

years. As a Member of Congress, he was a tireless advocate for the people of Philadelphia and a pioneer for a new generation of African-American elected officials.

He was a trailblazer who fought to protect the most vulnerable individuals in his community, in our country, and around the world.

During his tenure in Congress, Congressman Gray later became Chairman of the Democratic Caucus and Majority Whip for the party. With these Leadership positions, he became the highest-ranking African American ever to serve in Congress. His congressional record and service continues to inspire us all. During the four years he served as Chair of the House Budget Committee, Congressman Gray was the chief point man in budget negotiations between the Democratic Congress and the Reagan Administration. He was no stranger to reaching across the aisle to build consensus and work in a bipartisan manner.

He wielded his Budget Committee gavel for the good of the international community pressing for more economic aid for Africa and leading the critique of South African apartheid.

As a staunch supporter of education, he was a key advocate for strengthening and improving our nation's schools.

Upon his retirement from Congress, Representative Gray became president and chief executive officer of the United Negro College Fund from 1991 to 2004, where he led the Fund to new fund-raising records while cutting costs and expanding programs and services.

Congressman Gray was truly transformative for our communities and especially for our young people.

In 1994, President Clinton appointed Congressman Gray as a special advisor to Haiti and in that role he assisted President Clinton in developing and carrying out policy to restore democracy to Haiti. Due to his service, in 1995, the Congressman received the Medal of Honor from the Haitian government.

Congressman Gray's lifelong commitment to his community, to public service, and to his family was truly admirable and inspirational. To his wife, Andrea, his three sons and his many grandchildren, know that you are in our hearts and our prayers. And, I say to you, celebrate Bill's life, because he lived a life that was full of honor and integrity. Not only did he inspire each one of us with his service, he inspired the Nation.

I am truly privileged to be able to stand here and honor Congressman Gray.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, Bill Gray lived the very definition of a fulfilled life—full of family, friends, history making as a public man and above all, as a public servant. The first African American House Majority Whip, third in rank in the House, first African American chair of the House Budget Committee, Member of the House from Pennsylvania, author of the 1985 and 1986 South Africa sanction bills, a storied leader who broke fundraising records as the Chief Executive Officer of the United Negro College Fund, and pastor of Bright Hope Baptist Church for 25 years. At his premature death, Bill was co-chairman of his own consulting firm, GrayLoeffler and Corp.

However, the highlights of Bill's life of public service did not fully define the man. Bill Gray left the Congress before I was elected and many were convinced that he would become the first African American Speaker of the House, had he chosen to remain in Congress. However, you did not have to be a member of

Congress to get to know Bill Gray, so wide-ranging were his contributions, activities and his friendships.

Bill was gifted with an agile mind, a magnetic personality, and a generous spirit. The shock, regret, and profound sadness Bill's loss leaves are mitigated only by the certain knowledge of a life fully, richly, and generously lived.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, today we honor someone who truly embodied what it means to be a "public servant," former Congressman Bill Gray. Whether it was during his time as a professor, as a Member of Congress, or as President of the United Negro College Fund, Congressman Gray spent his entire life selflessly serving others.

He exemplified the characteristics of a true leader and was a model for all of us here in this chamber. More than anything, Congressman Gray loved Philadelphia, he loved the people he served, and every day he dedicated himself to making the lives of those less fortunate just a little bit better.

Congressman Gray's affinity for education began long before he became President of the United Negro College Fund, when he was teaching in my home State of New Jersey. As a professor of history and religion at St. Peter's College, Jersey City State College, and Montclair State College, he helped change the lives of hundreds of young men and women throughout my district.

This passion for education continued throughout his life as Congressman Gray became a leading advocate in changing the American educational system.

To Congressman Gray, adversity was a welcome challenge. He broke down racial barriers as the first African-American Majority Whip Leader and Chairman of the House Budget Committee. He also led the charge to help end apartheid.

These remarkable achievements paved the way for me and other African American leaders to follow.

Despite his incredible accomplishments in Congress, Congressman Gray never stopped serving and always believed he could do more.

Returning to his true passion—education—Congressman Gray became President of the United Negro College Fund. There, he remarkably helped raise more than half of UNCF's \$1.6 billion in funds to help open the door for thousands of African-American students who merely had a dream and the drive to go to college. With Congressman Gray's help, those dreams have been turned into reality.

I am incredibly grateful for Congressman Gray's tireless years of civil service and for being a model of true leadership. My condolences and prayers go out to his family and the people of Philadelphia during this difficult time. Congressman Gray will certainly be missed, but has left a mark on this Nation.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable man, a former Committee Chair, Majority Whip of this distinguished body and an outstanding American, Congressman Bill Gray.

In 1972, Congressman Gray succeeded his father to serve as the Senior Pastor of Bright Hope Baptist Church in Philadelphia, a position he held until 2007. It was through the church and his family where he first learned the benevolence of kindness and value of public service.

Congressman Gray, first elected to Congress from Pennsylvania's 22nd District in 1979, worked tirelessly to promote the civil rights of all people. His dedication to this cause extended further than the boundaries of our country and touched countless lives. In Congress, Congressman Gray was instrumental in passing legislation aimed at ending apartheid practices in South Africa.

Throughout his tenure in Congress, Congressman Gray achieved many firsts. Most notably, he rose to become Chairman of the Budget Committee, a first by an African American. He also served as Majority Whip, the top three job in the House leadership and the highest position occupied by an African American elected official up to that point.

Congressman Gray was a strong advocate for educational policies, and later led the United Negro College Fund, which supports scholarship programs for African American students and more than three dozen private historically black colleges. In 1999, Congressman Gray helped to secure a \$1 billion pledge from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation for scholarships to be administered by the fund. This is believed to be the largest single act of philanthropy in the history of American higher education.

I had many opportunities to personally speak with Congressman Gray.

Congressman Gray was an advocate of strong family values, as he displayed in his marriage with his wife, Andrea, and three sons, William IV, Justin and Andrew.

Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon this body to acknowledge Congressman Gray's achievements and life of public service which have improved our Nation.

On behalf of the people of the 30th Congressional District of Texas and the United States Congress, I extend my heartfelt sympathy and celebrate his life of service.

#### IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity that we have in this body to be able to come before the American people and talk about issues of the day that impact all of us. We're talking about one today, and that's really dealing more than anything with the economy and the problems that we're having with job creation. What we want to do in this economy is make sure that everyone who's in the middle class has a chance and an opportunity for a job, and for work and for employment.

It was really troubling because there was a story that came out recently that said that over half of all of the adults in the United States—over half—don't have a full-time job. That's what people need. We all know that people want to be self-supporting, they want to be able to support their families, but right now we have a real problem because too many adults don't even have a full-time job.

For a lot of Americans who are watching tonight, a full-time job isn't

even enough to be able to begin to pay for the bills, let alone put aside some money and save some money to pay for important things, like maybe college for your children, maybe just even to be able to save up and buy a car, or pay off a few bills.

People have lowered their expectations, Mr. Speaker, to a point that we haven't seen for a long, long time because people have just, frankly, gotten discouraged. They're discouraged now, and they don't know where the economy is going to lead.

In the midst of all of that, we're talking about new impediments that are coming to job creation, one of those being ObamaCare, the fact that the President's health care law is coming into effect. The law says very clearly that the law is to come into effect and that the provisions of the law are to be followed by this upcoming next year, in 2014.

Well, we saw that the President of the United States—unilaterally—effectively waved a magic wand. And as he has been wont to do lately, he is making laws and decrees, really by a press conference or by a press release or just by going to a microphone. And so no longer do the American people even know what the law is or what the law says. Because we presume when a law is passed that we're supposed to follow it—at least that's what the IRS tells us. If a law is passed, they tell us that they're supposed to enforce it. So that's the expectation that people have, that they're supposed to follow the law.

Yet the President of the United States said that he's going to put some of these provisions away so that people won't have to follow them. Well, I think our recommendation would be to the President: let's not follow any of ObamaCare; let's put it all in abeyance. Because, as we know, one of the bill's chief authors, Senator BAUCUS, has said the bill is, in effect, a "train wreck." And that's what's coming down the pike.

So we know, according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, that ObamaCare is the number one reason, Mr. Speaker, why employers aren't creating jobs, another reason why the middle class is suffering.

So in the middle of all that, now we're hearing another layer of burden heaped on the middle class, and it's this: now we hear from not only the President, but also from the Senate and some of our colleagues in the Senate and the Republican side, that what we need to do next is offer amnesty to millions of illegal aliens. And it isn't just a few million, Mr. Speaker. At minimum, we're looking at 11 million illegal aliens. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there are estimates that we will be allowing into this country, conservatively speaking, 33 million new illegal aliens into the United States in the next 10 years. That's more illegal aliens than we've allowed into the United States in the last 40 years.

If we allow in 33 million new illegal aliens, Mr. Speaker, when we already have 24 million Americans who are without a job—we have 24 million Americans that are unemployed right now in this country, and we're looking, through amnesty for illegal aliens, at allowing in another 33 million. Where are those 24 million Americans supposed to go, Mr. Speaker, when they have to compete not only with the current population but an additional 33 million?

Well, if there's anything that we know, it is this: it is that amnesty costs a fortune. Conservatively speaking, we're looking at \$6 trillion in costs. And of that \$6 trillion, nearly half of that amount is to go to pay out retirement benefits for illegal aliens—at the worst possible time, Mr. Speaker.

When all of the baby boomers are looking at having to draw down what they've spent their life paying into Social Security, when millions of baby boomers are looking at drawing down what they've paid in to Medicare, now we're looking at potentially 33 million more illegal aliens coming into the United States also competing for those benefits. But the difference is, Mr. Speaker, they haven't paid in to get those benefits out.

We have a lot to talk about tonight. Joining me tonight are some other very concerned colleagues who are also concerned about this issue of illegal aliens coming in to the United States.

We have with us tonight the gentleman from the State of Florida (Mr. YOHO), and at this time I'd like to yield to the gentleman. And we have other Members who would like to be heard on this issue this evening.

Mr. YOHO. I would like to thank the gentlelady from Minnesota, my home State, for allowing me to speak tonight on this very important topic.

This is a perfect example where Congress has failed to lead on immigration for the last 30 years, and it's unacceptable. It's not just an economic issue; it's also a national security issue when we have open borders like this. Somebody said, well, you just want to exclude everybody. No, I don't.

You know, if we look at our own homes, we lock the doors at night for a reason. The job of a mayor is to keep a city safe. The job of a Governor is to keep her State safe. The job of us in Congress is to legislate to keep our country safe.

What we have right now is a situation that the American people are fed up with. They're fed up with the fact that Congress is not leading on this. This is a moment in time where we do need to lead and set some policies out front that are not Democratic policies, they're not Republican policies; these policies need to be what's best for America. If our policies are best for America, everybody wins. If we cater to a certain group or this group or this industry or that industry, what we miss is the mark. And again, that

mark is to protect what is sacred about America, and that is the opportunity that people flock to this country for. That opportunity, if we put the work behind it, we all know that becomes the American Dream. And that really is what's under attack here. So us, as legislators, we need to come out with a policy that's best for America.

I think if our Founding Fathers looked at where we are today, I think they would be outraged. Because, again, we have failed to act for the last 30 years. We have, you know, the estimate is—pick your number, 11, 12, 20, 30 million people here illegally. It's weakening our economy. It's also diluting that opportunity.

I think all of us here are in agreement that if we don't protect that opportunity, there will not be a place that is that beacon on top of the hill that other people aspire to come to. So I'm happy to be here as part of this discussion.

I think the worst thing that we can do is to pass a bill and that bill not be well thought out or not read. It would be like some of the bills in the past where I feel there was legislative malpractice when they passed bills and they said, we have to pass it to see what's in it, we have to pass it to see how it's going to work. We don't want to go there again. We want a bill that, when we pass it, our children and the children of the future can say, You know what? They did a great job. I'm glad they stood up and took their time to make a bill that was good for America and that protected that opportunity that we hold so dearly.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Florida. We will continue to have this discussion back and forth as we yield to one another.

