



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 2021

No. 69

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

April 21, 2021.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DEBBIE DINGELL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Be gracious to these, our lawmakers, O God. Shower Your mercy on them as they continue to take on the challenges of their office.

Schedules press on them; obligations pursue them all the day long. No one more than You knows the pace they keep, the long days and restless nights, the unrelenting schedule they juggle to master, and the countless and circuitous flights home to their districts.

In You may they find their respite. Keep their feet from falling, that they may walk before You in the light You shine on their lives.

In You may they place their trust. Keep their consciences clear and their motives pure as You guide their decisions.

In You may they be assured that their worries and concerns are known. Keep them in Your care, that nothing can snatch them from Your hand.

To You, then, may they turn, confident of Your deliverance and sure in the stamina You provide. To You may they offer their praise, and to Your Word may they turn.

In Your saving name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. VARGAS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF CODY LYSTER

(Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, it is my honor today to recognize the life of Cody Lyster, son of Kevin and Lea Ann Lyster, of Aurora, Colorado.

Cody passed away on April 8, 2020, and is Colorado's second youngest victim to die from COVID-19. He was a criminal justice major at Colorado Mesa University, following in his father's footsteps to become a law enforcement officer.

Cody was an avid baseball player. As a freshman, Cody was named team captain of his school's club baseball team,

a first for Colorado Mesa University history. He helped others through his love for the game and had a knack for bringing people together and could be counted on during times of calm and times of crisis.

Cody made his community better. In his honor, a \$1 million scholarship was established at Colorado Mesa University, and a sportsmanship award and scholarship at Arapahoe Little League were dedicated to a life well-lived.

Cody was an inspiration to others, and I can think of few as deserving of this honor today. I honor Cody and thank the Lysters for drawing strength from tragedy to make sure Cody's story is heard and to save as many lives as they can during this pandemic.

CONGRATULATING DRIPPING SPRINGS FOR TAKING 5A SOCCER STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Dripping Springs Tigers women's soccer team for their outstanding win in the UIL Class 5A final.

Dripping Springs finished the season as the Class 5A State Champion with a record 26 wins. They outscored their opponents this season 104-8.

The team showcased their amazing talent and skills on the field, and I am proud that all of their hard work and dedication throughout the year ultimately paid off.

Congratulations again to the Dripping Springs Tigers. Texas' 25th Congressional District is extraordinarily proud of their achievement, and we cannot wait to see what they will do next. Go Tigers.

In God We Trust.

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2001

MUSLIM TRAVEL BAN

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, the Muslim ban enacted under the previous administration is a stain on our country and our Nation's history. As we work to rebuild a humane and just immigration system, we must start by outlawing any type of this State-sanctioned religious bigotry. We do that today by passing the NO BAN Act.

This bill strengthens the Immigration and Nationality Act by banning discrimination on the basis of religion. Importantly, it will prevent any future President from enacting something like the Muslim ban in the future by placing appropriate checks and balances on the President's authority in this area.

Discrimination based on religion is not who we are as a nation. Today, we can take the first step towards a more just and humane immigration system, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on the NO BAN Act.

HONORING J. MICHAEL MYER

(Mr. MCKINLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my friend, Mike Myer of Wheeling, who passed away earlier this year.

Besides being a loving husband and father, Mike was an incredibly gifted editor at the Ogden newspaper chain and was a personal friend. Over the years, Mike and I had lively discussions on politics, the fossil fuel industry, and what would make West Virginia better. He was both a pragmatic and authentic editor, and he cared deeply for the livelihoods of men and women in the coal and natural gas fields of our valley.

Out of frustration, Mike would repeatedly ask why Members of Congress would intentionally inflict harm on so many of these families. His passion was his community and the people who lived there.

Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Connie, and their two children and two grandchildren as we all mourn Mike's passing.

Mike, you made a difference. You are already missed.

TRI-CAUCUS RESOLUTION ON COVID-19 VACCINE EQUITY

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, as chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I rise today to join my colleagues in the Tri-Caucus to ensure equitable access to the COVID-19 vaccine for communities of color.

While we are all equally susceptible to the coronavirus, we are not all equally impacted by it. Communities of color are disproportionately likely to be in frontline jobs with greater exposure to the virus; have less access to quality healthcare; and, as a result, have been experiencing higher infection and mortality rates throughout the pandemic.

With over 150 deaths per 100,000 cases, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders have one of the highest mortality groups of all groups from this virus.

That is why we will be introducing a resolution to address this. If we rely on communities of color to get us through this pandemic, then we need to ensure they are provided equitable access to the vaccine so they can stay healthy. We must ensure all Americans have an equal shot to be vaccinated.

LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD GOES TO CONGRESSMAN BOBBY SCOTT

(Mr. WITTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my good friend, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, on receiving the Lifetime Achievement Award from the L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs at Virginia Commonwealth University on April 15, 2021.

The Lifetime Achievement Award recognizes an individual Virginian whose career represents the highest values of public service and citizenship, and who has made a substantial contribution to the good of the Commonwealth.

Congressman BOBBY SCOTT is incredibly deserving of this recognition and award. He has spent more than four decades in public service, serving in the Virginia General Assembly for 15 years prior to being elected, and now serving Virginia's Third District in the U.S. House of Representatives, where he has been since 1992.

It is my honor to serve the Commonwealth of Virginia with a servant leader like BOBBY SCOTT. We share the same desire to work tirelessly for Virginians and to advocate for the needs of the Commonwealth.

Please join me in congratulating BOBBY SCOTT on receiving the Lifetime Achievement Award and in thanking him for his dedicated service on behalf of all Virginians.

PROMOTING COVID-19 VACCINE EQUITY AMONG COMMUNITIES OF COLOR

(Mr. VARGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VARGAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of a resolution promoting COVID-19 vaccine equity among communities of color.

Communities of color continue to be disproportionately impacted by the ongoing COVID-19 crisis, highlighting longstanding health, social, and economic inequities.

The resolution calls for the prioritization of areas with a high Social Vulnerability Index, SVI, for COVID-19 vaccination efforts and working with trusted community partners to implement culturally and linguistically appropriate strategies, among other efforts.

The resolution is going to be introduced during this month of April, during the National Minority Health Month to promote the health and well-being of racial and ethnic minority communities and to underscore the need for these communities to get vaccinated.

Vaccinate, vacunen. It is very important that they get vaccinated, es muy importante que se vacunen.

Madam Speaker, vaccinate yourself. It is very important.

I am so proud to support this resolution.

106TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

(Mr. VALADAO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 106th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

From 1915 to 1923, the Ottoman Empire engaged in the systematic and organized murder and deportation of an estimated 1.5 million Armenians.

Around the world, leaders have rightly identified these horrific events as genocide. However, despite both the House of Representatives and the Senate passing resolutions in 2019 recognizing this tragedy, no United States President has ever joined in this acknowledgment.

This week, I and my colleagues in the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues sent a letter to President Biden urging him to formally recognize the Armenian genocide.

Many of the men, women, and children forced to flee Armenia immigrated to the United States and have raised their families and embraced their new communities in our country. They deserve our recognition.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring and remembering those whose lives were lost and forever changed by the Armenian genocide.

AFGHANISTAN TROOP WITHDRAWAL

(Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the President's decision to end the war in Afghanistan.

Now Congress must ensure that future Commanders in Chief can never

again wage failed forever wars. This is also a critical moment to show we can defend America and protect the global commons without a \$740 billion defense budget.

We must repeal the Authorization for the Use of Military Force; reassert congressional oversight of war powers; and cut the Pentagon's budget by at least 10 percent as we invest instead in diplomacy, humanitarian assistance, and solving global challenges like climate change and pandemic preparedness.

The war in Afghanistan cost our country more than \$2 trillion, the lives of 2,400 American servicemembers, and credibility at home and abroad. The generation that fought in this war must now govern in light of its mistakes. Let us resolve to learn from them.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING GOLD STAR SPOUSES DAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Gold Star Spouses Day. Earlier this month, we honored the spouses who lost a loved one in service and remember their sacrifices.

As the son of a Navy veteran and the proud father of an Army soldier, I recognize the challenges our military families face. It is important to remember that our freedom is not free. Gold Star Spouses Day reminds us of the cost of war. Each year on April 5, it is important to take the time to remember, respect, and honor the spouses and their families of our fallen servicemembers.

Madam Speaker, Gold Star spouses and their families deserve our gratitude today and every day. God bless the brave men and women who put their lives on the line to protect us and God bless their families.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF MAJOR GENERAL DAN HELIX

(Mr. DESAULNIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the life of Major General Dan Helix.

Dan grew up in West Berkeley, California, and enjoyed a distinguished 41-year career with the United States Army and Army Reserve.

On top of his service in the military, he served on the Concord City Council for 8 years before serving as a director of the Bay Area Rapid Transit District.

After being away for some time, Dan eventually returned to the city council and served two terms as mayor during both of his tenures.

In 1989, Dan retired from the U.S. Army as a major general. As a Korean

war veteran, Dan earned numerous recommendations including: the Army Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star with "V" device, and the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster.

Sadly, Dan passed away last month at the age of 91. He was a cherished resident of Concord who dedicated his life to helping others. He was a mentor to me and to many others.

Please join me in honoring Major General Dan Helix for his many contributions to my community and to this country.

COMMEMORATING 46TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLACK APRIL

(Mrs. STEEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. STEEL. Madam Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the 46th anniversary of Black April.

April 30, 1975, marked the fall of Saigon and the end of the Vietnam war. Many Vietnamese Americans who were alive during the war remember this as the day that signified the loss of a country they once called home.

The people left everything they knew to flee communism. Hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese people have resettled in the United States and built vibrant communities here. California's 48th District is the proud home of Little Saigon, which is home to more Vietnamese Americans than anywhere else in the United States.

On Black April, I will join the Vietnamese Americans in our community and around the country in honoring those who served in Vietnam, and those who lost their lives attempting to flee Communist rule.

TRI-CAUCUS COVID-19 VACCINE EQUITY RESOLUTION

(Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, as a proud member of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I rise in strong support of the Tri-Caucus resolution promoting COVID-19 vaccine equity among communities of color.

I represent the large immigrant population that has been especially hard hit by this crisis, and now these are the same communities who are still struggling to get the vaccine.

Yes, vaccine hesitancy remains an issue, but the reality is that access is an even bigger problem. If we are serious about fighting COVID-19, we need to meet people where they are and bring vaccines to those who need it most, and we can't do this without engaging with trusted community leaders.

I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge one of these leaders in Chicago. Illinois Unidos, a coalition of

health professionals and community leaders, is one of a kind and stands as a national model. From testing, to the vaccine rollout, to housing and food assistance, Illinois Unidos has stood shoulder to shoulder with the Latino community in Chicago.

GREEN NEW DEAL

(Mr. CLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, there is no denying that we need to support an all-of-the-above solution for energy policy to secure our energy independence. But the Green New Deal which was recently introduced, yet again, seeks to fundamentally change our way of life, cripple American businesses, and explode our national debt—\$93 trillion, with a T, which is how much their proposal will cost over the next 10 years.

Let's put that into perspective. \$93 trillion is more money than the Federal Government has spent for the entire period from 1979 until the present. Madam Speaker, that is absurd. Worse yet, how do the Democrats propose that we pay for it? By raising the taxes, of course, up to 70 percent. This is outrageous.

It crushes jobs, costs an average American household nearly \$700,000 through 2029, provides paychecks for people unwilling to work, abolishes airplanes, cows, and fossil fuels, and would require rebuilding and retrofitting every building in America. This is a crazy policy.

ENCOURAGING COSPONSORSHIP OF TRI-CAUCUS COVID-19 VACCINATION EQUITY

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to encourage cosponsorship of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus-led Tri-Caucus COVID-19 Vaccination Equity resolution.

Hispanic, Black, Asian American, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, and Native American communities continue to bear the brunt of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Not only are communities of color suffering disproportionately from COVID-19 complications, but they are receiving vaccines at a lower rate than their White counterparts. These inequities are not new. They highlight longstanding health, economic, and social disparities.

As chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I worked with my Tri-Caucus colleagues to introduce this resolution, promoting equity in COVID-19 vaccinations. The resolution calls for solutions like prioritizing vaccines to communities with the highest rates of infections and deaths, working

with trusted community partners, and implementing culturally, linguistically appropriate strategies.

During National Minority Health Month we must promote vaccine equity to the benefit of all Americans.

INFRASTRUCTURE BILL

(Mr. BAIRD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, today I rise for the concerns over the President's \$2 trillion infrastructure plan. One concern is the steep price tag, but my bigger concern is what the administration is trying to classify as infrastructure.

We are to the point of changing the definition of what that is. We are throwing everything in except the kitchen sink and the kitchen table and calling it infrastructure. I think that is irrational and I think that is irresponsible.

How can you call this an infrastructure bill when less than 6 percent of it goes to roads and bridges, 5 percent goes to broadband infrastructure, and less than 2 percent goes to the waterways, locks, dams, ports, and airports?

Less than 2 percent of our waterways and ports is unacceptable. This type of infrastructure is critical for Hoosiers in transporting our manufactured and agriculture exports to the global market.

If we are going to ask the American taxpayers to make these critical and substantial investments, it is our duty to make sure our dollars are spent wisely and efficiently on true infrastructure.

GREEN NEW DEAL FOR AMERICA

(Ms. JACOBS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACOBS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call for a Green New Deal for America.

As one of the youngest members of this body, I am proud to represent a generation that is taking on climate change with the urgency that it deserves.

The Green New Deal is a call to action and a blueprint for positive change. It is about choosing justice and progress over scarcity and inequality. It is about choosing to have a plan instead of waiting for a miracle.

San Diegans are all too familiar with how devastating unchecked climate change has been for our community, and those who can least afford it have paid the highest price.

This plan is to mobilize and rebuild our economy around clean energy, empowered workers, and good jobs.

Madam Speaker, my generation knows that we can't take small steps to solve big problems. We have to think differently and reimagine a better future.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO GERALD CLARK

(Mr. BURCHETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my good friend, Gerald Clark, a true American hero from my district who passed away on April 19.

Gerald dedicated his life to helping his fellow veterans and their families and patriotically served his country during World War II.

Gerald viewed his time with the U.S. Army as an adventure. He fought with the 75th Infantry Division at the Battle of the Bulge and lost his leg defending our country fighting the Nazis.

He was awarded a Purple Heart for his service and sacrifice. He was honorably discharged after being hospitalized over a year. Then he returned to Tennessee; married his wife, Bea; raised five children; and continued to serve his community.

For decades, Gerald held memberships in the American Legion, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in the belief that his support lent strength to the voice of each organization.

Gerald was also a leading advocate for opening a Tennessee State Veterans' Home in Knox County. Thanks to his efforts, Ben Atchley Tennessee State Veterans' Home opened in 2006, and my father actually passed away in that veterans' home, so I hold it very close to my heart, Madam Speaker.

It is my honor to salute Gerald Clark one final time here on the House floor. He will be greatly missed.

COVID-19 TASK FORCE AND CITIZEN CORPS OF DELAWARE COUNTY

(Ms. SCANLON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the incredible staff of the Delaware County COVID-19 task force, led by Rosemarie Halt, for their amazing work, along with the thousands of volunteers from the DelCo Medical Reserve Corps and the DelCo Citizen Corps who have created and implemented new systems to test, feed, and vaccinate tens of thousands of people in our community.

These folks have been working day and night to help guide the residents of Delaware County through the challenges of a once-in-a-century pandemic. In an ever-changing landscape, they have distributed supplies, coordinated communication, and are now helping to ensure that everyone gets vaccinated.

I am proud to honor them today during National Volunteer Week to cele-

brate those working behind the scenes to get us back to normal.

Rosemarie, her staff, and the DelCo volunteers have been critical to the response and relief efforts in our district. For over a year, it has been all hands on deck, and we cannot thank them enough for their service.

CONGRATULATING TONY SCHMITZ ON HIS ACCEPTANCE TO WEST POINT

(Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a young man in Iowa's Second Congressional District with an incredibly bright future.

