numbers that is the most recent congressional testimony that I know of, and that is a 25 percent efficiency rate, which was, some thought, a stretch then. So it is a 75 percent inefficiency rate.

So if Janet Napolitano came to me and said, I have this offer for you. Here is \$6 million. Guard that west mile of your house, and you can only let 75 percent of the people that illegally want to cross it go across. The other 25 percent, you've got to turn them back.

Would I take that deal for that level of efficiency, especially if it's a 10-year contract? So now it's \$60 million for 10 years? I would just hope I could live long enough to spend it all. Yes, I would take them up on that.

Now, if the offer was, you're going to get your \$60 million for your mile, \$60 million over 10 years for guarding a mile of the border, you'll get your \$60 million, but you have to provide efficiency, and you don't get to build empire, and you're not going to grow an empire that gives you political clout by hiring a lot of people and giving

them good benefits packages and marketing it off in that fashion. You're going to have to make the best efficiency with it you can.

I would look at that mile, and here is what I would do, Mr. Speaker. I would pick up the DUNCAN HUNTER proposal and I would say, let's build a fence, a wall and a fence. Let's build a fence, a wall and a fence across that mile. And I would put the capital investment in it, and for a couple of million dollars, I would have that all done.

For about a third of my first annual budget I would have that all done, and it would cut my costs on the guard and manpower costs for the duration of the decade and beyond, if you build a fence, a wall and a fence, when you amortize it and depreciate it out about for 40 years, and it would yield benefits every single year. They built that kind of a barrier in Israel, and it is 99-point-something percent effective. If you look around the world, there is fence after fence after fence.

The people over on this side of the aisle as a rule will say, Don't you know that we don't do that? Don't you know that the Berlin Wall is abhorrent to us? My answer to that is, how did you get history so distorted in your mind that you would compare a fence to keep people out with a fence to keep people in? They are two opposite proposals, two opposite reasons.

You can't argue that the Berlin Wall is like building a fence on our southern border unless you want to argue that the people that were in the west wanted to get over that wall into the east. They did not. There was no traffic sneaking in behind the Iron Curtain. It was the other way around.

So we are trying to keep large masses of people out of the United States and force them all through the ports of entry and let them come in here the legal way. And there is no country in the world that is more generous than the United States. In fact, all of the countries in the world don't match up to the generosity of the United States from an immigration perspective.

So we are generous. We bring in about 1.5 million people a year legally, and we watch as every night we have dozens and hundreds of people that come into the United States. One calculation showed during the peak of this 11,000 a night, 11,000 in a 24-hour period. Most of that is at night.

Santa Anna's army was only about 5,000 to 6,000. It is nearly twice as large as Santa Anna's army every single night. No, they weren't in uniform, and a lot of them weren't carrying guns, and maybe they weren't a physical threat to us in a general sense. But that is a pretty large group of people, every night to see twice the size of Santa Anna's army coming into the United States illegally. And I will tell you, I believe it is at least the size of Santa Anna's army now, every night.

And we are letting this happen day by day by day, and we turn a little

blind eye to it, and we watch as we tragically pick up the bodies in the desert of those who are sneaking into the United States illegally that don't make it across that desert.

□ 1750

As the summer comes along, the numbers go up and up. But I asked the question a few years ago when they were testifying before the Immigration Committee about how many lives were lost in the desert while they were sneaking into the United States. How many Americans died at the hands of those who made it into the United States? How many times have we seen fatalities on the highway of someone who didn't have a driver's license? didn't have an insurance policy? that was in the United States illegally that didn't understand our laws? drinking and driving? had been picked up and had been interdicted by law enforcement?

We lost a nun in Virginia last year very close to home. Corey Stewart knows about that, the county supervisor down there in, I believe, Prince William County. That's an example.

We lost several kids in a school bus wreck in southwest Minnesota, north of me. That happened with an illegal that had been interdicted several times and turned loose into our society. And those families grieve for their lost children in a school bus wreck that would have been avoided if we'd enforced our laws at the border, if we'd enforced our law with local law enforcement here in the United States when we come across people in the United States illegally.

This is not a big ask. A sovereign nation has to have borders. And what do borders mean? They mean that you control the traffic that's coming into those borders. And we can actually decide. You control the traffic going out of the United States. But we don't have to do that because we've developed a pretty good country here, but we're going to lose this country if we don't adhere to the rule of law. And the rule of law is that, when this Congress acts, the executive branch is bound to enforce the law. It's a prudent decision that reflects the will of the American people.