I think you've raised an excellent point, and that's really going back to 1986, when President Reagan told the country that we would have a one-time deal—one time only; this would never be extended again. Only one time will we ever have amnesty. And he assured the country that there would only be amnesty given to about 1 million illegal aliens. It ended up being 3.6 million illegal aliens. Why? Because all of a sudden people realized the door is open, we can go in, and they all flooded across the border. And rather than 1 million people being given amnesty, it was 3.6 million. Then of course this chain migration that expanded beyond that, that goes again to the issue of dealing with the rule of law.

What we were told in '86 is that we would once and for all secure that border. Let's see, 1986, 1996, 2006. Where are we now? Oh, yeah, 2013. Over 25 years later, that promise of a secure border is unfulfilled.

So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, what in the world are we doing talking about amnesty again when we haven't seen the fulfillment of the promise by President Reagan from 1986?

Well, people were so angry and belligerent about that, actually, in 2006, that

this Congress passed a bill that authorized building a fence across all 700 miles on the southern border. And they paid for it. They completely funded it. That's something when you get Congress to pay for something, but they did. Well, that was '06. What is it again, 2013? Seven years later this very body passed a bill to build a fence. Where's the fence? There used to be a commercial on TV that was "Where's the Beef?" We're saying: Where's the fence?

So what we're saying is: No bill. None. No bill. The middle class has had it up to here. They're fed up. They're saying, I don't want my government to lie to me anymore. I want my government to do what I sent them to do, and that is secure the border.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I want to thank my friends tonight that we're all sharing this hour with, and Mrs. BACHMANN in particular for leading us.

You know, Milton Friedman, the famous economist, said that you can have open borders if you don't have a welfare state. But if you have a welfare state, you're going to have to close your borders, and you're going to have to seal them. You see, we didn't have a problem with illegal immigration until we developed a robust welfare system in this country.

Now, make no mistake about it, people who come here legally and illegally come here for opportunity. I get that. Our forefathers came here for opportunity. The problem is that so many of them who come here illegally come so ill-prepared for success. They come with lack of education; they come with lack of skill; they come with lack of ability or unwillingness to assimilate into the culture. So what happens is they can't find success. So instead of returning back home where maybe they can work within their culture, they settle for our welfare state, and as such it has grown quite a bit.

So what does that mean when it comes to the amnesty that we're talking about tonight that's contained within the Senate bill? Well, the problem with that—and Heritage Foundation has done a great study on this. Robert Rector, as we know, is the guru, is the master when it comes to understanding the whole issue of our welfare state and the reform thereof and the need for that reform. What he tells us is, that as soon as we grant amnesty to folks, there will be chain migration. There will be votes for more and more entitlement programs and more and more safety net programs.

□ 2045

And so you will have millions of people who will be putting something into the system that are taking much more out, especially after the 10-year budget window, which is why it looks so good when it is actually put on paper. But we all know that what will happen is

that this Nation, even though we are already \$17 trillion in debt, will be much more in debt as a result of those people then getting onto Social Security and Medicare and all these other programs.

So what does that mean? We do have a problem. It all began with our inability to patrol our borders; and yet you have a giant Senate bill which is to immigration what ObamaCare is to health care—a giant, unwieldy, complicated bill that law, if it's ever passed into law, will be unenforceable.

So I've heard so many times—I've been here almost 5 years, my good friend from Minnesota—and do you know what, I've heard so many times that we've got to do something, we've got a problem so we've got to do something. So what do we do? We slam through a terrible bill, we get a terrible law, and we are worse off than we ever were.

So I say tonight, and I join with my friends to say, no, if we're going to pass something, let's pass something good. And what is that going to be? It's going to be border security, both external and internal border security. It begins there. We do nothing else until we have complete border security.

It is already in law, as the gentlelady has already expressed. We just simply ask the President to enforce the laws we already have. If we are not a Nation of laws, then we are a Nation of chaos and lawbreakers.

With that, I would just say in summation that we need to join together in this body and let's stop this terrible Senate amnesty bill. I don't know, it's about 1,200 pages, I believe. It is for immigration what ObamaCare is for health care. Let's stop these crazy, giant bills that nobody reads until they are passed. Let's begin to do it right. Let's start right now doing it right by fixing immigration by making our borders secure once again.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I want to thank Dr. FLEMING from Louisiana, because you hit on a great point. That's why we have such a credibility problem right now as the United States Congress, because we say we are going to do something and we don't.

I think the only way the American people are going to believe us on this border security is if we in the House declare that if we pass a border security bill, it is only going straight to the Senate and that's it. We are not going to send any bill to a conference committee where we know it's going to get ripped up and turned to something that doesn't even resemble border security. There will be full-blown amnesty buried somewhere in that bill. We know it.

How do we know that? Because Senator SCHUMER on the Senate side said that that's their deal breaker. And that's what President Obama said, that's a deal breaker. I think it's time that this body says that amnesty is our deal breaker—we are not doing amnesty, no way, no how, not until you

secure the border. We are a one-track mind. We are going to listen to what we are hearing the people say.

I would like to have my colleagues weigh in on that too about what you've been hearing at home. What I've been hearing people say to me is, MICHELE, we don't get why in the world you don't just secure the border. What are you talking about amnesty for? Just secure the border. That's what I'm hearing. I would just like to ask very quickly—I know we've been joined by Mr. GOHMERT and we also have Mr. BROOKS here as well—I would like to ask Mr. FLEMING, is that what you've been hearing at home?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Thank you, my good friend from Minnesota.

That's precisely what I'm hearing in Louisiana, north Louisiana. Again, they go, why is it so complicated, fix the border, secure the border.

It's not just about the external border. Remember, 40 percent of those here illegally are because of their visa overstays. So we've also got to have internal security too.

This doesn't count all the other issues: the crime, the criminal elements, the terrorists and others that come across the border.

Yes, my constituents are 100 percent behind us on that.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Is that what you are hearing as well from your constituents?

Mr. YOHO. Yes, ma'am. I'm hearing the same thing: close the border, secure the border. Somebody said, well, what percent would you want it secured: 70, 80, 90 percent? I said, well, if you were in an airplane and they only had 90 percent of the fuel to get from point A to point B, would you get on the plane? We want 100 percent security. I mean, secure is secure.