On June 28, Pella High School senior Tony Schmitz will enroll as a cadet at the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York.

Everyone knows just how tough it is to get into West Point, with its 12 percent acceptance rate, but getting in is only the beginning. As a 24-year veteran of the Army myself, I can speak firsthand of the challenging, fulfilling, and exciting journey Tony is about to begin.

As the school year starts to wind down, I also want to remind all rising seniors in the Second District to reach out to my office if you have an interest in applying to any or attending one of our four amazing service academies.

Once again, congratulations to Tony, and always remember: Go Army, beat Navy.

WISHING LIEUTENANT COLONEL RETIRED SAM MULRAIN A HAPPY 104TH BIRTHDAY

(Ms. MACE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MACE. Madam Speaker, today I rise to wish a very happy birthday to a South Carolina hero, a community leader and someone who just yesterday turned 104 years young, Lieutenant Colonel Retired Sam Mulrain.

Lieutenant Colonel Mulrain has done so much in his life and I am proud to recognize him today, and I am grateful for all of his accomplishments. His legacy is inspirational to our Nation and the Lowcountry. We owe Lieutenant Colonel Mulrain so much for his contributions, both in military service and in his humanitarian efforts.

He was part of the Greatest Generation, storming the beaches of Normandy where he was wounded and received the Purple Heart. He played baseball with Hall of Famer Phil "The Scooter" Rizzuto.

In and around Hilton Head, the community knows him for his tireless dedication to public service.

Today, we in Congress, wish Sam a very happy birthday.

□ 1230

STANDING UP FOR THE
VOICELESS

(Mrs. MILLER of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I proudly signed a discharge petition in order to vote on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Along with my Republican colleagues, we are standing up for the voiceless to end this ongoing tragedy once and for all. We must end infanticide.

Seventy-seven percent of Americans support protections for babies born alive after a failed abortion, but Speaker PELOSI refuses to bring up the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act for a vote.

This legislation is long overdue. It is time to stand up to Speaker PELOSI and the radical Democrats' lack of regard for human life and pass the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

My heart aches in all instances when the dignity of human life is violated. As a Christian, I believe that the image of God in each one of us gives us intrinsic worth that cannot be assaulted.

This bill simply requires an abortionist to give lifesaving treatment to a child who survives a botched abortion rather than let them die slowly.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 21, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 21, 2021, at 11:51 a.m.:

Appointments:
United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission.

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

NATIONAL ORIGIN-BASED ANTI-
DISCRIMINATION FOR NON-
IMMIGRANTS ACT

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 330, I call up the bill (H.R. 1333) to transfer and limit Executive Branch authority to suspend or restrict the entry of a class of aliens, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 330, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1333

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Origin-Based Antidiscrimination for Non-immigrants Act" or the "NO BAN Act".

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF NONDISCRIMINATION PROVISION.

Section 202(a)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(a)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking "Except as specifically provided in paragraph (2) and in sections 101(a)(27), 201(b)(2)(A)(i), and 203, no" and inserting "No";

(2) by inserting "or a nonimmigrant visa, admission or other entry into the United States, or the approval or revocation of any immigration benefit" after "immigrant visa";

(3) by inserting "religion," after "sex,"; and

(4) by inserting before the period at the end the following: "except as specifically provided in paragraph (2), in sections 101(a)(27), 201(b)(2)(A)(i), and 203, if otherwise expressly required by statute, or if a statutorily authorized benefit takes into consideration such factors".

SEC. 3. TRANSFER AND LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND OR RESTRICT THE ENTRY OF A CLASS OF ALIENS.

Section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND OR RESTRICT THE ENTRY OF A CLASS OF ALIENS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), if the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, determines, based on specific and credible facts, that the entry of any aliens or any class of aliens into the United States would undermine the security or public safety of the United States or the preservation of human rights, democratic processes or institutions, or international stability, the President may temporarily—

"(A) suspend the entry of such aliens or class of aliens as immigrants or nonimmigrants; or

"(B) impose any restrictions on the entry of such aliens that the President deems appropriate.

"(2) LIMITATIONS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

"(A) only issue a suspension or restriction when required to address specific acts implicating a compelling government interest in a factor identified in paragraph (1);

"(B) narrowly tailor the suspension or restriction, using the least restrictive means, to achieve such compelling government interest;

"(C) specify the duration of the suspension or restriction;

"(D) consider waivers to any class-based restriction or suspension and apply a rebuttable presumption in favor of granting family-based and humanitarian waivers; and

"(E) comply with all provisions of this Act.

"(3) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Prior to the President exercising the authority under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall consult Congress and provide Congress with specific evidence supporting the need for the suspension or restriction and its proposed duration.

"(B) BRIEFING AND REPORT.—Not later than 48 hours after the President exercises the authority under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide a briefing and submit a written report to Congress that describes—

"(i) the action taken pursuant to paragraph (1) and the specified objective of such action;

"(ii) the estimated number of individuals who will be impacted by such action;

"(iii) the constitutional and legislative authority under which such action took place; and

"(iv) the circumstances necessitating such action, including how such action complies with paragraph (2), as well as any intelligence informing such actions.

"(C) TERMINATION.—If the briefing and report described in subparagraph (B) are not provided to Congress during the 48 hours that begin when the President exercises the authority under paragraph (1), the suspension or restriction shall immediately terminate absent intervening congressional action.

"(D) CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'Congress', as used in this paragraph, refers to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

"(4) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall publicly announce and publish an unclassified version of the report described in paragraph (3)(B) in the Federal Register.

"(5) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an individual or entity who is present in the United States and has been harmed by a violation of this subsection may file an action in an appropriate district court of the United States to seek declaratory or injunctive relief.

"(B) CLASS ACTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to preclude an action filed pursuant to subparagraph (A) from proceeding as a class action.

"(6) TREATMENT OF COMMERCIAL AIRLINES.—Whenever the Secretary of Homeland Security finds that a commercial airline has failed to comply with regulations of the Secretary of Homeland Security relating to requirements of airlines for the detection of fraudulent documents used by passengers traveling to the United States (including the training of personnel in such detection), the Secretary of Homeland Security may suspend the entry of some or all aliens transported to the United States by such airline.

"(7) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as authorizing the President, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security to act in a manner inconsistent with the policy decisions expressed in the immigration laws."

SEC. 4. VISA APPLICANTS REPORT.

(a) INITIAL REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit a report to the congressional committees referred to in section 212(f)(3)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by section 3 of this Act, that describes the implementation of Presidential Proclamations 9645, 9822, and 9983 and Executive Orders 13769, 13780, and 13815, during the effective period of each such proclamation and order.

(2) PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION 9645 AND 9983.—In addition to the content described in

paragraph (1), the report submitted with respect to Presidential Proclamation 9645, issued on September 24, 2017, and Presidential Proclamation 9983, issued on January 31, 2020, shall include, for each country listed in such proclamation—

(A) the total number of individuals who applied for a visa during the time period the proclamation was in effect, disaggregated by country and visa category;

(B) the total number of visa applicants described in subparagraph (A) who were approved, disaggregated by country and visa category;

(C) the total number of visa applicants described in subparagraph (A) who were refused, disaggregated by country and visa category, and the reasons they were refused;

(D) the total number of visa applicants described in subparagraph (A) whose applications remain pending, disaggregated by country and visa category;

(E) the total number of visa applicants described in subparagraph (A) who were granted a waiver, disaggregated by country and visa category;

(F) the total number of visa applicants described in subparagraph (A) who were denied a waiver, disaggregated by country and visa category, and the reasons such waiver requests were denied;

(G) the total number of refugees admitted, disaggregated by country; and

(H) the complete reports that were submitted to the President every 180 days in accordance with section 4 of Presidential Proclamation 9645 in its original form, and as amended by Presidential Proclamation 9983.

(b) **ADDITIONAL REPORTS.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President exercises the authority under section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)), as amended by section 3 of this Act, and every 30 days thereafter, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security and heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit a report to the congressional committees referred to in paragraph (3)(D) of such section 212(f) that identifies, with respect to countries affected by a suspension or restriction, the information described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of subsection (a)(2) of this section and the specific evidence supporting the need for the continued exercise of presidential authority under such section 212(f), including the information described in paragraph (3)(B) of such section 212(f). If the report described in this subsection is not provided to such congressional committees in the time specified, the suspension or restriction shall immediately terminate absent intervening congressional action. A final report with such information shall be prepared and submitted to such congressional committees not later than 30 days after the suspension or restriction is lifted.

(c) **FORM; AVAILABILITY.**—The reports required under subsections (a) and (b) shall be made publicly available online in unclassified form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1333.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1333, the National Origin-Based Antidiscrimination for Nonimmigrants Act, or NO BAN Act, is an important step toward reining in executive overreach and preserving the power of Congress to establish our Nation's immigration laws.

Section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the INA, authorizes the President to suspend the entry of noncitizens when the President finds that their entry would be detrimental to U.S. interests.

From 1952, when this provision was enacted, until January 2017, Presidents of both parties invoked section 212(f) to exclude only narrow groups of individuals, such as human rights violators, North Korean officials, and individuals seeking to overthrow governments, for reasons that would clearly serve the national interest.

But former President Trump abused this authority, twisting it in ways that were never intended. He first used it to deliver on his campaign promise to ban Muslims from the United States, an immoral and disastrous policy that traumatized children and families and made us no safer, while weakening our standing in the world.

The former President then used this section to rewrite immigration laws with which he disagreed. For example, the INA expressly provides asylum eligibility to any individual who arrives in the United States “whether or not at a designated port of arrival.” However, President Trump invoked section 212(f) to deny asylum to persons who cross the southern border between ports of entry, in direct conflict with the statute. Fortunately, the judiciary agreed that this was unlawful and stopped the policy from taking effect.

H.R. 1333 will prevent such executive overreach by amending section 212(f) to ensure it is used in a manner consistent with its intended purpose and historical norms.

Although President Biden has repealed the egregious orders of the Trump era, including the Muslim ban, we must pass the NO BAN Act to ensure that this authority is never abused again. In advancing this legislation today, we uphold our Nation's founding ideals and reaffirm our commitment to the rule of law.

This should not be a partisan issue. Members on both sides of the aisle should agree that no President, Republican or Democratic, should be permitted to usurp the powers of the legislative branch enshrined in the Constitution. The separation of powers is fundamental to our democratic Republic, and it must be protected.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague, Representative JUDY CHU,

for her leadership and her steadfast commitment to this issue. Her efforts led to the introduction of the NO BAN Act, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), the ranking member of the Immigration and Citizenship Subcommittee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, this bill presents a very simple question: Should we all but strip the President of his authority to restrict travel from countries that pose a danger to the United States?

Ronald Reagan and George Bush used this authority to protect our country. So, too, did Barack Obama and even Joe Biden as recently as January 25.

President Trump invoked this authority against countries that were hotbeds of international terrorism and that were not cooperating with the United States in providing basic information about travelers coming from these countries. Now, the left calls it a Muslim ban. What nonsense. The President's orders affected only a tiny fraction of Muslim-majority countries and a sizable number of non-Muslim countries. The Supreme Court cited this obvious truth when it fully upheld the President's actions. In fact, when a rogue government changed its policy and cooperated with us, the restrictions were lifted.

Without this authority, the President would have been powerless to take simple, prudent precautions against terrorists and criminals from entering the United States.

The President's ability to protect against threats, negotiate security protocols, and, when necessary, retaliate against discriminatory actions by other countries depends on his having this power at his immediate disposal.

This bill, instead, forbids the President from taking action until he can show that it is the weakest possible measure at his disposal. It requires him to get his own Secretary of State's permission, which is a constitutional absurdity, and it gives anyone who claims any harm the standing to block an order in Federal district court.

So, I ask, in this world that is becoming increasingly threatening and unstable, does this bill make us more safe or less safe? The answer should be self-evident to anyone who is not completely besotted with the woke insanity of the radical left.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU), the author of this legislation.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my legislation, the NO BAN Act.

The Muslim ban was always wrong, needless, and cruel. Today, we can make sure it never happens again.

First, this policy was wrong. America does not ban people because of their religion, and the Supreme Court acknowledged this. When they upheld the

third iteration of Trump's Muslim ban, the Court insisted that, in order to prove this wasn't just a religious ban, the Trump administration would have to issue waivers to allow those we know not to be a threat to travel here. But that waiver process was a sham, with almost all requests ignored, proving the purpose of the ban was to keep Muslims out of the country, just as Donald Trump always said it was.

Second, the policy was needless. As the Supreme Court's waiver requirement recognized, America has the best and strongest vetting system in the world. Many of those stopped by the Muslim ban had been vetted by U.S. officials many times over many years. I have met with many of them myself. These are people who are trying to escape dangerous situations or who simply wanted a chance at a better life. They turned to the U.S., as countless others have done over the generations. But instead of opportunity, they were met with bigotry, sometimes just days before they were supposed to arrive here.

Which is why, thirdly, this ban was about cruelty. Afraid to leave America out of fear they wouldn't be able to return, or unable to visit here at all, families were intentionally isolated from each other, missing weddings, funerals, births, and graduations.

This past year has shown us what the impact of missing such milestones feels like. To do it deliberately is inexcusable.

Thousands of families were separated by this policy simply because of a lie that Muslims are dangerous, a lie that encouraged bigotry and xenophobia, even as hate crimes are on the rise.

Fortunately, President Biden understood the harm of this policy and rescinded the Muslim bans on his first day in office. But we must make sure no President is ever able to ban people from coming to the U.S. simply because of their religion, which is why I am so pleased that we are voting to pass the NO BAN Act today.

While preserving a President's ability to respond to national emergencies like pandemics, this bill amends the Immigration and Nationality Act to require that any future travel ban is based on credible facts and actual threats. The bill also requires the President to work in consultation with the Departments of State and Homeland Security to provide evidence of why a ban is needed in the first place.

I am so grateful to Chairman NADLER, as well as my House and Senate cosponsors, for their support, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, if this bill passes, the President may only act if the Secretary of State allows him to act, and that is backward. The Secretary of State should not be authorized in statute to tell the President, the Secretary of State's boss, that the

President may act. It is antithetical to the executive powers as set forth in the United States Constitution.

Let me say that again. H.R. 1333 gives the authority to initiate a suspension of entry not to the President but to the Secretary of State in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security.

But it is the President, in whom all executive power vests, who should determine whether to suspend entry and not just in consultation with or the permission of the State and Homeland Security Departments.

While we are discussing this, we have a crisis on our border, a crisis created by this President. For months, he refused to acknowledge the crisis. When he accidentally slipped and said it was a crisis, we were later told he didn't really mean it was a crisis.

Well, here is the deal. You are housing illegal aliens in hotels. That is the kind of crisis this has become. The situation is so bad that the Biden administration has reopened and expanded facilities to house illegal aliens who have surged across the border.

President Biden inherited a secure border and policies that were working and, instead, has created an inhumane border crisis.

If he wants to solve the crisis, he needs to finish construction of the wall; reinstate the migrant protection protocols; reinstate the asylum cooperative agreements with Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador; and remove the other incentives to come, like \$1,400 from the COVID package that was just recently passed.

He can bring it under control, but the best way to bring it under control is to move immigration judges to the southern border to deal with asylum cases that are occurring today, not the backlog. Those people are already in here. Deal with those cases today.

Getting back to this bill, it is representative of an executive branch that is willing to give over and cede Presidential authority to Cabinet members instead of the President himself. This bill should not be passed. It should not even be considered.

□ 1245

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1333, the NO BAN Act.

This legislation would prevent future abuses of power committed by the previous administration through its xenophobic Muslim ban, a despicable policy which undermined one of our Nation's founding principles, freedom of religion.

My home State of Rhode Island was established by Roger Williams on the principle of religious liberty and separation of church and state, and his leadership inspired the Framers of our Constitution to incorporate these principles into our founding documents.

This legislation will help to preserve that principle.

