

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

come from immigrants. We're a Nation of immigrants.

Going all the way back to the 1700s, my forefathers were immigrants from Scotland. They farmed the land. They were farmers all the way up until my dad left the farm to go to World War II. I'm very proud of that fact, and I'm very proud that other people want to come to this country. I celebrate that. And I want to encourage them to come, as long as they come lawfully.

We have a place for migrant workers, for guest workers to come. We need them. They will do jobs that many Americans won't do, and it benefits them and advantages their families back home, and they send that money back. It's a great working relationship, but it must be done legally.

And then we have the high-end STEM workers who come either with high degrees or earn high degrees here. They bring them with them oftentimes their capital. They start businesses. They start companies. And we want to attract those and keep those. We don't want them taking back our innovations to other countries and then competing with us. We just simply ask that they come here legally. We, of course, as Members of Congress have a responsibility to make sure that we do what's in the best interest of the citizens who are here, whether they were born here or naturalized here.

But I want to shift just slightly to this, and we've touched upon this. One of the biggest fears we have about the Senate amnesty bill—and there's no question about it, it's amnesty by any measure, by any metric—is that we can't trust the President. We can't trust him. Whatever we pass into law, we know he's going to cherry-pick.

How do we know that? Well, look at the Defense of Marriage Act. He refused to defend that to the courts. Appointees to the NLRB, he did that when, of course, the Senate was actually not in session. It's against the Constitution to do that. ObamaCare, he's picking and choosing the parts of the law that he wants to implement.

So I think we can create a long list here tonight of the fact that this President is doing something I have never seen a President do before. In a tripartite government with its checks and balances, we have lost the balances. We have a President that picks and chooses the laws that he wants to obey and enforce. We have a head of the Department of Justice who does exactly the same, even to the point that Congress has held him in contempt.

And so for lack of any better term, that makes him a ruler. He's not a President; he's a ruler. Because if he can just pass whatever laws that are going to be passed and then pick and choose the laws that he's going to enforce and he's going to obey, then we no longer have the checks and balances that go along with the Presidency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 2140

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, personally, I like the President. And I will refrain from those kind of comments; although I will continue to disagree with him on his approach to this.

I wanted to make a comment in response to the discussion here by Dr. YOHO and Dr. FLEMING.

Yes, we're a Nation of immigrants. I have continually heard that testimony before the Immigration Subcommittee for over a decade now. And so one day I just had this thought that was a little bit off the wall. I just asked this question: Can you name me a nation—I had this panel of experts in front of me—name me a nation that is not a nation of immigrants. And the witness said, well, let's see, that would be—well, name me a people that is not a nation of immigrants, a nation that's not a nation of immigrants. She said, well, that would be the Incas and the Aztecs. The Incas and the Aztecs are not immigrants. I said who, according to anthropologists, came across the Bering Sea about 12,000 years ago? Would you like to try again? Of course that was it for her. She didn't want to try again.

I've asked that question a number of times, and I've been challenged to do a little bit of research. I haven't found a nation that is not a nation of immigrants. Some will say Japan is about as indigenous a population as you can find, but even they, there are a couple of definitions on where they come from. There are two distinct groups for the Japanese, and some of their roots go down to the Polynesian islands, they think—that they might have arrived there. Some of them might have arrived from Asia. And their language and even their appearance differs from the north to the south—I don't know that, but they do.

So if Japan isn't a nation of immigrants, if they did come at one time, name your country around the world. We're all nations of immigrants. The history of the world has been about the migration of human population. That doesn't mean that nations shouldn't exist or shouldn't have borders. Look back over the last couple hundred years and name for me an institution more successful than the nation-state. The nation-states emerged from the city-states, which emerged from the castles in the feudal era, where they had to build a castle and get inside the moat to defend themselves from the marauding hordes that traveled the countryside to rape and pillage.

So then the castles became the city-states, the city-states joined together and became the nation-states, and the nation-states defended themselves against the other nation-states. Nations have borders. You can't be a nation without a border, and you can't call it a border if you don't defend the border.

So if people are willing to argue against a nation-state—that's true with the globalists. They argue against a nation-state. They think they should

be able to trade—buy, sell, trade, make gain, and move human population wherever it suits their economy.

So I started to wonder about this. The nation-state is a successful institution. There's nothing wrong with a border; you must have it. It's Biblical as well. When St. Paul gave his famous sermon on Mars Hill in Acts 17, he said: And God made all nations on Earth, and He decided when and where each nation would be.