You brought up the rule of law. I think this is really what we need to talk about because we are a country of laws and we are supposed to follow those laws. But when you think back what happened prior to the election with President Obama—as you said, he waived his pen—now, think about that. That's one man in a country of 330 million of us that chose to change our immigration laws and how we implement them and how we enforce them. One man in a country of 330 million without a debate, without a discussion, and without a vote. That's not acceptable.

The American people are telling us that. In my district they say secure the borders, no amnesty, absolutely not. And it goes back up. What are we doing? Are we trying to protect a certain group or a certain business or are we trying to protect America? Again, our job is to protect this country. It's a national security issue.

When I hear—like you brought up, Dr. FLEMING—"comprehensive," when we hear that word "comprehensive," I

think we all kind of run and hide because it reminds us of comprehensive health care reform, comprehensive financial reform. I think when I talk to the people in our district, and you guys will probably mimic this, I don't have anybody against immigration; they want it done properly.

So I think what we need to talk about is responsible immigration reform, but that can't happen until we secure the borders and enforce the rules on the law.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for saying that because I think what I fear is that if we combine these issues in so-called comprehensive reform, what's going to happen is you're going to have selective enforcement, and you're going to pick and choose. Because, again, we saw the President of the United States this week twice say that he is not going to enforce certain parts of ObamaCare. Hey, fine with me, don't enforce any of it, as far as I'm concerned. But do it through the rule of law. Do it through this body.

I ran for office, and it was tough to do, and I got here. But my voice counts, just like your voice counts, just like your voice counts, just like the Senate's voice counts. Because we are a constitutional Republic. We are not a dictatorial State. We don't have a king; we shouldn't have a tyrant. And yet we are seeing that the President decides, well, I'm going to support something today and maybe I won't.

I guess that should give us a clue, shouldn't it, that maybe if we get so-called comprehensive reform that the President may say, well, I'm not going to secure the border because I don't have the political will to secure the border, but I am going to go ahead and maybe speed up amnesty for illegal aliens. So maybe I'll just give them voting rights today because I want to, and I'm just going to go ahead and give them access to ObamaCare today because I want to, and I'm going to give them access to the 80 different means-tested welfare programs because I want to, and plus it will help me in that 2014 election. These are the kinds of things that we need to think about.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas. I would like you to weigh in also. What are you hearing from people back home about amnesty versus border security? Did they want it in the same bill? They don't want it in the same bill? What are you hearing? And this is LOUIE GOHMERT from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend from Minnesota yielding.

It is pretty overwhelming. It's not just Texas. There's a 2010 Rasmussen poll that says 68 percent of likely voters think that securing the border is more important than granting amnesty to illegals. So this is nothing new.

Yet the President himself has promised that he would secure the U.S. border with Mexico. But then again, he also made a speech in May of this year

in Mexico condemning the sale of guns in the U.S. that have gone to Mexico. And of course we know his administration required that to be done.

So you can't just go by what's being said. The President promised to secure the border. It hasn't. The American people are sick of promises not being kept, and they want the border secure. I know that none of us want the border closed. We appreciate immigration as wonderful fresh water coming into this great lake, but it's going to sink the boat if it comes too fast. Anyway, I'm mixing my metaphors.

But the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act promised it would secure the border. Not only that, it said that "it would prevent and deter the illegal entry of aliens in the United States and the violation of the terms of their entry." That has not happened. In 27 years that has not happened. The American people are not stupid. Lincoln pointed out "you can fool some of the people some of the time" or "some of the people all of the time." But regardless, here it's like this administration thinks they're going to fool enough of the people enough of the time to continue to pass things that hurt America.

It is interesting, though, the immigration bill that was passed previously and then in 2006, we had another bill that was supposed to actually get enforcement done, and it didn't happen. I'm not sure if my friend from Louisiana was here at the time, but we were told there would be a fence, virtual fence, walls where needed, all this would be taken care of, and this was under the Bush administration, and there were billions of dollars appropriated for that.

And if my friends will recall, it wasn't all that long ago, the Secretary of Homeland Security just out of the blue announced, I've decided not to do the virtual fence. So we're just going to blow that off. The money had been appropriated. It's in the law. Here's what you do. And this administration just decided, we don't care it's in the law; we don't care there's money there to do it. We're not going to do it.

Mrs. BACHMANN. The Secretary of Homeland Security also testified before Congress when she was asked about whether or not the border was secure, she had testified that they didn't even have a metric to know if the border was secure. So what are we doing here? What are we doing here if the Secretary of Homeland Security doesn't even have any possible way to even measure whether the fence is secure?

Mr. GOHMERT. If the gentelady will yield, we do have one metric from the Government Accountability Office. They have certified or indicated in their recent report that of the approximate 2,000-mile border between the U.S. and Mexico that 129 miles are under full control, to use their words; 129 miles out of 2,000 are under full control, and this administration is saying,

Let's just go ahead and provide amnesty to everybody that's here and then we'll eventually secure the border.

We are going to have to keep doing this kind of amnesty bill every couple of years—or maybe we wait 10 years and do it in lumps every 10 years—unless we do what the law already requires: secure the border.

I would like to see us adopt a resolution that just says basically until the United States' southern border is secured as confirmed, not by Janet Napolitano because we know we can't trust that, but as confirmed by the Governors and the legislatures in the four southern border States, the House of Representatives shall not bring any legislation, including any conference report, regarding immigration before the House for a vote. I think that's what we ought to do.

We've got Americans upset and concerned about the IRS, upset and concerned about Benghazi, upset about this administration snooping. Of course, we have to say, though, as MATT SALMON said, the people finally have a President who will listen to them, or at least his administration listening to these things.

But anyway, there are all these other issues that need to be taken up, and I think our position ought to be very clear to the White House: you do your job and then we'll get an immigration bill.

And one other thing on the comprehensive, since the gentelady mentioned that, since I got elected in November of 2004, it's my experience that when somebody in either the House or the Senate down here says we want a comprehensive bill on anything, that is code meaning—you break down the code—we've got a lot of really bad stuff that we want to get passed and nobody will ever vote for it if it stands up and people see what it is. So we need such a massive bill that we can hide the bad stuff in there we want passed so people won't see it until long after the bill has been passed. That's what "comprehensive" has come to mean.