From the very beginning, former President Trump was clear about exactly what his policy was, an explicit attempt to keep out as many people from Muslim-majority countries as possible, regardless of whether they were seeking refuge or asylum. It was never designed to make us safer. It was simply a way to spark fear and hatred among our citizens.

On his first day in office, thankfully, President Biden rescinded this policy.

Yet the impact of the Muslim ban remains. After 4 years of having this policy in place, the time it takes to reimplement normal immigration and travel policies brings delays in otherwise routine procedures, such as obtaining visas, thus delaying the reunion of families.

Thankfully, however, with the Muslim ban rescinded, those families can take comfort in knowing they are a step closer to once again being with their loved ones.

Despite this, it remains necessary to pass this NO BAN Act. Without making the necessary reforms to prevent the abuses of power of the previous administration, they could simply be put back in place by a future President.

The NO BAN Act makes it unequivocally clear that we stand by the American ideal of freedom of religion. It will provide the necessary limitations on the President's ability to use overly broad terms to inappropriately and indiscriminately target and label entire groups of racial, ethnic, or religious minorities because of who they choose to worship.

We must not tolerate discriminatory actions that undermine our core values and threaten our Nation's health and safety.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support passage of the NO BAN Act. I thank the chairman of the committee for his leadership, and I thank Congresswoman JUDY CHU for her extraordinary leadership in this regard.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished Republican leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, at the heart of Democrats' border security policies is the assumption that America can assume an unlimited number of illegal immigrants without considering its impact on jobs, communities, security, and, in today's world, health.

This assumption defies all historical evidence. More importantly, it defies the evidence right before our very eyes.

Madam Speaker, in the last month alone, Border Patrol apprehended the largest surge of migrants in 20 years, 172,000 individuals in one single month. By September, we are on track to encounter 2 million illegal immigrants. Now, that is about twice the size of the population of Delaware, President Biden's home State.

The surge was directly caused by the actions of the Biden administration. On day one, President Biden issued five executive orders that reversed the commonsense immigration policies that were working.

Then his administration sent mixed signals to migrants that now is not the time to come, but promising not to deport children and many families.

Now, as Monday's order demonstrates, the White House is more concerned with policing Border Patrol's language than it is protecting our border.

I am very glad that President Biden finally admitted that there is a crisis at the border, but what we really need is for him to admit that his policies and rhetoric caused the crisis to begin with.

The results of this crisis are as predictable as they are disastrous, for both migrants and American citizens. Just this past weekend, the Biden administration was forced to shut down a Houston migrant center for children because of unbearable conditions. Hundreds of unaccompanied minors had to be shuttled somewhere else.

I know everybody in this body understands that that is heartbreaking. It is also a public health risk. That is because the Biden administration is releasing migrants into American cities without negative COVID tests, without court dates, and without a way to track where they will go. Already, that number is up to 15,000.

Now, Madam Speaker, that doesn't come from me. I saw it on the news today from a Democratic colleague who put this number out and said it was disastrous.

But the border crisis isn't just a humanitarian and public health crisis. It is also a national security crisis. Last month, I shared some alarming news. When I was down on the border, I was speaking to the Border Patrol agents, and they informed me that individuals on the terrorist watch list were caught trying to enter our country.

Madam Speaker, I know how much you care about protecting this country from terrorism. I thought everybody on your side of the aisle would care just as much. Unfortunately, Congressman GALLEGO accused me of lying. Congresswoman ESCOBAR said I was trying to fuel division, Madam Speaker.

But the Customs and Border Protection agency confirmed that four suspected terrorists had been caught. Since then, more suspected terrorists have been caught at different times and different places, from Yemen, but not on the same day; two different individuals.

Now, I am sure, maybe because of the challenges with COVID and the distance we must keep, that I have not received the apology of being accused of being a liar on a national security issue, but I assume that will come shortly.

The security problem also includes a flow of drugs. When I was on that same

border in El Paso, talking to some of those same agents, they told me they have never seen the amount of fentanyl that has come across the border in the last month. Americans are dying because the cartels are exploiting the Biden border crisis to make a profit. Fentanyl overdoses are surging across the country.

Now, in my home State, Madam Speaker, the Speaker's hometown of San Francisco saw more fentanyl-related deaths last year than COVID-related deaths, according to The Wall Street Journal.

Madam Speaker, it is hard to imagine anything more shortsighted than doubling down on Biden's failed border policies. But, incredibly, as I sit on this floor, the House Democrats want to respond to this humanitarian, public health, and national security crisis by passing recycled legislation from the last Congress.

I know, Madam Speaker, the Speaker doesn't want us to work in committees and wants to do it from afar, but I still think we could have new ideas to a bigger problem created by a new administration.

They want to strip future Presidents of their authority to keep Americans safe. That is what the NO BAN Act does.

They also want to grant foreign nationals access to lawyers. But foreign nationals have never been entitled to this privilege before, and it will cost taxpayers \$825 million over the next 5 years. That may not sound like much if you just want to throw trillions out there, but that is hardworking taxpayers' money. It is a lot of money.

But are Democrats working to repair the crisis its radical policies caused? No.

Are they working to stop the mass flow of illegal migration? No.

Are they working to secure our borders? No.

Vice President Harris has refused to visit the border for 28 days.

By contrast, more than one-third of the House Republicans have been to the border and seen the crisis for themselves. There have even been some bipartisan trips, Madam Speaker. And I was very excited to hear that, in the bipartisan trip, questions were asked.

My understanding was the very first question one of our Democrat colleagues asked was: Is it really true we are catching terrorists?

And the shock on their face when the border agent said: Yes, from the terrorist watch list, we have caught them.

What is really concerning to me, if you read The Washington Post, is the thousands of people who come across per day who are not caught.

How many terrorists are in that group? How much fentanyl are those people carrying?

What we learned has led directly to the action we have taken here in Congress.

Two weeks ago, Dr. MILLER-MEEKS introduced a bill to require a negative

COVID-19 test before any illegal immigrant is released from custody.

Madam Speaker, I was shocked that your side of the aisle blocked it.

Last week, Representative CARTER and Representative PETER MEIJER offered a motion to combat the trafficking of fentanyl analogues, which are 100 times deadlier than regular fentanyl.

Democrats blocked it, even though 137 of them voted for the same motion last year.

Can you imagine that, Madam Speaker? 137 on your side of the aisle voted just last year for that amendment. I guess things have changed.

Madam Speaker, Congress needs to do the right thing here. We should not be wasting our time on recycled legislation that weakens our national security. We simply need to return to commonsense border security policies that work.

We need to finish the wall and deploy technology to the border.

We need to fully reinstate the "remain in Mexico" policy and maintain the robustly implemented Title 42 authority.

We need to require a negative COVID test before releasing migrants. I think that would be common sense. Most Americans have to have that.

We need to send a clear message: Do not come to the United States illegally.

Madam Speaker, if we want to fix the crisis, we need to fix its root cause. But that root cause isn't only in Guatemala, El Salvador, or Honduras; it is right here in Washington, D.C.

You see, Madam Speaker, before the crisis hit, there wasn't legislation that was passed. It was just on day one with executive orders. So all they have to do is do the exact same thing they did, take the pen and bring them back. Let's bring common sense back to solutions.

Madam Speaker, why don't we bring new ideas to committees? Why don't we have Members show up for work? And why don't we have committees actually work instead of just picking old ideas when they have created a new problem that will only expand it further?

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership, and I thank Congresswoman JUDY CHU for her leadership.

Madam Speaker, I rise with great enthusiasm for the National Origin-Based Antidiscrimination for Nonimmigrants Act, and that is the NO BAN Act.

I proclaim a breath of fresh air, and that was the election of 2020 and the inauguration of President Joe Biden and Vice President KAMALA HARRIS, who made it very clear what our position is as it relates to those who come to this country.

First of all, they did not turn a blind eye to the Statue of Liberty, which acknowledges the fact that we are a refuge for those who are fleeing persecution. They also understood that we are not a country that discriminates against individuals simply because of their religion. That is what the NO BAN Act represented. It had nothing to do with terrorism.

I wonder why President Trump never said anything about domestic terrorists? Why didn't they have a structure to ban them, the very terrorists that jumped this Capitol on January 6th?

I am reminded of a little 15-year-old on the day that the ban was issued. When I was flying in from Washington, I went straight over to the international terminal because my staff had called me and others had called me. This little boy, innocent, with legal documents, a tourist visa, coming to visit his family, innocently indicated who he was. And, of course, by law, those CBP officers had to detain him.

□ 1300

Do you know what was worse? He was not able to see anyone at that time, but more importantly, he wound up in Chicago.

And so I rise to support the NO BAN Act, and I indicate that there is a policy. The border is closed. The Vice President will be working on a broader plan for dealing with the border. The shelter in Houston was a temporary shelter. It was an emergency shelter. It was rightly closed when other beds were found. 130 of those children were reunited with their families. This bill is important.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I am delighted that this bill includes an important provision of mine offered last year during the committee markup, which requires the administration to report to Congress on the impacts, positive, negative, and unintended of any action by the President pursuant to executive orders.

We know that banning Nigeria was the wrong thing to do, and I support the NO BAN Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE).

Mr. STEUBE. Madam Speaker, this is a dangerous piece of legislation that comes at a time when our national security and our public health are being threatened by a dire crisis at our southern border.

Only Democrats would bring a bill to the floor during a surge at our southern border that would make it easier for terrorists to enter our country. As someone who served in the war on terror and served in Operation Iraqi Freedom, the last thing we should be doing as a Nation is making it easier for terrorists in Iran, Iraq, Syria, and other

terrorist-harboring nations to travel to the United States.

Despite the harrowing statistics we see coming from the southern border with record-setting numbers of illegal crossings and unaccompanied minors, my colleagues on the left continue to ignore and downplay the actual facts, while terrorists and COVID-positive illegal immigrants are granted unprecedented access to our country.

The Biden administration has driven illegal crossings up to historic highs by encouraging more illegal immigration and loosening restrictions to give criminals a free pass. These policy reversals, and now this legislation, will be directly responsible for what will go down in history as our biggest failure of border security in our lifetime.

Now, rather than addressing the hundreds of thousands of illegal border crossings this year, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are still spending their time trying to attack the successful policies from the Trump administration that actually drove our border numbers down and kept Americans safe.

Rather than attacking the Trump administration at the expense of the American people, my colleagues on the left should instead think about spending their time trying to reinstate some of his policies that were proven effective, like continuing border wall construction or ending chain migration.

Even more hypocritical, while telling American citizens to stay home from work, school and to refrain from normal life due to a global pandemic, legislation like this keeps sending the message to illegal aliens, even those from dangerous countries, that the United States is open for them to flood our borders and be taken care of by our taxpayers.

At a time when there is a border crisis, a global pandemic, and emerging national security threats, we should not be handicapping any current or future President from exercising their executive authority to keep our country safe.

In fact, the Obama-Biden administration used this authority 19 times during their administration. The only reason why my colleagues are pushing this is because of their hatred for President Trump and his actions to restrict entry from certain countries that protected our national security.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the distinguished chairperson of the Immigration and Citizenship Subcommittee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, this is an important step towards the enactment of the NO BAN Act, which would prevent overreach in a President's authority to suspend the entry of noncitizens into the United States under section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

As a candidate for President, Donald Trump promised to ban "all Muslims" from entering the U.S., and he sug-

gested without any evidence that it would somehow make our country safer.

Immediately after his election and swearing in, he tried to deliver on that promise by using section 212(f), claiming the admission of individuals from seven Muslim-majority countries would be detrimental to the U.S. interests.

In court, the Trump administration claimed the ban was necessary to keep our country safe from terrorists. And yet, a bipartisan coalition of former national security officials strongly rebuked those claims.

In addition to this ban, President Trump also relied on section 212(f) to circumvent clear statutory requirements related to asylum. Section 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act specifically allows individuals to apply for asylum "whether or not they arrive at a designated port of arrival."

The law could not be clearer. But apparently unhappy with it, the President invoked section 212(f) to categorically deny asylum to those who cross the border between ports of entry rather than seeking to amend the law by working with Congress.

This was an attempt to rewrite our Nation's immigration laws in direct violation of the constitutional separation of powers. The power to write the law is ours, not the President's.

Fortunately, this ban has now been reversed by President Biden, but this bill is still important. It is important to take action to prevent any future President from trying to usurp the legislative power of the Congress.

I thank Representative CHU for her persistence in pursuing this bill, and I think it is important to note that the President, if this bill passes, retains ample authority to act in the national interests of the United States to protect our security.

The bill allows the President to suspend the entry of individuals or class of individuals if he determines that they would undermine the security of the United States.

To be clear, under the current bill, if the President determines there is a national security issue related to a particular country that is so significant that it could only be addressed by suspending the admission of all nationals of that country, the President could still do so.

It is important that we also address the issue of children at the border. This bill isn't about children at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, we can do more than one thing at once. We need to make sure that the law is adhered to by the President. We also need to deal with the issue of unaccompanied children at the border and deal with the crisis in Central America that is causing it.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, 172,331 border patrol apprehensions in March, a 233 percent increase in fentanyl seized, the worst crisis in 15 years, but more than that, no peak in sight.

President Biden and the Democratic majority bury their heads in the sand. They have put the United States Government, charged with enforcing the border, in the service of Mexican drug cartels and their criminal enterprises. I have been there. I have heard from the CBP.

And Democrats choose this moment to advance this bill to hobble the authority of the President of the United States to protect the Nation by excluding foreign nationals he or she might identify as posing a danger. Think North Korea.

In fact, they strip the President and transfer to the secretary of state and Homeland Security the President's longstanding authority to protect the Nation in this way.

And in case you would have concluded otherwise by the rhetoric, this is not limited to a religious criteria for entry.

I offered an amendment in the Judiciary Committee to defer the effectiveness of this unwise legislation—to understate—until the current crisis can be brought under control by restoring the Trump administration's successful remain in Mexico policy. But Democrats rejected that and refused to consider it on the floor.

Customs and Border Protection advised us on our trip the week before last that they told the administration revoking the remain in Mexico policy would cause a disaster. But they did it anyway.

And here they have doubled down. Just the latest evidence that today's crisis is intentional. There is no intention to control it. There is an intention, yes, there is a plan, but the plan is to build out the capacity for bringing people illegally into the United States. This is a crisis. They serve not the people of America. You can't have a country if you don't have a voice.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished chair for his yielding and for his leadership.

The foundational model of this country is *e pluribus unum*, out of many, one. It doesn't say out of many Europeans, one. It doesn't say out of many Anglo-Saxons, one. It doesn't say out of many Confederate sympathizers, one. It doesn't say out of many Christians, one. It certainly doesn't say out of many nations, except Muslim countries, one.

E pluribus unum. Out of many, one. That is what makes America a great country. And no matter what

xenophobic behavior is coming out of the halls of power in this country, we are not going to let anyone take that away from us; not now, not ever.

Vote "yes" on the NO BAN Act so we can continue our country's long, necessary, and majestic march toward a more perfect Union.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, wow, the rhetoric is hot today. Bigotry, xenophobia, Muslim ban, racism, discrimination. This is what is coming from the left side of the aisle.

They say that Biden rescinded Trump's Muslim ban—that he has rescinded the Muslim ban. I want to ask them: Which Muslim ban are they talking about? Which one are they talking about? Are they talking about the one they voted for?

By the way, I think it is inappropriate to call it a "Muslim ban." But let's use their language. Are they talking about the bill that 165 of them voted for, including the chairman of this committee, the author of this bill, and the chairwoman of the subcommittee?

Are they talking about the bill that they all voted for in 2015 that Obama signed into law called the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act of 2015? I don't think Trump was President in 2015. Obama signed this bill.

What did it do? It named four countries, not seven. We will get to the seven later. It named four countries to ban.

What were those four countries? By the way, the ACLU was not happy about this when Obama and the Democrats on the other side of the aisle did it. Iraq, Syria, Iran, and Sudan.