Well, this is the United States of America—a very blessed nation, a nation that was formed with this religious concept, driven also by a lot of other forces of manifest destiny. This country was formed and shaped from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, from sea to shining sea, in the blink of an historical eye. How did that happen? How did that happen that we happen to have all of these rights that come from God? Not accidental.

We are an extraordinary nation for a lot of exceptional reasons, and we've talked about those exceptional reasons. But nations should be proud of the nations that they are, and no nation could be more proud than the United States of America. We are the unchallenged, greatest nation in the world, and we risk a decline if some of the people in this Congress don't come back around to embrace the pillars of American exceptionalism.

So I ask myself, what is it that the people on my side of the aisle, but also across the country, what is in the Gang of Eight's bill that's good for America and Americans? Who has benefited when you look across the country? First I looked at it and my serious thought was, well, nobody. Then I dug a little deeper, and I said I'm going to be challenged if I say nobody in America is benefited by this. So I produced a complete list. I think this is a complete list of the Americans that are benefited by the Gang of Eight's bill.

First, the elitists—the elitists being those people that want to hire cheap labor to take care of their gardens and their lawns and clean their houses and their toilets and do those things that people say Americans won't do or don't want to do. So they want to be able to hire cheap labor to take care of themselves, and maybe paint the gate in their gated community and oil the hinges for them and then lock the gate outside, or however they might do that. Elitists benefit from cheap labor.

The next group of people that benefit are Democrat power brokers—not the blue collars, not, in the short term, the unions, not the workers, but Democrat power brokers who have a long-term strategy—which isn't very far down the line—to capitalize politically on the massive votes that they would bring in if the Gang of Eight bill is passed.

You don't have to ask Democrats what they think—it's very, very clear: they're political beneficiaries; if they're power brokers, they want this done. Elitists and Democrat power brokers.

Third, employers of illegals, whatever their party might be. They want to be able to hire cheap labor. And they would say, well, if you legalize them, the cost of wages are going to go up. Well, they want to have a continual supply of cheap, illegal labor coming in. That's why this is perpetual and retroactive amnesty. It doesn't stop the flow of illegal immigration, it just lets those that want to legalize themselves get right with the law. It gives amnesty to the illegal employers—they can't go back on them after the Gang of Eight's bill might become law.

So that's the three groups of people that benefit from the Gang of Eight's bill—elitists, Democrat power brokers, and employers of illegals. By the way, go to any of those groups of people and ask them: Do you want those folks to go back to where they are legal? Just challenge them. I would tell you the elitists don't. They want their cheap labor to clean their toilets and cut their grass and take care of their gardens, their flower gardens for them. Democrat power brokers surely don't. By the way, they understand this—that they have political power anyway, legal or illegal, because the census counts the people, not the citizens, for purposes of apportionment and reapportionment. So what that means is there are 9 to 11 congressional seats in America that would change hands politically if we counted citizens instead of people. Because some of these districts are way overloaded with illegal populations, they're counted. I didn't see how many votes it took for—well, I'd better not get personal with this. I'll just tell you it takes me 120,000 votes at least to get elected before we redistricted. And there are seats here that it only takes 40,000 to win. That's because there are a lot of illegals in the district that are counted. They have representation in this Congress.

So who doesn't want them to go home? Just ask them. Do the elitists want them to go back to their home country? No. They're beneficiaries. Democrat power brokers? No. They're beneficiaries. Then what about employers of illegals? Certainly not. They're beneficiaries. They get a continuing supply of illegal labor—a labor that is going to be legalized. And then those folks that come in afterwards, that deadline, they're going to be legalized too. That's the three groups. Otherwise, there isn't anybody in America that's a beneficiary from this that I can come up with. The rest of Americans are disadvantaged by this idea.

If you have two jobs and three people that are qualified to do that work, then you've got at least somebody that can bid that work down. If there are only two people available for that job or meet the qualifications, they name their price. Well, multiply that out into the millions and see what happens with the no-skilled and the low-skilled workers. That's where you get double-digit unemployment, no-and-low skilled.

Why would you bring in more no-and-low-skilled people—especially those illiterate in their own language—to come in and do more of this work when you've got an overload there anyway? And the supply and demand piece of this tells it.

We listen to the numbers of 24 million unemployed Americans—that would be those that are unemployed and those that are underemployed I think that number adds to, if I'm not mistaken. But I know that Stuart Varney said that there are 88 million who are simply not in the workforce. That number now goes to 92 million. If I understand the data right, you add the raw unemployed number to that. However you do that, we end up with more than 100 million Americans of working age who are simply not in the workforce.

Now, what kind of a nation would you have to be to decide that even though you've got double-digit unemployment in the no-and-low-skilled jobs, that you would go find a few more people that—go bring in millions more to add them to the unemployment rolls and add Americans or legal immigrants to the rolls as a consequence.