□ 2100

Mrs. BACHMANN. And that's absolutely true, because "comprehensive" is code language for this is really, really bad what's in this bill. Take a look at comprehensive sex education. That's all you need to know. This is really really bad, and it's not going to help anyone.

I know we have the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS), who would also like to weigh in. He has been a marvelous voice also on this issue and has been very thoughtful and has a tremendous amount of background on this issue and has participated in a tele-townhall with numerous individuals and has a great deal of information. So I would yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Thank you. I very much appreciate this opportunity and the work that you put forth in getting us together this evening.

I want to emphasize a few points about America's immigration situation. The first point of emphasis is this: America is now and has been far and away the most generous Nation in world history when it comes to allowing foreigners to come on to our soil, when it comes to allowing foreigners to receive our most cherished right, that of citizenship.

In that vein, I would like to share with each of you some information from the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Immigration Statistics. This covers data from 2011 and going backwards.

First, with respect to legal status, the numbers of people that we as a country allow to have permanent legal status in the United States of America, in 2011, it was 1,062,000 foreigners in that 1 year that were given legal status who previously had not had previous legal permanent resident status. To put that into perspective, let's go back 50 years to 1963. It was 306,260 that were given legal permanent resident status; i.e., today, we're even more generous than we were half a century ago. Today we're giving three times as many legal permanent resident status than we did a half century ago.

Forty years ago in 1973, 398,000 foreigners were given legal permanent resident status. That's still twice today, what we're giving, than we gave 40 years ago. In 1983, it was up to 550,000, meaning that today roughly twice, again, what we are giving than we did as recently as 30 years ago. Then in 1993, it was 903,000. In 2003, it was 703,000. Again, today it's more generous than any time in American history. That's with respect to legal status of permanent residency for foreigners.

A bigger issue is how many petitions for naturalization were filed by foreigners and how many foreigners did Americans give naturalization to, i.e., our most cherished right in the United States of America.

Over the last few years, in 2011, 694,000 foreigners were naturalized in the United States of America; in 2010, 620,000 foreigners were naturalized; in 2009, 744,000 foreigners were naturalized; in 2008, a little over a million were naturalized; and in 2007, 660,000 were naturalized. Those are huge numbers. Probably more so than any nation on Earth. Not probably, but definitely more so than any nation on Earth and probably more so than all the rest of the world put together. That's how generous America has been with respect to foreigners.

If you put that into perspective, a decade ago, 462,000, meaning we're roughly giving 50 percent more now than we did just a decade ago naturalization. In 1993, 20 years ago, it was 313,000, meaning today we're giving twice as much naturalization as we

gave 20 years ago. Thirty years ago in 1983, it was 178,000, meaning today there are four times more today than there were in 1983, just 30 years ago.

But it goes further, and this is important.

How many foreigners lawfully come into the United States of America? Bear in mind that we as a country have a total population of a little over 300 million people. But let's look at what's happened since 2003. The total of all admissions—again, this is according to the Department of Homeland Security—in 2003, 180 million foreigners came into the United States of America lawfully. They may be tourists coming and going, they may be students on student visas coming and going, they may have work permits or work visas, they may be part of trade delegations, but 180 million foreigners figured out how to do it the right way, the lawful way.

In 2004, 180 million again. In 2005, another 175 million foreigners came into America the right way. In 2006, another 175 million foreigners came into America the right way. In 2007, 171 million foreigners came into America lawfully. In 2008, 175 million; in 2009, 162 million; in 2010, 160 million; and in 2011, 159 million came into America lawfully.

Now, why do I emphasize these numbers? It's because the number of people whose first act on American soil is to break our laws is minuscule compared to the big picture, compared to those who know how to come into America lawfully, compared to those that America welcomes into the United States lawfully.

Those are numbers that I want to emphasize, and basically what that tells you is that there are hundreds of millions of foreigners around the world that want to come into our country and we generously and compassionately allow them into the United States of America. What we are focusing on today are the lawbreakers. And we have people in this body, people in the United States Congress, people in the White House who want to give amnesty to lawbreakers.

Let's bear in mind that there are reasons why we should not be doing that. First and foremost, we can have the choice of whomever we want out of these hundreds of millions that want to come to the United States of America and immigrate and become citizens of our great land. In that kind of perspective, what we need to be doing is choosing those who best fit America's needs. In that perspective, let's bear in mind our financial condition as a country.

We have had four consecutive trillion-dollar deficits, the worst deficits in the history of our country. We are now about to rush through the \$17 trillion mark in total debt. We are not a country that can afford to stay on this path. We are not a country that can afford to allow into our Nation immigrants who are going to be tax consumers rather than tax producers.

When you have the pick of hundreds of millions of people around the world,

we should be smart and we should have a smart immigration policy that brings in people who are going to be tax producers, not tax consumers. That's going to help us with our deficit situation, help us with our accumulated debt, and hopefully reduce or minimize the risk of an American tragedy, that tragedy being a debilitating insolvency and bankruptcy of our great Nation. So, in that vein, our foreign policy, our immigration policy should focus on those who are going to come here and produce more revenue than they're going to consume.

I'm for allowing immigration in the United States of America. It's a cherished privilege and it's a historical fact of our country. But smart immigration means that the people we allow into the United States of America need to bring wealth with them if that's going to help produce more in tax revenue than they're going to consume. We need to allow people into our country who are going to bring skill sets with them if it's going to empower them to produce more in tax revenue than they're going to consume. We need to allow them to bring in their intellectual capacity that's going to enable them to produce more revenue than they're going to consume.

Yes, our immigration policy is broken in part because we have laws that need to be better. Yes, our immigration policy is broken in part because we have a President of the United States who refuses to enforce the laws that are on the books.

Me, personally, I see no need whatsoever to engage in an immigration law debate until we have a White House that's going to enforce the laws that we already have on the books. In the absence of a White House, in the absence of a President that is going to enforce the laws on the books, then new immigration law is meaningless because it has no force and effect as long as we've got a President of the United States who, instead of being the chief law enforcement officer of this great land, instead of being the chief executive officer of the executive branch ends up being the person who is in charge of more lawlessness than anybody else in the United States of America because, so long as you encourage lawlessness by refusing to enforce the laws, you're giving a wink of the eye and a nod and a tacit admission that it's okay to break our laws. And as long as we have a President of the United States that refuses to enforce our laws, that refuses to come forth with a sound immigration policy that he will abide by, then it does no good for us to have this kind of immigration law debate.