And now the Democrats are complaining that the President has too much power to protect this country, and they want to take some of this back, but they gave Obama the power to add three more countries. What were the three he added? Libya, Somalia, and Yemen in 2016. Interesting.

So where does that bring us to? It gets us to seven countries. Did they overlap or are they maybe five of the same countries? It is the seven exact same countries that the Democrats voted for that everybody over on the other side of the aisle who is hurling these claims of xenophobia voted for. Those same seven countries are now in and on the website at the State Department that Joe Biden runs.

Now, what does this do? Again, I want to be clear. It is not a total ban. But, by the way, Trump's wasn't either. It was a temporary suspension. But what they have done, and what Joe Biden perpetuates on these same seven countries—this is not a Muslim ban, but he is doing it to the same seven countries, perpetuating the Terrorist Travel Prevention Act of 2015, he is saying you can't get a visa waiver if you are from one of those seven countries.

Now which is worse? I mean, you can say, okay, it is not racist to just make it harder to travel, if we do it for 5 years or do it forever, that is not racist or xenophobic. But if you do it for six months, like Trump proposed, 180 days, well, now that is racist right there.

This is so ridiculous. I can't even believe they have the audacity to pretend they didn't vote in 2015 to add these seven countries.

Let's just get back to protecting this country. Let's not use these bills and these provisions to say that one side is racist, or one side is xenophobic, or you are a bunch of bigots. President Obama was not xenophobic when he put these seven countries on his list, because they were the seven countries that the Democrats on the other side of the aisle chose. They are the seven countries that Obama chose.

I say, let's protect this country and get back to working together.

[From the State Department website]

VISA WAIVER PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND TERRORIST TRAVEL PREVENTION ACT OF 2015

Under the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act of 2015, travelers in the following categories must obtain a visa prior to traveling to the United States as they are no longer eligible to travel under the Visa Waiver Program (VWP):

Nationals of VWP countries who have traveled to or been present in Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, or Yemen on or after March 1, 2011 (with limited exceptions for travel for diplomatic or military purposes in the service of a VWP country).

Nationals of VWP countries who are also nationals of Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran, Iraq, Sudan, or Syria.

These individuals can apply for visas using regular appointment processes at a U.S. Embassy or Consulate. For those who require a visa for urgent travel to the United States, U.S. Embassies and Consulates stand ready to handle applications on an expedited basis.

If an individual who is exempt from the Act because of his or her diplomatic or military presence in one of the seven countries has his or her ESTA denied, he or she may go to the CSP website, or contact the CSP information center. The traveler may also apply for a nonimmigrant visa at a U.S. Embassy or Consulate.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection strongly recommends that any traveler to the United States check his or her ESTA status prior to making any travel reservations or travelling to the United States. More information is available on the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) website.

□ 1315

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the NO BAN Act, and I thank Congresswoman CHU for her leadership.

Yes, let's get back to protecting America. That is what we want to do.

Madam Speaker, Anahita is an asylee from Iran. The last time she spoke to her father, he told her that, when she returned home, he would sit with her on the terrace and talk politics. That

never happened. Due to Trump's Muslim ban, Anahita could not get travel documents to see her dad before he died or to mourn with her family.

Madam Speaker, for 4 years, families remained separated. That is not the America we want to protect.

American businesses and universities couldn't recruit top candidates, and our Nation's doors were closed to people seeking refuge.

President Biden rescinded the bans, but we must pass the NO BAN Act to prohibit any future President from issuing discriminatory bans.

Now, that day, I was in my first month here in Congress, when the Muslim ban was passed. I rushed to the airport, along with our chairman and many other Members of Congress. We worked with attorneys to file the national lawsuits that called for an emergency petition that blocked the President's order from taking effect.

We were also able, at Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, to go onto the tarmac and stop a plane from taking off because of an emergency habeas from a judge there that allowed us to get two people back in who should have been here in the first place.

Madam Speaker, just imagine the hearts and souls of people whose lives were thrown into chaos, thinking that they were going to land in the United States with valid travel documents and then were turned away by a President who issued a Muslim ban. The reason we need this bill is to make sure that that can never happen again.

Madam Speaker, yes, we want to protect America's values. We believe that the way to do that is to pass the NO BAN Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I would note, for all of our friends and fellow citizens who are watching at home on C-SPAN, that you are seeing something go across your screen that says, "Prohibiting Religious-Based Travel Restrictions."

Well, to C-SPAN, I say: Be better. Don't take the talking points from my Democrat colleagues about what we are actually debating here on the floor of the House because it is not that.

What we are talking about is a power grab by Democrats who, for some reason, want to continue to perpetuate the lie that there was ever a Muslim ban. It is literally not true. It is absolutely not true. No matter how many times they say it, it doesn't make it more true.

For example, the gentlewoman referred to litigation. Let's look at what the United States Supreme Court said precisely about what President Trump did to try to secure the United States from terrorists. Let's remember what we are talking about. The President of the United States, President Trump, working to secure the United States from terrorists, the Court said: "The

proclamation is expressly premised on legitimate purposes: preventing entry of nationals who cannot be adequately vetted and inducing other nations to improve their practices. The text says nothing about religion. Plaintiffs and the dissent nonetheless emphasize that five of the seven nations currently included in the proclamation have Muslim-majority populations. Yet, that fact alone does not support an inference of religious hostility, given that the policy covers just 8 percent of the world's Muslim population and is limited to countries that were previously designated by Congress or prior administrations as posing national security risks," as my friend from Kentucky just laid out.

Madam Speaker, these are the facts. Do not listen to Democrat talking points being thrown on the screen on your C-Span. Do not listen to repetitions and lies about Muslim bans when it is not true. The facts are completely opposite of that.

Let's also add one more point here. As we talk about this, our borders are wide open. As we talk about this, foreign nationals come in between ports of entry because Border Patrol is distracted, processing immigrants who come here because Democrat policies entice them to be abused by cartels while cartels have operational control of our border, while they create a narco-terrorist state in Mexico, and while they exist in the district that I represent, where children are in cars being driven by American citizen employees of the Cartel del Noreste, being taken to stash houses to be put into the sex trade.

Then, we sit here and listen to this? This is what we are focusing on, taking away the constitutional authority of the President to protect us from terrorists while terrorists are able to come into our southern border between ports of entry because my Democratic colleagues and this administration flat out refuse to do their job to secure the border of the United States?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, when the President first announced his Muslim ban, I immediately went to LAX. I went because constituents were telling me that they couldn't get their relatives into the U.S. Individuals who were traveling to the U.S. that had been approved by the U.S. State Department could not enter the U.S. I saw people who thought they were here for a regular, routine visit approved by the U.S. Government denied—denied on a whim.

This bill is simply about making sure that no future President—Obama or Trump—will ever be able to deny entry into the U.S. based on religion or race. That is what the bill is. It is not about any specific President. It is about doing the right thing in America.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT).

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member JORDAN for yielding.

Madam Speaker, right now, we have an immigration disaster at the southern border of the Biden administration's own creation. Instead of putting a stop to this madness, my colleagues across the aisle are encouraging this open borders agenda by bringing the NO BAN Act to the floor today.

The NO BAN Act limits the President's ability to make executive decisions about who should be allowed to enter our country. This would dangerously weaken the President's executive authority on important issues related to national security.

To put this reckless idea into perspective, Customs and Border Patrol agents recently caught two Yemeni terrorists at the southern border. Thank God, law enforcement caught these terrorists, but this is exactly why executive authority on immigration issues needs to remain in place.

Madam Speaker, a responsible President would notice what is going on at the southern border and use his authority to step in for the sake of national security. It is naive to believe there aren't bad actors who want to hurt Americans actively trying to exploit this ongoing crisis.

President Biden needs to use his executive authority to solve the immigration and national security crisis his administration has created. If he is not physically or mentally capable of doing this, he should step down.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding and for his leadership. What a busy time in the Committee on the Judiciary, bringing two bills to the floor today, with all the work that went into them under Chairman NADLER's leadership.

Madam Speaker, here we are, under the gaze of our patriarch, George Washington, right there in this Chamber.

Madam Speaker, 230 years ago, our patriarch, George Washington, who watches over us in this Chamber, famously wrote to the Hebrew Congregation of Newport, Rhode Island. In that letter, he made a promise that would be our Nation's guide for centuries to come.

He wrote: All possess "liberty of conscience. . . . It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights."

He went on to say: “For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens.”

Today, by passing the NO BAN Act, the House is upholding that fundamental promise—“to bigotry no sanction”—by taking action to ensure that no President or administration can ever again abuse its authority by waging discrimination on the basis of religion.

Madam Speaker, thank you to Chair JUDY CHU of CAPAC, our sponsor of this legislation and a national champion in combating discrimination and xenophobia, who has helped lead the Congress’ response to recent anti-AAPI attacks.

The NO BAN Act strengthens the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of religion, and it restores the separation of powers by limiting overly broad executive action to issue future religious bans, which are fundamentally un-American.

As Justice Sotomayor wrote, echoing President Washington, in her dissent in the shameful *Trump v. Hawaii* Supreme Court case upholding the last administration’s Muslim ban: “The United States of America is a Nation built upon the promise of religious liberty. Our Founders honored that core promise by embedding the principle of religious neutrality in the First Amendment. The Court’s decision today” to uphold the Muslim ban “fails to safeguard that fundamental principle.”

Madam Speaker, I want to mention that when this happened 4 years ago, and the President came and did his Muslim ban legislation, we had a hearing. It wasn’t an official hearing because we weren’t in the majority, and the majority wasn’t interested in having it, but we had a hearing on it.

What we saw in that hearing were leaders of the security community saying that if this stays in place, it is going to hurt our national security because we will not be able to keep promises that we made to those who helped us in Afghanistan and Iraq. We won’t be able to because many of them are Muslim.

Madam Speaker, a thousand diplomats from the State Department—and this is highly unusual—signed on in opposition to what this did to us diplomatically in the world. Our rank-and-file men and women spoke directly to the problem that this would create, the danger it created, in people trusting our word when we asked them to help us and that we would help keep them safe.

Madam Speaker, you have heard me quote, and PRAMILA has heard me quote, again and again in that same hearing because many of the people who come here for asylum and refugee status because of religious persecution

where they are from, the National Association of Evangelicals testified the following: “The United States’ refugee resettlement program is the crown jewel of American humanitarianism.” They were speaking in terms of religious refugees.

Again, we cannot allow any President to abuse the power of his or her office in this regard.

Madam Speaker, if I may, I would like to also address another piece of legislation, and I thank the chairman for bringing it to the floor, the Access to Counsel Act, protecting the civil liberties of those who face prolonged detention as they seek legal entry into the United States. Some of them are little children.

This is a commonsense step to close a serious and dangerous gap in our immigration law that too often prevents the vulnerable from accessing not only legal counsel but also medical attention or contact with their families.

□ 1330

I am always proud to salute Representative PRAMILA JAYAPAL, the sponsor of the Access to Counsel Act and a champion for the dignity and rights of all newcomers to our Nation—in fact, everyone in our Nation; and I thank her for her efforts.

Passage of these bills, the NO BAN Act and the Access to Counsel Act, should not be controversial. Over 400 immigrants’ rights bills organizations, faith-based organizations, business groups, and civil rights organizations support the NO BAN Act, and many more support the Access to Counsel Act.

These bills are about honoring our Nation’s promise that, as President Washington said, we will give “to bigotry no sanction; to persecution no assistance.”

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong vote for both of these bills honoring the vision of our Founders, and the aspirations of so many people in our country.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I am from the great State of Texas, and there is nothing great about the crisis at our border. It is unprecedented. It is unmitigated. It is ever-escalating. It is absolutely, absolutely self-inflicted and avoidable.

Because of the actions of our Commander in Chief, whose first job is to protect the American people, and the irresponsible and reckless unilateral actions, we have got chaos at our southern border. The American people are suffering for it. The poor, vulnerable people being abused by the cartels are suffering for it. Endless lists of tragedies because of what is happening and what is coming out of the White House.

The answer, the solution in the midst of this crisis and disaster like we have never seen from my Democrat colleagues is to offer legislation to grant

mass amnesty and citizenship; more green lights, more incentives, more welcome mats to continue to violate our sovereignty and to break our laws; not to be detained and deported, but to be released and rewarded, cut in line in front of millions of people. They don’t get a free lawyer paid for by the taxpayers.

I can’t believe this is happening in our great country. I can’t believe my Democrat colleagues are pouring gasoline and inflaming the situation with more of the NO BAN Act, tying the President’s hands to do his job, to prevent high-risk folks from coming to the U.S., giving legal counsel, giving navigators and people who can help aid and abet the exploitation of our laws.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, it makes no sense at all. In fact, Madam Speaker, it is insulting.

We care about people. This country does more for the immigrant than any in the world. We welcome those who want to make America their home, those God-fearing, freedom-loving families. But they have to respect our sovereignty. They have to respect the safety and security of the American people. They have to respect our laws.

And I am waiting for the Democrats to respect the laws of this land. On this issue, I am waiting. But this is spitting in the face of these families and communities that are terrified. Ranchers are terrified to leave their families in their homes.

And this is the answer? This is what you got?

Shameful. It is shameful. I am embarrassed.

Yes, I encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on the NO BAN Act.

God bless America.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I would like to begin just by correcting the understanding, I think, from the gentleman from Kentucky, who tried to align President Obama’s temporary suspension of the Visa Waiver Program in foreign and southern countries with Donald Trump’s complete suspension of visas.

As one of the two U.S. Ambassadors to serve in this Chamber at the moment, I presided over 4 years of consular affairs. And the Visa Waiver Program is when you are allowed to get into a country without the deep background checks, without going through Homeland Security.

This is not what Donald Trump did. He suspended visas completely.

By the way, this is not about the southern border. I don’t believe there is a single Muslim country south of the Rio Grande in the Western Hemisphere.

Six years ago, then-Presidential candidate Donald Trump argued for a complete and total Muslim ban. Remember,

he didn't specify specific countries; he said no Muslims.

I quickly produced a bill, the Freedom of Religion Act, to prohibit discrimination in our immigration system on the basis of religious belief, and I rushed to Dulles Airport after the inauguration as the ban was implemented, and many were stuck in limbo. I never expected that such an openly bigoted policy would be so intentionally executed, especially knowing the economic and reputational effects.

Billions of people around the world were stunned by this destruction of the American ideal as a beacon of freedom.

My bill then became part of JUDY CHU's very thoughtful NO BAN Act, and I am proud to champion it. As reckless and thoughtless and cruel as the Muslim ban is, this bill is the opposite. It is a thoughtful way to ensure that a future President cannot simply use racism or religions discrimination as a basis for keeping individuals from entering the United States.

We cannot erase the dark stain on our country's history left by Donald Trump's Muslim ban, but we can prevent it from happening again.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, there is an ongoing crisis at the border. President Biden himself had admitted it. Despite his political staff's best efforts to avoid acknowledging the truth, he has admitted it.

I have served as a doctor in private practice for more than 26 years. I have served on our Board of Health in Cincinnati. I have served in a combat support hospital in Iraq, where we provided outstanding care to thousands of detainees. I have seen quite a few crisis situations in my life.

Two weeks ago, I led a group of healthcare experts and national security experts to the border. What we saw was a very difficult situation. It is a humanitarian crisis. It is a national security crisis. But it is also a national health security crisis.

Our group visited HHS' Donna Processing Center, which, per COVID guidelines, is supposed to house 250 individuals. That day, it had 3,500. Earlier that week, it housed 5,000.

The sites we visited had seen cases of lice; scabies; meningitis; chicken pox; flu of unknown origin; and, of course, COVID-19. What really stuck out was that we are only testing symptomatic individuals for COVID-19.

We have learned through this pandemic to know better, to know that this is not an effective way to stop COVID from spreading among the camp or fueling surges across our Nation.

Worse, we are releasing people into our Nation without ever having tested them for COVID. You don't have to be a doctor to know that is dangerous.

That is why I offer this motion to recommit today and delay this legislation until every migrant released by Customs and Border Patrol produces a

negative COVID test before boarding a U.S. domestic flight.