This is an appalling miscalculation on the part of the people that advocate for this. They apparently have not done the math or they don't care, or they fit within the category of elitists, Democrat power brokers, or employers of illegals, or those who are, I'll say, influenced by their opinions.

I want to yield to the gentlelady from Minnesota and then to the gentleman from Texas.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I will just be brief.

It seems like you have the power brokers in this country act like this is such a difficult issue to solve, that this is some big, perplexing issue with immigration.

The fact is immigration policy worked beautifully for hundreds of years in this country. And as recently as 1950, when my in-laws immigrated to the United States from Switzerland, it was pretty simple. You had to show that you were physically fit when you came into the country; you didn't have a transmittable disease that other people in America could pick up. That's pretty self-explanatory. You had a little bit of money in your pocket. You didn't have to be wealthy, but you had to show that you had a little bit of money on you. You also had to have a sponsor. You had to have someone here in the United States who would vouch and say if anything happens to that person, I'm the one who will be responsible, I'm the one who will answer. And the person coming in had to verify that they would not become a burden on the taxpayers of America. Because they knew when they came in, they had to come in as a net plus for the country. They couldn't take more out than what they were bringing in. That was the agreement.

The other part of the agreement is, whoever came into the country had to

swear under oath they would learn to speak the English language—as Mr. YOHO indicated—and they would learn the Constitution of the United States and a little bit of the American history. They had to know that.

□ 2150

My in-laws took that very seriously. They were farmers in Wisconsin. They've been net plus to this country, proud Americans. They've fed thousands of people with the work that they've done in Wisconsin. But they kept their end of the bargain. America kept its end of the bargain to my in-laws, but they kept their end of the bargain also.

Again, I think Dr. FLEMING hit it earlier when he quoted Dr. Milton Friedman, You can't have an open border in a welfare state. Because, you see, in 1950 there was no modern welfare state. That is our problem.

We have to deal with our current reality, don't we? Our current reality is we have a gigantic welfare state. Knowing that, we cannot bring people into this country who will not add to the economy. Why would we import into the country people who are going to consume more revenue than what they bring in when they are \$17 trillion in debt?

This adds up. That's why this is not very difficult to figure out. It is actually fairly simple. All we have to do is abide by the policies that we embraced in 1950, and you've got a solution; you've got a solution to the problem.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time for a moment, some of the institutions out here that advocate for open borders will argue that no matter who comes into this country, if they do an hour's worth of work, they've contributed to the GDP; therefore, they're a net asset to our economy. How would a tax attorney respond to such a statement?

Mrs. BACHMANN. What I would say is this: Who is benefiting? The studies all confirm that it is the illegal immigrant who is the recipient of that money. It isn't going to the taxpayers.

What we do know from a tax point of view is that illegal immigrants on average pay somewhere about \$10,000 in taxes, but they receive over \$30,000 in taxpayer-subsidized revenue benefits; therefore, they are a net negative to the American Treasury of \$20,000 a year.

Now, why in any universe would you import people into the United States that cost us on average, not just \$20,000 one time, \$20,000 every year? As a matter of fact, Robert Rector has said in his work that the average illegal immigrant cost the United States Treasury over the course of their lifetime about \$1 million. Why would we do that? Why would we do that? Because we are robbing from our children. That's why it doesn't make sense. We are hurting the American middle class who are here legally.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota.

Reclaiming my time, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. I too want to follow up on something Dr. FLEMING was referring to. The Senate bill was considered some great panacea. It's going to solve all the problems. We are finally going to get border security, we are told.

But I can think of at least a couple of times when this President has said, if the Congress doesn't change the law, I will. Basically he said, if they don't act by changing the law, then I'll act.

We've seen him do that. When he didn't like the law on immigration, he changed the law just by his own decree. We've seen with regard to even ObamaCare—his signature bill from his first administration—it's not going well. He wouldn't come ask Congress, uh-oh, it's not going well so let's change the law. So he just gave "so as I speak so shall it be," which is not reminiscent of normal Presidential conduct.

It is important that a President enforce the law, advocate for changes in the law, but under no circumstances is the President supposed to change the law to fit his own desires. I mean, you advocate, but the checks and balances which are the real genius behind the Constitution that do create gridlock, that create tensions between the different branches are what keeps this place from becoming a monarchy.

This President, when he says, if Congress doesn't act to change the law, then I will take care of it, well, we've seen that with gun control. He didn't like the fact that Congress was not changing the law when we were demanding that he enforce the laws that are there. All of these killers that have just been a plague on society, they violated plenty of laws. But this administration may be the worst at enforcing the gun laws. Certainly this administration has really been wanting in the area of enforcing the gun laws; and instead they come around and say, we want new gun laws. Well, that's not the way to do it.