□ 2110

But that having all been said, I want to emphasize a few other things. As pointed out earlier, the Senate Gang of Eight's amnesty and open borders bill legalizes or brings in 40 million foreigners over the next decade. You put

the two numbers together, 11 million who are unlawfully here, who have broken our laws, whose first step on American soil was to thumb their nose at our law enforcement and America's laws, and we have another 10 million that this Senate Gang of Eight's amnesty and open borders bill is going to admittedly bring into the United States of America—think about the impact of that on our economy. Think about the impact of 40 million job seekers on the wages of Americans who are struggling to survive.

There's a study by George Borjas, a Harvard University professor, not exactly a conservative think tank, Harvard University, that indicates that this huge influx of illegal immigration is going to have a definite and adverse effect on the wages of Americans. For example, people who have only a high school degree, illegal immigration is already impacting them to the tune of a loss of \$800 per year. Now to a lot of folks who are wealthy, \$800 is not much. But to a lot of people who are struggling to make ends meet, \$800 is a lot of money.

With respect to the average American, not just the least among us, but the average American, the cost to the average American household is over \$1,000 from these immigration policies that are in existence now from a White House who refuses to enforce our immigration laws and refuses to protect American workers from this huge supply of cheap foreign labor that is competing with struggling, hardworking American families.

Minorities are also dramatically hurt. I would highly encourage everyone to look at the reports that have come out by the Black American Leadership Alliance.

Finally, I want to focus on a passage from "America the Beautiful." This really is about the rule of law. If we do not enforce our laws, we have no laws, we have anarchy, we have open borders. In that vein, many of you have heard the first stanza, but let me cover it in the second:

O beautiful for spacious skies,  
For amber waves of grain,  
For purple mountain majesties  
Above the fruited plain!  
America! America!  
God shed His grace on thee,  
And crown thy good with brotherhood  
From sea to shining sea!  
O beautiful for pilgrim feet  
Whose stern, impassioned stress  
A thoroughfare of freedom beat  
Across the wilderness!  
America! America!  
God mend thine every flaw,  
Confirm thy soul and self control  
Thy liberty in law.

This has been America's heritage for decades, for centuries. The rule of law is paramount.

I can't speak for the rest of this House of Representatives, I can't speak for the United States Senate. I can't speak for the White House. But I can speak for one voice from the Alabama Fifth Congressional District, and that

voice is this: I will never, never reward and ratify illegal conduct by supporting amnesty for people whose first step on American soil was to violate American law. We can do better than that. We should do better than that. And we must, must respect the rule of law or else we will descend into chaos and anarchy.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Alabama. That was a tour de force. I thank you for that. I think the context you gave was wonderful, the fact that we have been extremely generous because one of the numbers you mentioned, that I had heard as well, that the United States of America allows in more foreigners into the United States than all of the countries of the world combined. We are so extremely generous. This year alone I believe the figure was a million people that we allow into the United States legally.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. For citizenship.

Mrs. BACHMANN. For citizenship.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. A remarkable number.

Mrs. BACHMANN. It's a remarkable number, and when you consider the bill that came from the Senate would double the figure for legal immigration.

We're having a hard time assimilating the number of people that we have when we have 24 million Americans who are unemployed right now, we're still allowing a million people in legally, let alone all the other numbers of people who found legal venues to be able to get in, but another number that you mentioned—you talked about the study that came out earlier from Harvard. And in that study which I read at your recommendation, what we are looking at is the average household is looking at a reduction in income and wages of \$1,300 a year. That's an enormous amount of money for the average American household because just consider when Barack Obama became President of the United States, the average income per household in the United States was about \$55,000 a year. That number has dropped while he's been President. It didn't go up, it has gone down. It has gone from about \$55,000 a year down to close to \$50,000. And now we know that about \$1,300 a year has come in because of the amount of penetration of illegal aliens that are in the United States and how that's bringing down wages.

I would add to your comments as well, Mr. BROOKS, that as a Member of Congress, I can't vote for anything that's going to take away jobs from legal American citizens. That's what we're talking about when we're talking about amnesty. We're talking about taking away jobs from legal American citizens. From the middle class. Why in the world would we do that?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Let me focus on a news release by the Black American Leadership Alliance, and I encourage all Americans to Google

that phrase, Black American Leadership Alliance, and look at their news releases. They focus specifically on the impact of the Senate Gang of Eight amnesty and open borders bill on the Black community, and I'm going to quote. Everything I say is a quote, but I'm not going to read the whole new release:

Given the fact that more than 13 percent of all Blacks are unemployed, nearly double that of the national average, it is our position that each Member of Congress must consider the disastrous effect that Senate bill S. 744 would have on low-skill workers of all races, while paying particular attention to the potential harm to African Americans. Credible research indicates that Black workers will suffer the greatest harm if this legislation were to be passed.

Many studies have shown that Black Americans are disproportionately harmed by mass immigration and amnesty. Most policymakers who favor the legalization of nearly 11 million aliens fail to acknowledge that decades of high immigration levels has caused unemployment to rise significantly, most particularly among Black Americans. They further fail to consider how current plans to add 33 million more legal workers within 10 years will have an enormously disastrous effect on our Nation's jobs outlook.

The National Bureau of Economic Research recently issued a report asserting that 40 percent of the decline in employment rates for low-skilled Black men in recent decades was due to immigration.

Let me repeat that:

The National Bureau of Economic Research recently issued a report asserting that 40 percent of the decline in employment rates for low-skilled Black men in recent decades was due to immigration.

Studies by Borjas and Katz, professors from Harvard University, found that immigration reduced the earnings of certain native born laborers by as much as 8 percent and other demographic groups by 2 to 4 percent. According to research conducted by University of California San Diego economics Professor Gordon H. Hanson, immigration has accounted for 40 percent of the 18 percentage point decline in Black employment rates, and current immigration proposals are sure to substantially raise these numbers.

Many Blacks compete with immigrants, particularly illegal immigrants, for low-skilled jobs due to skill level and geography, and there are simply not enough of these jobs to go around. Consider the fact that nearly 51 percent of African Americans do not have a higher education. In 2011, 24.6 percent of Blacks without a high school diploma were unemployed. Even Blacks with a high school diploma were unemployed at a rate of 15.5 percent that same year.