If international travelers are required to show proof of a negative COVID-19 test before they can come into the United States from a foreign country, why are we making an exception for this surge of migrants?

American citizens are banned from the U.S. without a COVID test, but not non-U.S. citizens?

That is bizarre.

We risk all the progress we have made in this country to contain this virus by allowing this vulnerability to go unaddressed.

Madam Speaker, if we adopt the motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on the Judiciary to consider my amendment to H.R. 1333 to require that migrants released by Customs and Border Patrol show proof of a negative COVID test before they are allowed to board a plane.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of the amendment immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TLAB). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to express my incredible gratitude, first of all, to Congresswoman JUDY CHU for her tireless leadership on this issue, and to the Muslim community in my district for their tireless work and advocacy on this issue.

I remember the day well when President Trump issued this Muslim ban right at the beginning of his administration. And I remember running out to the airport immediately, to the international terminal. And shortly after I got there, there ended up being literally thousands of people who had gathered, at the shame on the United States of America. The people who came that day all had some documentation. They had visas. At first, even people with green cards were being held and oppressed.

Who are we? Who are we as the United States of America?

And I know that, finally, President Biden has said: No Muslim ban.

But we want to make it the law of the land so no other President can do such a thing that, based on religion, people would be banned from the United States of America.

I want to tell you, I take this personally as a Jew, myself. You know, I am a first-generation American. Neither of my parents was born in this country. They were able to emigrate to the United States.

But I also remember the story of our history as Jews, when the St. Louis, a boat that came to protect people from

annihilation, was turned away from the American shores; was told to go back to where it came from; and many of those people then perished in the Holocaust.

Who are we?

This bill is about who we are, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1333, the NO BAN Act.

This legislation prohibits discrimination based on religion and limits the executive branch's ability to issue future travel bans.

I stand here today during Arab American Heritage Month, a time to celebrate the diversity of our country and remind ourselves that our country is stronger for it.

My district is home to the largest Arab-American population in the United States. Arab Americans are an integral part of Michigan's identity and have made enormous contributions to our society. Many of my constituents fled war and violence to seek a safer life;—have done it legally—and many of their families still experience this suffering every day.

The former President's Muslim ban kept these families separated. It inspired fear. It perpetuated hate. And as the Speaker so eloquently stated, national security experts have made it clear that it has made us less safe, not more safe.

I believe that every one of us in this Chamber loves our country, and that it is a priority for all of us to keep this Nation safe.

□ 1345

I would argue that the actions by the previous administration did not. The President called for a total ban on all Muslims entering this country. We must work together against terrorism, both foreign and domestic. We need to worry about what we witnessed in our own Chamber on January 6.

This bill will not allow people to be targeted because of their religion again. We must work together to restore the faith and trust of the international communities targeted by the previous administration.

Madam Speaker, I urge people to support this legislation.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, there is a crisis at the border, I mean, the President even said so. There is chaos at the border. The crisis and the chaos have been created by policies of this administration.

We were down at the border 2 weeks ago. Every single Border Patrol agent we talked to said the crisis has been created by policy changes made by the Biden administration; specifically, three changes.

They announced to the world that they weren't going to deport anyone. Moratorium on deportation. They announced to the world they weren't going to finish the wall. And, most importantly, they got rid of the remain in Mexico policy.

And what do we have?

In March, we had the highest number of illegal immigrants coming into our Nation since they have been keeping records. So it is definitely a crisis, definitely chaos.

And what do the Democrats do? What do the Democrats do?

Last month, they passed two bills that give amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants. You can't make this stuff up. And then, today, they are going to pass a piece of legislation that takes power away from the Commander in Chief, takes power away from the individual who was on the ballot and elected, and gives it to the unelected secretary of state and Secretary of Homeland Security.

I mean, you would think, if they were going to take power away from the President, they would at least give it to the Vice President. After all, she is the one who has been put in charge of this thing. They don't even do that. They don't even do that.

The answer is real simple. What we should be focused on is reinstating the policies that worked. In fact, again, when we were down there 2 weeks ago—by the way, we invited the Democrats to go with us, and they said no. When we were down there 2 weeks ago, every Border Patrol agent said: Reinstating the policies that were working and we don't have the problem, we don't have the crisis.

But, no, we couldn't do something that common sense. We couldn't do something that simple, that basic. They, instead, come with this legislation.

Reinstate the policies that work. Don't take power away from the individual who was elected by the American people, the Commander in Chief. Don't implement crazy policies. Do the things that work. But, no, that is not what we are going to do.

And then after this bill is done, they are going to say, oh, by the way, bring in the lawyers. Give access to counsel to people coming into our country.

It makes absolutely no sense.

One of the speakers earlier said: Out of many, one.

That is so true about this country.

But is it too much to ask to have the many who come into this country do it legally?

And have policies in place that make sense. Is that too much to ask?

I think most taxpayers, most Americans, think that makes good, common sense.

This bill does not. I hope we vote it down. I hope we go back to the policies that work.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me say that I agree with some of what I heard from the Republicans. They said there is a lot of nonsense spoken on the floor today. Indeed, there was. Everything they have said about this bill is nonsense. They have said there is no Muslim ban. Everybody knows there was a Muslim ban. The President said he was going to impose a Muslim ban, and then he did.

When NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ and I went to Kennedy airport, when JAN SCHAKOWSKY went to the airport in Chicago, when other people went to the airport, what did we find?

We found Muslims being kept out of the country. People with perfectly valid visas, perfectly valid green cards, people whose relatives were waiting for them here because they had perfectly valid entry certificates, were being kept out of the country, and they couldn't even speak to their lawyers.

That is the next bill we will be considering on the floor in a few minutes.

That is what we found. And that has been in effect for a long time. It is un-American. It is unconstitutional. It is against the ethics of this country.

As the Speaker said—I think it was the Speaker who said it—the motto of the country is *E Pluribus Unum*; from many, one.

This situation, this Muslim ban, denies that. This says *E Pluribus*—I don't know the Latin from a few, not from all.

Madam Speaker, we must pass this bill. More than 400 organizations and industry leaders support this bill. They include Muslim Advocates, the ACLU, Airbnb, Asian Americans Advancing Justice, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society.

Yes, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society. Why? Because the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society remembers its futile efforts when Jews were turned away from this country to go back to the Holocaust; when the St. Louis was turned back to go back to the Holocaust; when the State Department deliberately wouldn't even use the quota. The quota was 150,000, and they kept it down to 6,000 because of the anti-Semitism of some officials in the State Department. And the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society—which was formed to aid Jewish immigrants, but has long since broadened its mission to aid immigrants from any country—knows what happens and doesn't want to see it happen again. That is why they are supporting this bill.

Other organizations and industry leaders that support this bill include the Service Employees International Union, because so many of their members were born abroad; the National Immigration Law Center, MoveOn, and United We Dream.

Members on both sides of the aisle should agree that no President, Republican or Democrat, should be permitted to usurp the powers of the legislative branch enshrined in the Constitution. The separation of power is fundamental

to our democratic Republic and must be protected.

For all these reasons, that is why passage of H.R. 1333 is so vital. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the NO BAN Act. In 2017, when the Trump administration implemented the first travel ban, nearly a thousand college students around Texas were forced to make a choice. Either stay in the United States to earn a world-class education or visit their family abroad and risk being blocked from returning to their studies. This is a choice that aspiring students should never be forced to make. Evidently, these travel bans were not in place because of national security. These bans were used as a tool to discriminate against the Muslim population. Texas is home to one of the largest and fastest growing Muslim populations in the country, and these bans separated families across many of our districts. I applaud the Biden-Harris Administration for revoking these discriminatory bans. But, now is the time for Congress to deliver to the American people by ensuring that no future administration works to discriminate against vulnerable communities. I urge a yes vote.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1333, the No Ban Act. This legislation would ensure that no president, Republican or Democrat, would carry the unilateral authority to restrict refugees, asylum seekers, immigrants, and their families from entering the United States based on their nationality or religion.

A little more than four years ago, I remember watching in horror as the Trump Administration first instituted the Muslim Ban—barring entrance for immigrants at airports throughout the country. But I found solace, and inspiration, in the thousands of demonstrations at the same airports, including at Dallas-Fort Worth International back home in North Texas. It was at this moment that Americans saw, for the first time, the severe damage that the Trump Administration would cause by targeting immigrants, refugees, and other underserved and vulnerable populations.

This legislation is a direct result of those demonstrations, and of the spirit and advocacy of people who believe that the success and well-being of our country are built upon the contributions of immigrants. It doesn't just prevent an executive overreach; it sends a message to the rest of the world that the United States is once again a beacon of freedom and hope. This bill reaffirms the belief that immigrants, refugees, and asylum seekers should be welcome here—free from discrimination. And no matter the nativist rhetoric spewing from a few on the other side of the aisle, we are, and will always be, a country of immigrants.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the swift passage of this bill and ask the Senate to take up this important legislation in a timely manner.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary and a cosponsor, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 1333, the "National Origin-Based Anti-Discrimination For Non-Immigrants Act, or No BAN Act, which stops executive overreach by preventing the abuse of

the system pioneered by the 45th President with his several abuses of the authority to restrict the entry of non-citizens into the United States under section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA).

Thankfully, it is unnecessary for Congress to repeal by legislation the several section 212(f)-based executive actions of the 45th President's, including his original Muslim ban, because were rescinded by his successor, President Joseph Biden, in the initial days of the new Administration.

Madam Speaker, I support this legislation because the NO BAN Act amends section 212(f) of the INA to place checks and balances on the President's authority to temporarily suspend or restrict the entry of aliens or classes of aliens into the United States, when it is determined that such individuals "would undermine the security or public safety of the United States or the preservation of human rights, democratic processes or institutions, or international stability."

Specifically, the bill requires the President to find and document that any suspension or restriction:

- (1) is based on specific and credible facts;
- (2) is narrowly tailored;
- (3) specifies a duration; and
- (4) includes waivers.

The NO BAN Act expands the INA's non-discrimination provision to prohibit discrimination based on religion and extends the prohibition on discrimination beyond the issuance of immigrant visas to include the issuance of nonimmigrant visas, entry and admission into the United States, and the approval or revocation of any immigration benefit.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the NO BAN Act includes an important provision offered last year during the committee markup of this legislation, which requires the Administration to report to Congress on the impacts—positive, negative, and unintended—of any action taken by the President pursuant to executive orders he has or will issue pursuant to section 212(f) of the INA.

I strongly support this legislation, and President Biden's rescission of his predecessor executive order which added the countries of Belarus, Myanmar, Eritrea, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Sudan and Tanzania to the President's new and offensive Muslim Ban.

Madam Speaker, as a co-chair of the Congressional Nigerian Caucus, it is important to convey to our colleagues that the United States cannot afford to hamper diplomatic relations with Nigeria due to its importance in the region.

Nigeria is the largest economy and most populous country in Africa with an estimated population of more than 190 million, which is expected to grow to 400 million by 2050 and become the third most populous country in the world after China and India.

The United States is the largest foreign investor in Nigeria, with U.S. foreign direct investment concentrated largely in the petroleum and mining and wholesale trade sectors.

At \$2.2 billion in 2017, Nigeria is the second largest U.S. export destination in Sub-Saharan Africa and the United States and Nigeria have a bilateral trade and investment framework agreement.

In 2017, the two-way trade in goods between the United States and Nigeria totaled over \$9 billion.

Due to many of the residents of these countries practicing Islam, the 45th President's ex-

ecutive order was appropriately nicknamed the "Muslim Ban", and only exemplified his xenophobic and prejudiced mindset that the American people renounced as unacceptable in the 2020 presidential election.

Tanzania is also an important partner of the United States, and through numerous presidential initiatives, the United States has provided development and other assistance to Tanzania for capacity building to address health and education issues, encourage democratic governance promote broad-based economic growth, and advance regional and domestic security to sustain progress.

Although Sudan has had some internal issues during the last decade, the U.S. was a major donor in the March 1989 "Operation Lifeline Sudan," which delivered 100,000 metric tons of food into both government and rebel held areas of the Sudan, thus, averting widespread starvation.

The United States established diplomatic relations with Eritrea in 1993, following its independence and separation from Ethiopia.

The United States supported Eritrea's independence and through a concerted, mutual effort that began in late 2017 and continues today, there are vast improvements to the bilateral relationship.

U.S. interests in Eritrea include supporting efforts for greater integration of Eritrea with the rest of the Horn of Africa, encouraging Eritrea to contribute to regional stability and partner on shared peace and security goals, urging progress toward a democratic political culture, addressing human rights issues and promoting economic reform and prosperity.

A comprehensive and coordinated strategy needs to be developed in coordination with the United States Congress to ensure that each country affected by this law may peacefully have its residents enter the United States and complete visa and asylum applications.

We live in a nation of laws, but we also live in a nation that seeks to establish and maintain diplomatic ties to these important African nations and imposing a discriminatory and arbitrary ban would adversely affect foreign relations with a critical continent for decades to come.

Madam Speaker, in light of the crisis presented by current COVID-19 pandemic, the NO BAN Act contains a provision to ensure that the President can use section 212(f) to protect the United States from the spread of communicable diseases, including COVID-19, by suspending the entry of a class of individuals if the President determines their entry would undermine the public safety of the United States.

However, to remove any perceived ambiguity and avoid the propensity of this president to abuse delegated authority, the legislation includes language to clarify that the term "public safety" "includes efforts necessary to contain a communicable disease of public health significance."

Madam Speaker, the NO BAN Act is supported by a bipartisan coalition of the nation's leading immigrants' rights organizations, faith-based organizations, and civil rights organizations, including the following:

American Civil Liberties Union, Church World Service, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, Muslim Advocates Immigration Hub, Asian Americans Advancing Justice Association, Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Bend the Arc, Center for

American Progress, The Public Affairs Alliance of Iranian Americans, Interfaith Immigration Coalition, Human Rights Campaign, Franciscan Action Network, HIAS, Jewish and Muslims and Allies Acting Together, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, National Council of Jewish Women, National Iranian American Organization Action, National Immigration Law Center, International Refugee Assistance Project, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Engage Action, Airbnb.

I urge all Members to vote for H.R. 1333 and send a powerful message that this House stands firmly behind America's well-earned and long-established reputation of being the most welcoming Nation on earth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 330, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Wenstrup moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1333 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The material previously referred to by Mr. WENSTRUP is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall not take effect until the date on which every alien described in subsection (b) is required to produce to the Transportation Security Administration proof of a negative Coronavirus (COVID-19) test completed not earlier than 24 hours before the alien attempts to board a domestic flight in the United States.

(b) ALIENS DESCRIBED.—An alien is described in this subsection if the alien—

(1) is inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a));

(2) was encountered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection on or after January 20, 2021;

(3) was released by U.S. Customs and Border Protection after such encounter; and

(4) is traveling by plane to a final destination in the United States.

(c) REPORT.—Notwithstanding section 4(a)(1), and in accordance with subsection (a), the report required under section 4(a)(1) shall not be required to be submitted until the date that is 90 days after the effective date under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

ACCESS TO COUNSEL ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 330, I call up the bill (H.R. 1573) to clarify the rights of all persons who are held or detained at a port of entry or at any detention facility overseen by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 330, the amendment in the nature of a substitute, recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1573

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Access to Counsel Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. ACCESS TO COUNSEL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE AT PORTS OF ENTRY AND DURING DEFERRED INSPECTION.

(a) ACCESS TO COUNSEL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE DURING INSPECTION.—Section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) ACCESS TO COUNSEL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE DURING INSPECTION AT PORTS OF ENTRY AND DURING DEFERRED INSPECTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that a covered individual has a meaningful opportunity to consult with counsel and an interested party during the inspection process.