I know that Republicans say, look, look, it's important we get this off the table, let's just get it off the table so let's pass something and that will get it off the table and then we can get on to the other things. I have already mentioned I think the thing to do is say, Resolved: the House is not going to take up an immigration bill until the President, the executive branch, Homeland Security, secures the border. Woodrow Wilson—and I'm not a fan of his historically—but in 1916 when Americans were threatened by rage across the border and Americans killed, that President secured the border, pure and simple. He secured the border, and he didn't go run around demanding that a new immigration bill be passed and we give amnesty to people.

There is a great article that National Review had from Fred Bauer. He said:

Any argument that says the GOP should support such a measure to remove immigration as a political issue should be treated with immediate suspicion. Millions would be left as illegal immigrants under the Senate plan and most other legalization plans a million more illegal immigrants, according to the Congressional Budget Office, would arrive over the next 10 years. Many provisions of the Senate bill, from the law wait time for citizenship to the status of guest workers, provide plenty of opportunities for the left to demagog this issue. Any changes to U.S. immigration law also change the future composition of the body politic. Immigration as a national policy question has not been "off the table" since 1789. Don't expect the latest link of congressional sausage to change that.

I think that's well said.

This is not going to be off the table. The way that we should deal with it responsibly is hold the administration accountable. You enforce the law and then we'll get an immigration bill done very quickly after that. I know we will.

All my colleagues here know there are parts of the immigration law that need to be fixed. But until the border is secure, not closed, but secured, we are wasting our time talking about a comprehensive immigration bill, or even good bills like TREY GOWDY or other bills that people have had; we shouldn't even be talking about them. Let the immigration secure the border and then we can work these things out very quickly. It's like a huge flood in your basement. If you run down and start with a mop while the water is still pouring in, you're making a mistake. You first stop the flood, and then you can clean up the problems after that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Texas. I just think of Congressman PHIL GINGREY, another doctor that engages in policy here, who once on this floor, probably at least once, said that when he is working in the emergency room and a patient comes in on a gurney and there's blood pouring off the gurney, you don't just go get the mop and the bucket and start to mop up the floor; you stop the bleeding first. Let's stop the bleeding at the border.

I think how hard is it to secure this border? It is not that hard. With the resources that we have, we are spending today—this is a 2,000-mile border, it's not just a rounded number, I mean, it is right at 2,000 miles—we are spending over \$6.5 million a mile on the southern border each and every year. So I look at that and I think, what are the economics of this? This is one of the advantages of being a ditch digger, a construction guy, because I figure this stuff out on what it cost to build things.

We are building interstate highway through expensive Iowa cornfields for \$4 million a mile, buying the right-of-way, doing the engineering, the archeological, environmental, the fencing, the seeding, the paving, the shouldering and the painting. All of that gets done for \$4 million a mile, and we are spending \$6.5 million a mile to guard a long barren desert that a lot of

it doesn't even have one barbed wire fence on it. It's just got a concrete pile on from horizon to horizon—\$6.5 plus million a mile.

So think of that. What would it take to build a fence, a wall and a fence if we can build interstate for \$4 million a mile and we are spending \$6.5 million a mile to—I guess they interdict perhaps 25 percent of the people that try? Instead, we can build a fence, a wall and a fence, we can secure the border, and we can do it with the resources that we have. We just have to want to. It has got to be about the rule of law, it has got to be secure the border first, it has got to be and who's going to be the metric. Let it be the border State Governors, the border State legislatures passing a resolution that the border is secure. Then let's have the balance of this conversation, not until, not unless.

It's like your teenager coming to you saying, Dad, I need the keys to the car. I know I've never mowed the lawn or carried out the garbage, I promise I will, just let me have the car tonight. I'll be back tomorrow. Is he going to keep his word? He hasn't even fired up the lawnmower yet. He doesn't know where the gas is. He probably doesn't know where the mower is.

Do the job first and then come back to us and talk to us, but let's not destroy this rule of law that's an essential pillar of American exceptionalism. Whatever it takes, we must block amnesty.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your attention and all of the people that spoke here tonight for this hour and a half to preserve and protect the rule of law, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHWEIKERT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for tomorrow on account of attending the funeral service for the firefighters who were killed in the Arizona wildfire.

Mr. WALBERG (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of flight delays due to mechanical issues and weather.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and tomorrow on account of the birth of his grandson.

Mr. HORSFORD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medically mandated recovery.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.