We are firmly convinced that such an expansion of the labor force during one of the most protracted periods of high unemployment in decades will result in suppressed wages for all Americans, but the effects on African Americans will be the most devastating.

This is the Black American Leadership Alliance. If you pull up the news release, you can see the Black leadership around the country that is saying no, that this is hurting Americans. And in particular, it is hurting us the most.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman, and I believe the next population most hurt is actually the legal Hispanic population in the United States.

□ 2120

It's their wages that are suppressed. So if you're thinking of a Hispanic mother who's working as a hotel maid, if we have legalization, she could be competing with seven other people who are vying for her job as well. That's what we're looking at right now.

And I thank you for bringing that research to our attention. It's very important because, again, what we're looking at is hurting the job prospects of those who are the most vulnerable. And that's one thing that we've seen from the President's policies. He is hurting the people who are on the very economic edge.

I'll yield quickly to you.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. The issue before us is, who are we, as Representatives and Senators, going to represent and vote for, American workers or foreigners? It's just that simple.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That is the point.

And with that, I'll yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for pulling this together and for yielding.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'm listening to the presentation by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS), about the rule of law and the application of the rule of law. And he concluded that segment with "thy liberty in law."

And I look around this Chamber and I see a doctor, a lawyer, a doctor of all species except homo sapiens in the animal kingdom, a tax lawyer, and a lawyer and a judge who wanted to legislate, left the bench and ran for Congress, and got it right, Mr. GOHMERT.

Now that might appear, Mr. Speaker, to the people that are watching in on C-SPAN that this is too hard for maybe some folks that don't fit those categories to understand. So I want to make the point that I stand here, I'm a ditch digger, and I understand this.

It is not complicated. All you have to do is understand that this is a great country, and we have a role to play here, each one of us, and it is to defend, preserve, protect and, in the case of the modern world, refurbish the pillars of American exceptionalism.

And an essential pillar of American exceptionalism is, as Mr. BROOKS articulated so well, the rule of law. You are not going to have liberty without law, the application of the law.

And as one of the members of the Judiciary Committee said to some people that wanted amnesty, as surely as you are crying out for the non-application of the law today, you'll be crying out for the full application of the law tomorrow in some other venue for some other reason.

But some of these points that we need to think about, and I just want to list them, because I think I've got an opportunity to pick up at the bottom of this hour, maybe add another 30 minutes to our discussion here, but there seems to be a belief in the Senate, and some of the Republicans in the House, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be

a belief that if we do business with the President on immigration, we can write laws that he will enforce.

I remember one of the self-appointed leaders of the secret Gang of Eight, now eight minus one, said to us, you know, if we determine that we are not going to legalize the people that are here illegally, then we will never get the borders secure.

Oh, really?

Well, that means then that they've got to be talking to the President, and the President is saying, I'm not going to enforce the law unless you legalize these people here. And that's got to be the calculus that's taking place, that he's not going to enforce the law unless we legalize the people that are here.

So I look at this and I say, okay, the Gang of Eight's bill. I don't know what's all going to emerge here in the House. Nothing is a better answer.

But over there on that side, it is perpetual and retroactive amnesty. Perpetual is this, it goes on forever. You could never enforce the rule of law again if you exempt people that came into the United States illegally or those that overstayed their visa.

Here's the exception, and that is, if they committed a felony, if they committed three of the mysterious, the correct mysterious misdemeanors, that disqualifies them, then they apparently embarrass the administration enough that they would send them back to their home country.

But other than that, other those exceptions, the felony three mysterious misdemeanors, everybody that came into America before December 31, 2011, gets to stay and they get legalized. Anybody that would come after that date, or admit that they came in after that date, they don't get legalized immediately, but what they do get is the implicit promise that they will be legalized eventually.

And anybody that has been deported in the past for anything other than a felony or three mysterious misdemeanors, any of these people get an invitation in the bill that says reapply, come on back.

So it's perpetual and retroactive amnesty. That's what this bill does, Mr. Speaker, and that's one of the things that's got to be blocked.

Now, the belief that the President would give his word and keep it, it's appalling to me to think that anyone would simply accept that statement on its face. We know that the President took his oath of office, the Constitution itself, and it says to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

And what the President has done, instead, is executed the law when he didn't like it. I mean, death penalty to a law that he doesn't like, including immigration law.

So we know here that our word is the only thing we have with each other. We give our word; we keep our word. It is the coin of the realm.

And yet they're willing to stake the destiny of the realm of the United

States of America on the anticipation that the President will give and keep his word and enforce immigration laws, when he's proven that he won't even keep his word on the law that bears his name, ObamaCare. He said, no, I'm going to change it. Even though the law specifically says it shall be implemented in the first month of 2014, now he wants to add a year to that.

So I suggest, instead, what they're doing is they're betting the future of America on the President's word that he'll enforce laws that he may not like if we send them to his desk. He might sign them anyway, because he doesn't intend to enforce them.

The coin of the realm is our word. And it says on our currency, "In God We Trust." Are they ready to place on our currency, "In Obama We Trust"? Because that's what's at stake here, Mr. Speaker.

And there are a number of other topics that I would bring up. However, I notice that there is a focus here on bringing this thing around to a logical conclusion, and I believe I'll have another opportunity, so I would yield back to the gentlelady from Minnesota.

I thank all the people that came here to speak and, hopefully, we'll have another opportunity to take it up in a few minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank Mr. KING.

And we do have a little bit more time. I'm thankful to talk about this topic because this isn't just a 1-hour topic.

As a matter of fact, there's a colleague that we were with earlier today who said that we need to talk about this for a full day because, just from a process point of view, for people who are tuning in tonight on C-SPAN, Mr. Speaker, we think it's very important that we don't just go through this topic glibly, because we know this bill wasn't read in the Senate.

We were betrayed by our colleagues in the Senate on this bill. This border security isn't border security. It's a fake border security bill that came through.

We're not interested in that. The American people aren't interested in that, and we need to have a real debate.