“(2) SCOPE OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

“(A) provide the covered individual a meaningful opportunity to consult (including consultation via telephone) with counsel and an interested party not later than one hour after the secondary inspection process commences and as necessary throughout the remainder of the inspection process, including, as applicable, during deferred inspection;

“(B) allow counsel and an interested party to advocate on behalf of the covered individual, including by providing to the examining immigration officer information, documentation, and other evidence in support of the covered individual; and

“(C) to the greatest extent practicable, accommodate a request by the covered individual for counsel or an interested party to appear in-person at the secondary or deferred inspection site.

“(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary of Homeland Security may not accept a Form I-407 Record of Abandonment of Lawful Permanent Resident Status (or a successor form) from a lawful permanent resident subject to secondary or deferred inspection without first providing such lawful permanent resident a meaningful opportunity to seek advice from counsel.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may accept Form I-407 Record of Abandonment of Lawful Permanent Resident Status (or a successor form) from a lawful permanent resident subject to secondary or deferred inspection if such lawful permanent resident know-

ingly, intelligently, and voluntarily waives, in writing, the opportunity to seek advice from counsel.

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(A) COUNSEL.—The term ‘counsel’ means—

“(i) an attorney who is a member in good standing of the bar of any State, the District of Columbia, or a territory or a possession of the United States and is not under an order suspending, enjoining, restraining, disbaring, or otherwise restricting the attorney in the practice of law; or

“(ii) an individual accredited by the Attorney General, acting as a representative of an organization recognized by the Executive Office for Immigration Review, to represent a covered individual in immigration matters.

“(B) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘covered individual’ means an individual subject to secondary or deferred inspection who is—

“(i) a national of the United States;

“(ii) an immigrant, lawfully admitted for permanent residence, who is returning from a temporary visit abroad;

“(iii) an alien seeking admission as an immigrant in possession of a valid unexpired immigrant visa;

“(iv) an alien seeking admission as a non-immigrant in possession of a valid unexpired nonimmigrant visa;

“(v) a refugee;

“(vi) a returning asylee; or

“(vii) an alien who has been approved for parole under section 212(d)(5)(A), including an alien who is returning to the United States in possession of a valid advance parole document.

“(C) INTERESTED PARTY.—The term ‘interested party’ means—

“(i) a relative of the covered individual;

“(ii) in the case of a covered individual to whom an immigrant or a nonimmigrant visa has been issued, the petitioner or sponsor thereof (including an agent of such petitioner or sponsor); or

“(iii) a person, organization, or entity in the United States with a bona fide connection to the covered individual.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this Act, or in any amendment made by this Act, may be construed to limit a right to counsel or any right to appointed counsel under—

(1) section 240(b)(4)(A) (8 U.S.C. 1229a(b)(4)(A));

(2) section 292 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1362); or

(3) any other provision of law, including any final court order securing such rights, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to clarify the rights of certain persons who are held or detained at a port of entry or at any facility overseen by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentlemen from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1573.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1573, the Access to Counsel Act of 2021, is an important bill that will ensure that individuals who seek to lawfully enter the United States can contact a family member or an adviser if they are held for an extended period at a port of entry.

Last September, the Judiciary Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing to explore President Trump's Muslim ban and the chaos that unfolded at airports across the country when it was first announced.

I can personally attest to that chaos, based on my experience at JFK Airport immediately after the ban was implemented. Refugees, individuals with valid visas, and even lawful permanent residents were detained for hours and were prevented from speaking with attorneys. Some even had their phones taken away and were unable to call their family.

Although the issue grabbed the headlines then, it is, unfortunately, a problem that occurs daily. Due to the complexity of U.S. immigration law and the fact-intensive nature of questions regarding admissibility, it is not uncommon for some people to spend hours undergoing inspection by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or CBP.

During this time, individuals are often prevented from communicating with those on the outside. And if the individual is lucky enough to have a lawyer, CBP will often refuse to speak to them, even if they can provide critical information or correct the legal error. Moreover, serious consequences can result from being refused admission.

Some have argued that this bill will require CBP to expend significant resources, but I believe they fundamentally misunderstand the substance of the bill. To be clear, H.R. 1573 does not provide a right to counsel, nor does it impose any obligation on the Federal Government to build any additional space to accommodate counsel or hire new staff, nor to pay for counsel.

The bill simply ensures that no one who presents themselves at a port of entry with valid travel documents is completely cut off from the world during the inspection process. It allows those seeking admission, including U.S. citizens, to communicate with counsel and other parties if they are subjected to secondary inspection that lasts longer than 1 hour. The bill specifically contemplates that this could be accomplished telephonically.

It is absurd to claim that providing these individuals with the opportunity to call their families or an attorney and potentially receive their assistance during the inspection process will consume significant CBP resources.

Madam Speaker, I would like to extend a special thanks to my colleague, Representative JAYAPAL, for her leadership on this issue and for championing this bill. I encourage my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), the ranking member on the Immigration Subcommittee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, we are way beyond any question of whether we face a border crisis. The question now is whether we have a border at all.

When I put that very question directly to the president of the Border Patrol, his answer was an emphatic: No, we do not.

By abandoning the border wall, rescinding the remain in Mexico policy, and obstructing enforcement of court-ordered deportations, President Biden has produced a mass illegal migration of historic proportions, preying most tragically on young children and making the Mexican crime cartels billions of dollars.

The only border security measure he hasn't pulled down is the ability of the CBP to stop illicit activity at our official ports of entry, where large volumes of narcotics and other contraband must pass.

Judiciary Republicans recently visited our facility at Hidalgo crossing, where thousands of cars and trucks passing through the port of entry must be inspected daily to protect our country from high-volume cartel smuggling. Our officers are experts at spotting suspicious traffic hidden among the high volume of legal crossings without unduly delaying honest commerce and passage.

Now, to do this, they wave the suspicious traffic to secondary inspections, where they can locate and stop contraband that is often ingeniously hidden.

□ 1400

Now, this has been a tremendous inconvenience to the cartels. We saw millions of dollars of methamphetamines and other deadly drugs, as well as infected fruits and vegetables heading to American markets, recently seized at these secondary inspections.

But H.R. 1573 would grind legitimate trade and travel to a halt by providing that anyone referred to secondary inspection can, within an hour, consult with an attorney and call other third parties. Now, there are more than 17 million secondary inspections conducted each year at our 328 ports of entry.

Can you imagine the effect of this bill?

It is not limited to attorneys. A smuggler pulled into secondary inspection could warn confederates behind him that their hiding places have been discovered, turn back.

The officers told me they are already overwhelmed, using antiquated facili-

ties, and suffering manpower shortages. This bill gives the CBP the Hobson's choice of curtailing inspections or routinely backing up traffic for hours on end.

The inspection itself is not a criminal process. It is a screening process to assure that only legal products enter our country. Only when it becomes a criminal matter is there a right to counsel.

Now, if this isn't actually written by the crime cartels, it is certainly entirely in their interest and service. It speaks volumes about the attitude of the Democrats on the security of our border, the safety of our citizens, and the sovereignty of our Nation.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), who is the chairwoman of the Immigration and Citizenship Subcommittee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill that allows individuals who have obviously valid travel documents to contact a member of their family or counsel if they are held for an extended period of time at a U.S. port of entry.

It has nothing to do with the inspection of contraband. It has nothing to do with providing a lawyer at government expense. That is prohibited. It has nothing to do with delaying the inspection. It is only if it is practical for the CBP to allow this to occur.

The immigration laws are very complex and fact-intensive, and for some people who are in secondary inspection for hours, providing a piece of information to the CBP can clear things up.

Madam Speaker, I will give you an example of a researcher coming in with a valid visa and the CBP wonders about that research: Is it true? Being able to communicate with the president of the university where the student is heading to can assure the CBP about the research and would clear the matter up.

This bill does nothing to alter the existing authority of the CBP to alter, to deny entry, or to issue an expedited removal order. It just allows individuals to communicate with their American family, with their employer, and with their counsel to help provide information. There are many red herrings that have been offered about this bill, but it is really about expediting a process that is impeded, oftentimes because of lack of information. These are individuals who are coming legally. It does not apply to people who are coming between ports of entry.

The lack of communication can cause harm to American families. Somebody who is coming to their American fiancée can be turned away. Somebody who is coming to work for an employer who needs their expertise could be turned away. Somebody who is coming to continue their groundbreaking medical research could erroneously be turned away.

It is important that information be made available to the CBP, and the way to do that is to make sure that in-

dividuals who are lawfully attempting to enter the United States with an apparently valid visa at a port of entry who has been held for secondary inspection have an opportunity to communicate with their American family or with their American boss or even a lawyer to get information that the CBP can then consider, and if they are not persuaded it is valid, they can still turn that individual around.

I think that the opposition is a bit overwrought.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from California such time as she may consume.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I actually am surprised by some of the things in the rhetoric that have been offered in opposition to what is really just a commonsense, modest measure that will allow for communication for people who have legal visas who have been held in secondary inspection, so the confusion can be cleared up. It is important, not just to the people trying to enter, but it is important to Americans who are waiting for them—their families, their employers, and their teachers.

Madam Speaker, I urge approval of this bill.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Madam Speaker, 185 years ago today in San Jacinto, Texas, the great State of Texas won its independence from Mexico.

General Sam Houston launched a surprise attack against Santa Anna, routed their forces, and then ultimately was able to negotiate with Santa Anna for his freedom the treaty that resulted in the founding of the Republic of Texas.

As a proud Texan, I am sitting here 185 years later recognizing that my State, the State that I am proud to represent, is under siege. It is under constant siege on a daily basis by dangerous cartels, but worse than being under siege by dangerous cartels, it is under siege by a Democrat President who refuses to do his constitutional duty to secure the border of the United States.

That is the fact, that this President, obligated under the Constitution, literally refuses to carry out and exercise his constitutional duty to defend our borders—our borders in Texas—where our communities are under siege, where our schools are overrun, where our hospitals are being inundated, where our ranchers are having people cross them, and where dangerous narcotics like fentanyl are pouring into our communities.

This is what is happening to my State of Texas on this, the 185th anniversary of the battle at San Jacinto.

One has to wonder whether the agreement that Texas made when entering

this Union remains worth it when the State of Texas is under siege by an administration that refuses to defend our border.

That is a question that we Texans are continuing to wrestle with, because it is the duty of this President and the duty of the Federal Government to secure the borders.

I look at Texans who have lost loved ones at the hands of people here illegally. I look at families who have families destroyed by fentanyl and dangerous narcotics. And I look at trafficking of human beings into the sex trade in the State of Texas where stash houses are being run by cartels. Then I watch as my Democratic colleagues want to put up every roadblock to security and launch every single way possible to prop up cartels, prop up the ability of our border to be exploited, and refuse to actually do the job necessary to secure the border.

It is incumbent upon this body to speak with one voice that we are going to defend the borders of the United States and do our duty under the Constitution while States are feeling the brunt every single day in very real terms.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to have a lot more to say about this bill a little later, but I have to respond to one point that the gentleman just made.

He said he was considering whether the agreement to enter the Union was valid or was worth it. He is not the first to consider that. John Calhoun considered that. Others considered it, and they tried it. The result was a civil war. So I certainly hope that no one is thinking of that again.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. CAWTHORN).

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I feel that too many on the left are comfortable with lies and half-truths. Let me tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker: I am sick of it, my constituents are sick of it, and the American people are sick of it.

My colleagues just said that President Trump instituted a Muslim ban. If my colleagues had read executive order 13769, instead of their liberal talking points, they would know that that is simply not true. President Trump's ban impacted seven specific countries. My colleagues' statements are patently false and prohibitively misleading.

The crisis at our southern border represents a serious risk to our national security of the United States and the sanctity of the rule of law.

Reports from law enforcement officers fighting to stem the overwhelming tide of illegal immigration into our country emphasizes the lack of re-

sources and misapplication of funds by the Federal Government. Yet today, we are being asked to vote on a bill that would do nothing to fix the weaknesses at our border but instead would misallocate resources away from our border security agents.

This little bill would spend \$825 million to provide taxpayer-funded legal assistance to individuals crossing our border because my colleagues on the left believe the best way to fix any problem is just to send in more lawyers.

This legislation would significantly hamper law enforcement's ability to effectively screen potentially dangerous individuals who have been flagged by other agencies for advanced screening due to their criminal record or status as a person of interest for national security purposes.

We should be empowering law enforcement, not reining in their effectiveness. Screening passengers who enter our country is a normal part of securing the U.S. ports of entry and is a uniform expectation for all who want to enter the United States. Granting a lawyer to anyone who warrants a secondary screening is like demanding a lawyer every time your bag is checked going through TSA.

This bill does nothing to enhance our border security, and, furthermore, it hampers their ability to carry out their mission.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1573.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), who is the sponsor of the bill.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman so much for his tremendous leadership on helping to bring this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, the Access to Counsel Act.

It is the Access to Counsel Act. I don't know if my friends on the other side have heard that. I am not sure how access to counsel helps empower cartels. I am not sure if my colleagues on the other side have read the bill. This does not fund counsel, and it actually doesn't give a right to counsel. We could debate that in another bill. This gives access to counsel.

It brings us one step closer to upholding our country's principles of due process and fairness by ensuring that individuals with lawful status have the right to call a lawyer and receive assistance if they are detained at ports of entry or in airports.

So why did this bill come about?

The Access to Counsel Act was the very first bill I introduced as a Member of Congress in 2017 in response to President Donald Trump's Muslim ban. On the day that Donald Trump announced that ban, I rushed to my local airport in Seattle. What I encountered and what we saw at airports across the Nation was a sham of our democracy.

People from seven Muslim-majority countries—all with legal access to be in

the United States—suddenly found themselves held for upwards of 30 hours, deported, and in some cases pressured to sign papers giving up their legal status without even the ability to call an attorney or a family member.

I then reintroduced, again, the Access to Counsel Act in my second term, in January of 2020, after Customs and Border Protection targeted Iranian Americans at ports of entry. As many as 200 Iranian Americans were held in secondary screening in Blaine, Washington.

Negah Hekmati and her two children were detained for nearly 6 hours despite being U.S. citizens and despite having preclearance for expedited processing at the border that is specifically for approved, low-risk travelers.

□ 1415

She recalls her small children begging her not to speak Farsi in fear of being detained. At such a young age, her children, U.S. citizens, already recognized that they were being profiled and unjustly held because of their heritage.

Of course, when we raised this in the moment, Border Patrol said: That is not happening. We can't do that. We wouldn't do that. We are not doing that.

Well, it took over a year and suing the government in order to access documents from Customs and Border Protection for us to find out that the total number of people held was 227 people. Half of those people were U.S. citizens and legal permanent residents, half of the 227. The rest of them had legal paperwork to come into the country.

So, why were they held? They were held because of their Iranian heritage or ties to the Middle East. Later, we also found out that there was no attempt from Border Patrol to figure out why they were there, whether they should be there, or to even comply with the law that says that your country of origin cannot be the sole purpose that you are held.

If Republicans want to talk about wasting Border Patrol resources, let's talk about the fact that 227 people, half of whom were U.S. citizens and legal permanent residents and the rest with valid visas, were held in a Border Patrol station in Blaine, Washington, for almost 12 hours and unable to leave. That is called detention.

You have now turned the Border Patrol stations into detention facilities. That is not what we are supposed to do. Why is it so difficult to say: Yes, a phone call is permissible.

That is what this bill is trying to do.

Throughout the last administration, we saw dozens of Iranian students with valid visas having their visas revoked or being deported upon arrival to the United States simply because of their country of origin. The Access to Counsel Act would ensure that people who have already been vetted and granted lawful status have a meaningful opportunity to call an attorney, have a

meaningful opportunity to call a relative or other interested party, like a Member of Congress, when they get held for more than an hour in secondary inspection.

This is a commonsense measure, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that our Nation treats those who are arriving to our country, whether it is green card holders who have made their home here in the United States; visa holders working, studying, or traveling to the United States; or U.S. citizens who happen to have been identified with a different country of origin for some reason, let's make sure we treat everybody with dignity and respect.