The American people have said, We want our borders secure, and we don't want workers in the United States illegally taking jobs away from Americans or legal immigrants who become Americans. We want to have a tighter labor supply than that.

If we wanted to up our 1½ million immigrants into the United States, we could do that. We could double this. We could triple it. We could go tenfold. We can say that anybody could come to the United States. All you have to do is sign up at the U.S. Embassy in your home country, and we'll give you a visa to come to the United States. We could say that. We could bring anybody in that wanted to come in. But why do we say no? Because there's a limit.

We have asked the question here in this Congress, and a previous Congress

has asked and answered the question: How many are too many? And what kind of people do we want to encourage to come here? And what kind of people do we want to discourage from coming here?

These are the questions. We have all kinds of people involved in this debate that don't have the slightest idea how to begin to answer those questions. They just say, Oh, my compassion compels me to be for open borders. My heart bleeds for people that aren't as fortunate as Americans are. So, therefore, I'm just going to be for turning a blind eye or granting amnesty so that I don't feel guilty that everybody can't live the American Dream like we all do.

Well, things have changed. Things have changed.

There was a time when we had high levels of immigration into this country and a zero welfare state. When my grandmother came over here in 1894, we weren't a welfare state. They screened people before they got on the boat, and they checked them out physically; they checked them out mentally. If they had a lot of resources, they got to ride first class and got unloaded in a different dock, but the rest of them went to Ellis Island.

And even though they screened a good number of the people out before they boarded the ship—and, remember, they didn't want to haul them back to Europe. It was Europe primarily at this time. But even still, after they were screened and they arrived at Ellis Island, they gave them a physical. They looked in their eyes. They gave them kind of a quick mental test. They looked underneath their eyelids to see if they had a disease that put little white spots underneath there. And if they weren't of physical ability or mental ability to be able to take care of themselves, they put them back on the boat—I should say “ship”—and sent them back to the place where they came from. About 2 percent were sent back.

Now here we are. We're interdicting 10 percent, 25 percent. We don't even get that many sent back because it's round robin. For a long time, we did catch and release, and we said, Come back and appear. Of course, they didn't appear. Then we did catch and return. We'd pick them up at downtown Nogales, take them up to the station sector location, and they would come in with their little Ziploc bag. We fingerprinted them, took the digital photograph of them, and sometimes we saw that same person came back. The peak one that I know of down there was in 27 times.

We had a really good return trade going on with people that were coming into the United States illegally. We'd pick them up, give them a ride up to the headquarters, and all they had to do is just have their prints taken again, get their picture taken again, and then they got a little van ride down to the port of entry where they

turned that little white van sideways, opened up the side door, and they'd get out and walk back to Mexico. The van would take off and go get another load. Around and around and around we went. It was round robin, and it wasn't accomplishing very much.

Now we're at least bringing prosecution against most of them, which is providing a little more of a deterrent, Mr. Speaker. We've got to do a lot better. We've got to understand this mission. The mission is to protect our borders for this sovereign Nation. You can't have a border if you don't control the border.

We need to control the border—all of it. We need to force all traffic through the ports of entry. We can do it if we build a fence, a wall and a fence. Yes, we need to put sensory devices up there and use some of the other technology that's there. And yes, we have to have Border Patrol agents that are there that are manning the fence and running to the locations where they need to make the proper interdictions. All of that needs to take place.

But we need to use our resources smartly, and we can. We can shut off all illegal traffic that's going to come across our southern border if we do these smart things. And I have not advocated, I will point out, Mr. Speaker, a 2,000-mile fence. I simply advocated that we build a fence, a wall and a fence, and build it until they stop going around the end—that's the standard—and force all the traffic through the ports of entry. Then we have to widen our ports of entry, beef them up so we can handle the increased traffic that's there so that it's not a significant impediment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 839, HAMP TERMINATION ACT OF 2011; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 861, NSP TERMINATION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-34) on the resolution (H. Res. 170) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 839) to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to terminate the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to provide new assistance under the Home Affordable Modification Program, while preserving assistance to homeowners who were already extended an offer to participate in the Program, either on a trial or permanent basis; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 861) to rescind the third round of funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and to terminate the program, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.