We don't want to see, here in the House of Representatives, that the People's Representatives are beguiled or have a boondoggle put in front of them or have a Trojan horse given to us, because one thing that could happen is we could have a great-sounding bill that we're given, and then we're supposed to vote for it.

We could pass that bill. We could talk about it for maybe 10 minutes on the floor. Actually, it would be a little bit longer, not much, but talk about that bill here on the floor, pass this Trojan horse, sounds like a really good bill, pass it.

And then it could go to a conference committee, where a Senate bill goes into a conference committee, and then that bill, all of a sudden, gets a legalization thrown into it. It can come

back to this Chamber, and then that's what we're all told that we have to vote for.

And my guess is a lot of conservatives on this side would say, I'm not going to vote for this bill. It has an amnesty in it. And so then what we could see happen is that all of the liberals in this Chamber could vote for that bill because it has amnesty, and just enough Republicans could vote for that bill that it would pass, and it would go to the President's desk.

And guess what?

It would be Republicans who would be responsible for helping the President pass his number one political agenda action item early in his second term before he's even been sworn in for how long?

And it's Republicans that would help pass the amnesty bill?

May it never be.

I think that the American people right now are just wringing their hands saying, who's going to listen to me?

And I think one thing, Mr. Speaker, that at least we've been able to demonstrate is that we have Mr. KING from Iowa, we have Dr. FLEMING from Louisiana, we have the judge over there, LOUIE GOHMERT, from Texas, we have Mr. BROOKS from Alabama, we have Mr. YOHO from Florida.

We've got six people here in this Chamber who are going to say, no amnesty no how. What we're going to do is demand border security.

We're going to demand that this government finally live up to the promise that it's made to the American people, because we've got to get back to what Representative KING talked about, and what each of these Members has talked about, the rule of law, because we think it means something. In fact, we think it's everything. We think, without the rule of law, you have nothing.

And that's why I'm so grateful, Mr. Speaker, that we've had this time tonight to be able to be together and talk about this topic.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has a couple of minutes remaining.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Oh, we do have a couple of minutes.

Well, then we're going to go full tilt.

Let me yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO). He has something on his mind, I can just tell.

□ 2130

Mr. YOHO. I appreciate the gentleman from Minnesota yielding.

You were talking about the rule of law, and we heard about it over and over again and what the people back home think. I think the biggest thing is they're going to hold us accountable. They expect us to be accountable and they will hold us accountable, and the only way we can do that is by holding the President accountable. We must hold the President accountable and demand that he enforces the laws on the

book, and if not, explain to us and to the American people why he chooses not to enforce the laws on the books. And if he is the chief executive officer of this country and he chooses not to do that, what would you do in business if you had the executive of your business not enforcing and running the company the way you are supposed to? I think we all know what would happen.

And I'd like to end with this. There were three Presidents in the 1900s that handled immigration differently. They did what was best for Americans. They sent people home—the Presidents did—because they were looking out for the American citizens. And I have to admire Presidents that would look out for the American citizens.

I always like to refer back to Theodore Roosevelt when he gave that speech at Ellis Island standing on the soapbox overlooking a crowd, realizing and acknowledging that we are a country with a lot of immigrants here. He said, We welcome all immigrants. After all, we are a country of immigrants. But what we expect you to do is this. There's room but for one flag. It's the American flag. You need to learn to honor and respect it. There's room but for one language. It's English. And you need to learn it. You need to assimilate and become Americans in our culture. We'll respect your cultures.

I agree with that, and I am so proud to have a President that would stand up and do what's best for this country. In the end, I think we need to make English the national language.

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

#### IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be recognized here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I'm hopeful that we can carry on some of this dialogue that Mrs. BACHMANN has led over the past hour.

I wanted to make a point about the fact we are a Nation of immigrants. Yes, we are. And we're certainly the Nation that has the most vitality that comes from immigrants. It's one of those things that is embodied in the Statue of Liberty. When you talk about Ellis Island and you look across to the Statue of Liberty, the image that's embodied within her is the image of American exceptionalism, the pillars of American exceptionalism. You see them all. Freedom of speech, religion, the press, the rule of law. Those are central pillars. And property rights, and you face a jury of your peers but you don't have to face them twice. There's no double jeopardy. And states' rights. The list goes on and on. Free enterprise capitalism. It is a

Judeo-Christian culture and society that founded this country.

You take out anything that I've said, you pull that out from underneath, and the Shining City on the Hill crumbles. But when you look at the Statue of Liberty and the people that love liberty all over the world see that statue, they find a way to come here because they realize that they can be the best they can be if they can just get to America. That's why we have, in this country, so much vigor and vitality. We have not just the pillars of exceptionalism that I've listed, but also the vigor that comes with people who have dreams.

So they see the statue and they think, I've got a dream to come there. And if I can freely speak and worship and preserve the rule of law, I can operate in a free enterprise society, I can be inspired. If you put that all together, it's a natural filter that goes across the world. It isn't because we screened all of them here. We screened a lot of them at Ellis Island. About 2 percent didn't make the grade, even after they were screened in the old country. They came and landed at Ellis Island and went through the filter and about 2 percent got sent back to the old country. But we got the dreamers. It was almost all dreamers that got on the ship to come here.

So we didn't get just a cross-section of every civilization from Norway to Germany to Ireland to Italy, or wherever it might be, name your country anywhere in the world. We got the vigor of every civilization. We got some of the best and the most energy that came from any civilization to America. So when you coupled that and think of a giant petri dish with all of those rights there and all of the freedoms and the pillars of exceptionalism that I listed, then you put the best people possible in that environment—it doesn't mean they're the smartest; it doesn't mean they're the richest; it doesn't mean they're the best educated; but it means that they are the doers that take that combination of brains and ambition and education and instinct and know-how, and that's what built this great Shining City on the Hill, this America that we are. We cannot let this be torn down. We cannot let them chisel away with their word processor jackhammers, their verbal jackhammers, or their legislative chicanery in order to produce something that undermines this.

I know one of the people that understands that very well is the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. FLEMING. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Well, I thank my good friend from Iowa for yielding and for his words. And I'd like to build a little bit upon what you were saying, and that is that everyone speaking in this room this evening opposes amnesty—we've already said that each and every one of us opposes amnesty—but we all celebrate immigration. We