I am so proud to be passing the Access to Counsel Act today, alongside the No BAN Act, to put an end to some of the most cruel and discriminatory policies adopted by the previous administration and to make sure that they never happen again.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation requires individuals entering our country at ports of entry, tens of millions of them, who are referred for secondary inspection to get a lawyer. Yet, Democrats tell us this is not going to cost the taxpayers anything. I mean, this is some kind of miracle.

You have a mandate for tens of millions of people coming into our country, and it is not going to cost Americans any money? I have never seen a government mandate that didn't cost something. This is amazing.

I remember my days in the State legislature. Local governments were concerned about unfunded mandates from the State. This may be the biggest mandate we have ever seen.

But somehow, our agents, who are busting their tails working night and day right now with this crisis on the border, it is not going to cost them anything in time and effort.

I think the American taxpayers are smarter than that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When I hear that, oh, this bill simply is just trying to give a phone call, well, then why didn't it say that? Why didn't it say that in the bill? It didn't say that. It talks about access to an attorney. I am an attorney. I did court-appointed attorney work. I did it all the time.

Madam Speaker, this may not give someone a court-appointed attorney, but what it does is, you open it up. If Democrats don't think that consumes resources, then I just wonder if Democrats have ever been to a port of entry and watched people coming through and seen the secondary inspection process.

This is going to bog down your ports of entry, and it is going to lead to litigation. This is a trial lawyer's blessing, a trial lawyer's dream, I can tell you

that, because that is what is going to happen. There are going to be mistakes made, and even if there aren't mistakes made, there are going to be lawsuits.

This is not designed to facilitate border ingress and egress. This is not designed to help commercial traffic. This is going to bog down our system.

While that is going on, Democrats say this is not going to be a problem. It will redirect and redeploy Border Patrol agents and Customs agents to deal with this. That means it is going to really slow things down, and everyone knows what that means. That means that all the people who are coming are going to have an even wider open field.

In February, over 101,000 aliens were encountered. In March, over 172,000 aliens were encountered at the border. The number is going up. It is not going down. It is going up. Do you know why? Because the policies of this administration draw people in. They have done absolutely nothing to slow this down.

Madam Speaker, do you know what the number one most important thing would be? How about the President of the United States of America stand up and say: No. We will send you back. Our border is closed. If you want to come in, come in legally through the ports of entry.

How about doing that? Well, he has not done that. That is why you see people showing up with Biden campaign T-shirts on the border. That is why the Mexican President said this is Biden's border crisis. That is why the El Salvador President has expressed the same. And that is what Border Patrol agents also understand.

Ranchers and people in my district and those who live on the border, that is why they will say: This is Biden's problem. He created it. He inherited a solution and created a crisis.

The person who he has tapped to lead the efforts to address this surge at the border has been all over the place, just hasn't been at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TLAIB). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, this individual has not been to the border once, but the solutions are not a mystery.

President Biden has to stand up and make a statement: You have to continue construction of the wall; reinstate the MPP program; reinstate the 12 international agreements that were in place that were slowing this down. That would have stopped it. The last thing is, move your asylum courts down to the border to deal with current asylum cases.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership.

I thank the gentlewoman from the State of Washington for her grand and superb and astute leadership in understanding the Bill of Rights.

I have watched this debate, and I have seen people go to the microphone and talk about "on the left." I didn't know the Constitution was on the left or the right. I thought the Constitution was a document that our Founding Fathers started with the language "to form a more perfect Union." And in the Bill of Rights, citizens or noncitizens can have access to due process just because of the basic foundation of this Nation.

For a moment, I am going to pause, but I rise to support enthusiastically the Access to Counsel Act, H.R. 1573. But let me pause, as a resident and citizen of a border State.

Oh, how interesting it is, the interpretation of those one-time visitors. What about those of us who have been at the border over and over again? What about those of us who stood in the dark of night and saw a 2-year-old or a baby come off the wall.

No, that was not what we wanted. But people fleeing persecution have always sought to come to the place where the Statue of Liberty stands in the harbor. As far as I know, she is not gone. There is an Office of Refugee Resettlement. We have been a refuge for refugees.

Madam Speaker, I can tell you that, in the last 4 years, I saw scenes that I had never seen in my life. Do I need to remind Republicans of the children who died in our custody? No, I don't blame those Border Patrol or others there, my neighbors. But I blame the policies of the previous administration that did not care and simply left them to their own devices, which was a crowded, unsanitized place with metallic blankets and people not able to move because their idea was: Move them out. Make it so horrible, short of losing their lives, they will leave.

Then, what about the MPP program? I went to Mexico and saw desperate people in the streets. They had no place to live. They were being taken advantage of. I don't fault Mexico that, in essence, made an agreement. Maybe they were intimidated by the last administration and didn't know what else to do. But the MPP program subjected people to very dangerous conditions.

So, besides the Biden administration's policy of a closed border, sending people back who are single adults, but for the ports of entry, obviously; and, as well, those families, still giving them the opportunity to apply for asylum, which was literally cut off—domestic abuse persons couldn't apply for asylum under the last administration—fleeing bloodshed.

I would rather stand with President Biden and Vice President Harris, who are strategically trying to work on behalf of the American people, but they have not left their compassion and humanity at the front door of the White House.

This legislation is absolutely in compliance with the Constitution because what it says is that you have access to counsel. We don't pay for it. You have legal entry documents, and it is only when you are in secondary detention that this takes place so that little Ali, who I mentioned earlier on the floor, coming from Egypt with the appropriate documents, would have been able to call his father or his uncle, who was here in Houston, Texas.

Is that not simple humanity? Is that simple kindness? Is that recognizing the dignity of all people?

What about this New York City design gallery owner detained at an airport because of this ridiculous process? Of course, that was in 2017, the last administration, Juan Garcia Mosqueda, founder of the New York art-and-design gallery called Chamber and a decade-long legal permanent resident. I don't know how he got detained at the John F. Kennedy International Airport. Not only did he get detained, but he was shipped back to his native Argentina with no opportunity to talk to anyone ahead of his gallery art show that very day.

In an open letter titled "The Visible Wall," released by Mosqueda, he called the experience dehumanizing and degrading. He had his documents and detailed his 36-hour-long detainment, questioning, and return to Buenos Aires.

We already know I was getting ready to speak in the last debate on the No BAN Act. Nigeria was added to the list. I co-chair the Nigerian Caucus. There are doctors, lawyers, teachers, and businesspersons who have served from Nigeria in this Nation.

I believe this is a right-thinking bill, the Access to Counsel Act of 2021. I rise to support this legislation, and I oppose all of those who think that the Constitution no longer exists. Support the bill, H.R. 1573.

□ 1430

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE).

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Madam Speaker, I recently visited the border in my home State of Texas. The crisis there is astounding, as thousands of illegal immigrants enter the country on a daily basis. The Biden administration has been silent and in denial of any crisis, as we have seen record numbers of apprehensions, drug crossings into the U.S., and no answer for the humanitarian crisis of 20,000 unaccompanied minors.

President Biden appointed Vice President Harris as his immigration czar, and we have seen her travel all around the country, but not to the border. We have got a border czar who has not even been to the border.

Democrat leadership has been silent, not once questioning her absence from this humanitarian crisis. Instead, this week, they bring us more bad legislation. Today, we are debating spending

nearly a billion dollars to give access to counsel to foreign citizens when they are not even subject to a criminal investigation. That is a right we do not even afford our own citizens.

My Republican colleagues and I continue to expose the crisis on the border, having seen firsthand the horrific situation. Yet the Democrats' solution is to hire attorneys, forcing Border Patrol to hire new personnel and construct new space to comply with this misguided legislation, which does nothing to address the hundreds of thousands of people surging our borders at record numbers, the girls and the boys who are being sexually assaulted and exploited, and the thousands of pounds of illegal drugs and weapons pouring into our country.

If the Vice President actually went down there, agents could show her the miles of unprotected border they have been pulled off of to instead act as babysitters. She might be able to understand that the policies put in place under the previous administration actually worked.

We should be focused on securing our border and letting our agents do their jobs. The lack of compassion, the lack of humanity that we have seen under the Biden administration is appalling. The gentlewoman from Washington said we should treat everyone with dignity and respect.

Have you seen the conditions that are down at the border right now?

It is the exact opposite of dignity and respect. And these words mean nothing if we refuse to follow them with action.

The legislation in front of us does nothing to stop the Biden border crisis, and it is just another attempt to prioritize the interests of aliens over the American people.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I want to start with responding to a complete misrepresentation of what this bill does. We have heard our friends on the other side of the aisle say that this bill requires that counsel be appointed to individuals, and they have even gone so far as to assign a number to it, \$800 million.

That simply is not true. At first, I thought maybe it was an honest mistake, but it is being repeated. So now I know it is an affirmative misrepresentation.

What the bill does—and I invite my colleagues to look at the language of the bill. Go to page 3, line 17. A covered individual has a meaningful opportunity to consult with counsel and an interested party; they are required to provide a meaningful opportunity to consult with counsel.

There is no requirement in the bill that counsel be provided or paid for. So that claim is just not true. No matter how many times it gets repeated by our Republican colleagues, they are making it up. It is not in the bill.

So I rise in strong support of the H.R. 1573, the Access to Counsel Act.

Our legal system rests on the principle that every person is entitled to due process and a meaningful opportunity to be heard. The ability to consult with legal counsel is critical to both of these principles. For some, it is a matter of life and death. In the context of immigration, access to counsel can mean the difference between someone fleeing persecution, being able to remain safely in the United States, or detained or deported back to a war zone.

These are decisions that are often made away from courts. For example, Customs and Border Protection have the power to remove individuals from the United States without a hearing, based on statements made during an initial screening. Nothing in this bill changes that.

Questioning by Immigration and Customs Enforcement can lead to arrest, detention, initiation of removal proceedings, and removal, all done without access to counsel. The time, expense, and other resources associated with many immigration-related detentions could be avoided entirely if counsel were able to sit in during questioning.

H.R. 1573 confirms that the right to access counsel attaches at the time of holding or detention and requires CBP or ICE to provide people detained and questioned with the ability to make a call and notify an attorney of their detention.

H.R. 1573 does not force CBP or ICE to identify and assign lawyers to individuals subject to inspection. It doesn't require them to provide funds to obtain lawyers and support through the inspection process, nor does it create any obligation for the government to pay for counsel.

This legislation simply opens the door to meaningful access to counsel for those who have an attorney ready to assist, and it ensures that people subjected to prolonged inspection are able to communicate with and receive assistance from counsel or other individuals who can facilitate the inspection process.

This is a commonsense proposal that really does ensure that the system will work more efficiently, particularly for U.S. citizens.

I want to applaud the sponsor of this bill, Congresswoman JAYAPAL, for her extraordinary leadership. I thank the chairman of our committee for bringing this to the committee and now to the floor. This is something that everyone should support.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1573.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD this cost estimate on H.R. 1573 from the Congressional Budget Office.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST
ESTIMATE, APRIL 15, 2021

H.R. 1573 would require the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to allow individuals subject to secondary immigration inspection at U.S. ports of entry to consult with an attorney, accredited immigration official, family member, or immigration sponsor during the inspection. The bill also would require DHS to allow the counsel or interested party to appear in person at the inspection site to the greatest extent practicable. (A secondary immigration inspection is conducted by customs officers if individuals entering the United States do not have the required documents for entry or if their information cannot be initially verified.)

Approximately 10.2 million individuals were referred to secondary inspection at the United States' 328 ports of entry in 2019. Using information provided by Customs and Border Protection (CBP), CBO expects that roughly 8 percent of referrals would request access to counsel each year. Immigration at ports of entry has declined significantly in fiscal years 2020 and 2021 because of the coronavirus pandemic; CBO assumes referrals would return to pre-pandemic levels beginning in mid-2022.

CBO estimates that CBP would need two new full-time officers on average at each port of entry to provide security and transportation services for individuals requesting access to counsel. (The number of CBP officers stationed at each port of entry ranges from several individuals to up to several thousands, and the number of additional officers needed at each port under the bill would vary by the size of the port.) CBO estimates that salaries, benefits, and overtime for the additional staff would cost about \$700 million over the 2021–2026 period; such spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Additionally, using information provided by the agency, CBO expects that 222 ports of entry (nearly two-thirds of all ports) would need additional space or other upgrades to accommodate the bill's requirement to allow counsel to appear in person at inspection sites. Using that same information and historical patterns of construction costs, CBO estimates the total cost for construction and operation of the additional space would total \$123 million over the 2021–2026 period.

Specifically, CBO estimates that construction costs at 113 land facilities would total \$62 million over the 2021–2026 period, with \$10 million spent in subsequent years. CBO estimates the cost of renting additional space at 109 airport facilities would total \$44 million over the 2021–2026 period. In addition, CBO estimates the cost of initial setup, recurring maintenance, and other operational expenses associated with the additional space would total \$17 million over the 2021–2026 period. All construction and operational costs would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

The costs of the legislation, detailed in Table 1, fall within budget function 750 (administration of justice).

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, the gentleman said it wasn't going to cost anything.

This is straight from the Congressional Budget Office: \$825 million over the next 5 years, this is going to cost. This is based on Customs and Border Protection telling the CBO what costs they are going to incur.

So right there it is. He can say it is not there, but the CBO says it is.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, our Nation is in a crisis. We are facing a real crisis at our southern border. As I speak, hundreds of migrants are crossing into the United States right now because the Biden administration has made it clear to the world that the border is open and the rule of law will not be upheld.

Now, instead of working on solutions to address the ongoing border crisis, the majority has brought forward legislation that would cripple our Nation's screening process for individuals entering at U.S. ports of entry.

Currently, a right to counsel does exist, but it only occurs once a screening turns from questions on the admissibility of people or goods to a custodial interrogation relating to a criminal offense.

More efficient, says my colleague from the other side.

This bill would place a significant burden on the men and women of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, who, prior to the pandemic, processed over 1 million people daily at various ports of entry. The CBP regularly conducts over 17 million secondary inspections each year. That is not more efficient with this legislation.

This legislation would severely limit the CBP's ability to ensure thorough inspections of all travelers, not only those referred to secondary inspection, creating unnecessary delays and significant impacts on daily operations.

This bill misuses taxpayer dollars, puts the interests of foreign citizens above the interests of American citizens.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, we must establish an America-first immigration policy. However, the Democrats are doing the opposite, with illegal aliens first, foreign nations first, and future Democrat voters first. Law-abiding American citizens are clearly last on the list of priorities, if they even make the list at all.

They are giving illegal aliens free healthcare, free education, free social services, free transportation, and even free lodging. Today, it is more of the same, with the continued effort to enable and facilitate illegal entry into our country. Now they want to provide attorneys for illegal aliens and further restrict our ability to refuse entry to those who wish us harm. Come one, come all.

Is it confusion and incompetence on the part of Democrats?

Do they not know the threat to our country? Do they not understand?

Or is it worse and they know exactly what they are doing and they don't care about the consequences?

Why else would they let organized crime profit off the suffering of those trying to illegally cross our border?

Why else would they stop building the Trump wall?

Why else would they reinstate catch-and-release and offer amnesty to illegal aliens?

Why else would they stop MPP and Title 42 restrictions?

The Democrats are destroying our country, and you need to look no further than our own border.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL). The gentleman from New York has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Access to Counsel Act.

Thousands of immigrants lawfully come to our country, come through our ports of entry, daily. They come in order to reunite with families, in order to receive lifesaving medical help, in order to pursue their educational dreams. They come because they are allowed to come, and they come for really good purposes.

When they arrive, all too often they are subjected to grueling inspections and relentless questioning by our Customs and Border Patrol agents, and often they have no help to turn to.

H.R. 1573 will ensure that these individuals can communicate with a family member, an attorney, or other party who can help them navigate what is going on at the port of entry if they are held over an hour.

This is important. We are not saying that there shouldn't be any inspections whatsoever, that there shouldn't be any questioning. But sometimes people have been held up to 30 hours without any access to help. It is not right.

This is critical to ensuring that immigrants are treated fairly and with dignity.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Access to Counsel Act and to support due process for all.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, there is a humanitarian crisis on our southern border. Every day, more migrants surge towards the border and overwhelm the dedicated men and women of Customs and Border Protection.

CBP is facing the most dramatic increase in detentions and illegal crossings in nearly 15 years, with no end in sight and no plan to address the situation articulated and caused by the Biden administration.

Mr. Biden revoked the remain in Mexico policy and the safe third country agreements with Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador. He stopped building the wall. He tapped Vice President KAMALA HARRIS to coordinate the response to this humanitarian crisis almost a month ago. She still

hasn't visited the border, but she has had time to stop at a Chicago bakery and grab a slice of cake for her plane ride home.

The Vice President's message to the American communities being overrun with illegal immigrants is, apparently, "let them eat cake," while the President rolls out the welcome mat to illegal immigrants pouring over our border.

My colleagues across the aisle want to fund lawyers for illegal immigrants and defund the police. They don't care if the American people are protected, but they want to make sure their friends in the local bar association get paid to represent criminals flooding into our country.

Democrats don't have time to fix our broken immigration system, but they have time to visit Minnesota and incite riots.

□ 1445

During the current crisis, immigration backlogs have gotten so extreme that illegal migrants are being housed in convention centers and hotels across the country. My liberal colleagues should try addressing the rising homeless problem with Americans rather than placing illegal immigrants in hotels.

Just 2 weeks ago, the CBP announced the arrest of two men on the FBI's terrorism watch list as they tried to cross the southern border. If this legislation was enacted, Americans would have paid for their lawyers to help these terrorists stay in our country.

This is a dangerous precedent that prevents our existing border security apparatus from working properly.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I know it seems compassionate to those who support this bill to say we want to give this young child whose parents sent them up by themselves, give them a lawyer, help them out.

But the consequences for those of us that have spent a lot of time on the border are very clear. It means, if you make this law, that the representatives of the drug cartels, which are often gang members, they can tell the parents, Look, I know it is a tough decision whether to send your child alone, this little 3-, 5-, 8-year-old child up by themselves, but the good news is that there are people in Congress that have fought for and have gotten you a lawyer at the border for your child.

So with the drug cartels, the truth is this child will likely be an indentured servant for many years, either drug

trade or sex traffic, but they are going to be owned by the drug cartel, as far as what they get to do in their freedom. This is not something we should be doing, adding more to lure more unaccompanied children up to our border. We are already in crisis mode.

As all of the Border Patrol that I have talked to over the years explained, they are basically working now for the drug cartels. As they have said, we are the logistics for the drug cartels. The cartels send them up, get them to the border, and then we ship them wherever the cartels want us to send them.

This is not as compassionate as it may seem. This is going to damage millions of people.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

In the midst of an unprecedented and ongoing border crisis, as CBP struggles to keep up, Democrats focus on a bill that will not only be expensive but will continue to hamper and slow down our hardworking women and men with the CBP.

Almost a billion taxpayer dollars—almost a billion taxpayer dollars—provided for by the hardworking men and women in America, both legal immigrants and others, literally, to provide access to legal representation to non-citizens. I guess they would call it non-citizen human infrastructure. But really it is just another payday for lawyers.

America is struggling. Our borders are struggling. Our neighbors are struggling. We all want to help. But let's help America. Let's love America. Let's take care of our American people. Oppose this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS).

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Speaker, I am the daughter of immigrants. My mother came to this country as a refugee, and we are speaking about those who are seeking refuge in our country.

When my mother came to this country, there was a process. There was order. I visited the border a couple of weeks ago, and there was just absolute disorder and chaos.

It is shocking that this body refuses to take any action, that the Vice President, after 28 days of being appointed to oversee this issue, refuses to go to the border and see what I saw, hear what I heard.

You need to have a discussion with Customs and Border Protection before taking any action on legislation. They will tell you that they are being overrun by the cartels and the smugglers, who are taking over the border and making half a billion dollars a month doing it.

The action we are taking here today will do nothing to help the 9-year-old girl that we saw in this facility who was gang raped on her journey here. How come nobody cares or has the compassion to do anything about those individuals who are being exploited by the smugglers and cartels? That is what we should be discussing here today.

To go into one of these facilities and see these children, sleeping on top of each other—capacity of 250, and they have 4,000 people jammed in there. No COVID testing. Nobody cares about the public health crisis that is creating.

So you have a humanitarian crisis, a public health crisis, and on top of it a national security crisis. Thousands of criminals being caught at the border and nobody is doing a damn thing about it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman from New York is exactly right. When will the Democrats take it seriously? When will the President go to the border? When will the Vice President go to the border, the person who is supposed to be in charge of dealing with this crisis? When will the press be able to enter the holding facilities and actually show the American people how bad it is, what Ms. MALLIOTAKIS just described?

When will Secretary Mayorkas come in front of the Judiciary Committee? We have asked for him to come, answer our questions, tell us how he is dealing with this crisis.

When are the Democrats going to take this seriously? We do. We have all been down there. We asked them to go. They wouldn't go with us.

The American people understand what is going on, how bad it is. I just hope the Democrats will deal with it sometime soon.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, H.R. 1573 provides access to counsel for individuals referred to the secondary inspection station, but there are over 328 ports of entry to the United States. Those field executives, if this is enacted, would, in fact, be handling over 17 million people who might seek assistance.

In the upcoming motion to recommend, we will offer that, in fact, the claim by this bill that there will be no cost for attorneys' fees is, in fact, likely to not be true.

Last week the Congressional Budget Office estimated it would cost \$828 million to implement this legislation if enacted, and that would be without the right to free counsel. We need to ensure that these costs aren't even higher.

The Democrats have stated that H.R. 1573 will not require the American people to pay for attorneys accessed during this administrative stop. And, again, Madam Speaker, this is an administrative procedure. If, for any reason, somebody is charged with a crime,

they immediately do get access to counsel. This is for those 17 million people who will go through secondary inspection and likely then be allowed to move forward.

However, you need to look no further in this act than the comprehensive immigration reform bill of the U.S. Citizenship Act for evidence that Democrats want us to pay for counsel to foreign nationals. This bill specifically removes the current prohibition on government-paid counsel. And yet, in the markup my colleagues insisted that this had no right to counsel. If you want more evidence than this, the American people deserve an assurance in this bill. We will ask in the motion to recommit that we add that specific prohibition in this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, in the language of the motion to recommit H.R. 1573, no one will doubt that Congress either does or does not have the intent to make sure that the voters and our taxpayers are protected. I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, if we adopt the motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on the Judiciary to consider my amendment to H.R. 1573 to ensure that no taxpayer funds are used.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, for all the reasons that we have stated here in the last half hour, we urge a "no" vote on this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I have heard a lot of nonsense on this floor. I have heard a lot of fiction on this floor today, but not everything the Republicans have said is fiction.

They said, for instance, there is a crisis at the border. Indeed, there is a crisis at the border.

The crisis at the border started under President Trump and has continued under President Biden; the same crisis. The difference is that President Trump tried to deal with the crisis in the cruelest way possible, by tearing babies away from their parents, by tearing families apart, and by doing so, so in-

competently—I assume it was incompetence; maybe it was malevolence, I don't know—that they didn't even get the records so that people today can figure out how to reunite these families.

The crisis continues, but at least we are dealing with it. We are trying to deal with it in a humane way.

It is also interesting the fictions we have heard about this bill: This bill will cost money, this bill gives people the right to an attorney, and the Federal Government will have to pay for that attorney. Not true. Not true.

I suspect my Republican colleagues have lost the ability to read a bill somehow. The bill is very clear. The bill simply says that if someone with valid documents—valid documents—no litigation as to whether they are valid or not, they have got to be valid in the first place, a U.S. citizen, a green card holder, someone with a valid visa, that is all we are talking about. The bill simply says that those people, if detained at a border entry point for a period of time for longer than an hour have the right to make a phone call.

A phone call doesn't cost the government anything. They have the right to make a phone call. To whom? To whoever they want. A family member, perhaps an attorney, a friend, whoever they want.

Experience tells us that when people can make a phone call to an attorney in such a situation because the INA, the Immigration and Naturalization Act, is so complicated, it can often straighten things out, and that saves the government money. Because they don't have to litigate, it saves the government money. So this bill will not cost the government any money. It will save it money.

□ 1500

It will also help people who must be helped—again, I stress, only those people who have a valid document to enter the United States and for some reason are detained at the border.

How long does this last? Eight hours, at most. That is what the bill says, 8 hours.

This bill is limited to a measure that Members on both sides of the aisle, everybody, should embrace. As I said before, this is not a bill about a right to counsel. It is simply a bill about fair process. It ensures that individuals seeking to enter the United States with facially valid documents—a visa, a green card, including U.S. citizens who may have a passport—are given an opportunity to call somebody, a family member, counsel, another interested party, whoever they want, if they are subject to prolonged inspection.

Admissibility decisions by Customs and Border Protection can have life-altering consequences. This bill will ensure that CBP has the relevant facts prior to making decisions, the relevant facts, and facts that don't cost the CBP anything to get. Well, they do, actually: the cost of a phone call. I take

that back. It would cost the CBP the cost of a phone call, although not necessarily, because the person may have their cell phone on him. So, it won't even cost the cost of a telephone.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the Access to Counsel Act. It makes sense. It hurts nobody. It imposes no duty on the government. It imposes no cost on the government. But it does mean that people will not unnecessarily get caught up in bureaucracy. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the Access to Counsel Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 1573, the "Access to Counsel Act of 2021", which would ensure that certain individuals who are subject to prolonged inspection by U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) at ports of entry have the ability to communicate with and receive the assistance of counsel and other interested parties at no expense to the government.

The Access to Counsel Act does the following:

Allows individuals who already have legal status in the United States who are held in secondary inspection at airports or other points of entry for more than an hour with an opportunity to access legal counsel or an interested party, such as a relative or someone with a bona fide relationship, under certain circumstances.

Allows counsel or a covered interested party the ability to advocate on behalf of the individual by providing information or documentation in support of the individual.

Affirms the opportunity to access to counsel attaches no later than one hour after the secondary inspection process begins and as necessary throughout the process.

Invalidates any effort by CBP to persuade someone to relinquish their legal status (by executing a I-407 or Record of Abandonment of Lawful Permanent Resident Status) if that person has been denied access to counsel or voluntarily waives, in writing, the opportunity to seek advice from counsel.

In 2017, Juan Garcia Mosqueda, a decade-long legal permanent resident of the U.S., was detained at John F. Kennedy International Airport in New York City and sent back to his native Argentina by a CBP agent who told him that, "lawyers had no jurisdiction at the borders."

This statement, made in the weeks following implementation of the former president's 2017 travel ban, lays bare the vulnerable situation faced by people upon their arrival to the United States.

Behind closed doors without a friend or counsel, people are subjected to prolonged questioning, coercion, extended detention, mistreatment and summary expulsion.

Many lose valuable rights, and sometimes more, as CBP agents interpret and apply complex immigration rules to decide people's lives without the benefit of a knowledgeable advocate.

While many within the agency interpret and apply the law competently, the position does not require more than a high school degree, and CBP inspectors continue to act as judge, jury and expulsion officer without so much as a

whisper allowed during that decision making from an attorney representing the banished.

We are a country of laws, and we hold as a cherished tradition the concept of due process of law.

The need for this bill became apparent after the Trump Administration implemented the Muslim ban in early 2017, resulting in individuals being detained at airports, while others being barred from boarding flights and pulled off planes abroad.

In 2020, we saw additional instances of CBP officers unjustly detaining Iranian Americans for up to 12 hours at the northern border in Blaine, WA and detaining and deporting Iranian students who were attending U.S. universities and people from Iran traveling on valid visas.

Immigrants and civil rights activists have also raised concerns that CBP appears to target individuals for inspection based on racial profiling, and often holds U.S. citizens with proper documentation in secondary inspection without access to an attorney.

For example, three Black CBP officers recently filed a lawsuit against DHS, alleging CBP routinely targets and harasses Black travelers at the Blue Water bridge between Port Huron and Sarnia on the Canada-Michigan border.

A March 25, 2021 report by the American Civil Liberties Union of Michigan examined CBP data on apprehensions at the Michigan-Canada border and corroborates these allegations.

The report found that between 2012 and 2019, over 96 percent of the 13,000 documented apprehensions involved people of color, and one-third involved U.S. citizens.

In another example, Tianna Spears, a Black U.S. citizen diplomat working at the U.S. consulate in Ciudad Juarez, Mexico said that she was targeted regularly for inspection over a four month period, despite crossing the border daily, possessing a diplomatic passport and Global Entry approval, and having registered her car in the SENTRI system.

She states that during these encounters, she was unable to contact counsel or State Department colleagues who could verify her identity.

After four months of regular apprehensions, she began to develop symptoms of PTSD, and was forced to transfer to a different post. She later resigned from the State Department.

Madam Speaker, we must ensure that people are treated fairly during the inspections process, and to do so at the very minimum requires that CBP permit representation of counsel when requested during inspections.

I urge all Members to vote for H.R. 1573 and send a powerful message that this House stands firmly behind America's well-earned and long established reputation of being the most welcoming nation on earth.

[From Curbed, Mar. 2, 2017]

OWNER OF NYC DESIGN GALLERY DETAINED AT AIRPORTS, DENIED RE-ENTRY TO U.S.

Juan Garcia Mosqueda, founder of New York art and design gallery Chamber and a decade-long legal permanent resident of the U.S., was detained last Friday at John F. Kennedy International Airport in New York City and was sent back to his native Argentina, ahead of his gallery's new show—Domestic Appeal, Part III—which opens tonight.

In an open letter titled The Visible Wall released by Mosqueda on Tuesday, he called

the experience “dehumanizing and degrading,” and detailed his 36-hours-long detainment, questioning, and return to Buenos Aires.

The reaction from the design community was swift and impassioned. Posting Mosqueda's open letter on Tuesday, Sight Unseen wrote: “We are strongly against this administration's unfair and un-American targeting of immigrants—and not just those who are important design gallerists, but all those who seek to make a better life here.”

Designers, journalists, and other supporters took to Twitter to rally behind Mosqueda and decry his alleged treatment.

Of the response from the design community, Mosqueda said this in a statement emailed to Curbed:

Since issuing the letter . . . I have received tremendous support from not only the design community in New York but from people all over the world. I greatly appreciate everyone's kind words and concern following this unfortunate incident.

My reason for sharing my experience was to bring to light the situation currently facing immigrants from around the world and to encourage my American friends to contact your local congressmen and push for immigration reform. I am currently in the process of dealing with my reentry into the United States and for this reason I am not able to speak with media at this time. Thank you again for your support.

You can read Mosqueda's open letter in full below.

THE VISIBLE WALL

DEAR FRIENDS: This past Friday, February 24, 2017, I was denied entry into the United States—the nation where I have been legally residing for the past ten years. The procedure was dehumanizing and degrading every step of the way.

After being escorted to the secondary inspection premises, I was brought down for interrogation where I was questioned under oath and threatened with the possibility of being barred from entering the country for five years.

The border patrol officer denied me the right to legal counseling, arrogantly claiming that lawyers had no jurisdiction at the borders. Shortly after my sworn statement was delivered to the chief officer in charge, they informed me that I was not permitted to come into the country and, therefore, would be forced onto the return flight to Buenos Aires later that evening.

During the following fourteen excruciatingly painful hours, I was prohibited from the use of any means of communication and had no access to any of my belongings, which were ferociously examined without any warrant whatsoever. I was deprived of food. I was frisked three times in order to go to the bathroom, where I had no privacy and was under the constant surveillance of an officer.

Finally, I was escorted by two armed officers directly onto the plane and denied my documents until I reached my destination, Buenos Aires.

This thirty-six hour nightmare is nothing but clear evidence of a deeply flawed immigration system in the United States, carried out by an administration that is more interested in expelling people than admitting them.

I was educated in America, worked at prestigious design entities, and, now, as you all know, own a gallery which employs Americans and non-Americans alike. Chamber supports architecture and design studios in the United States and abroad.

I own several properties in New York and have collaborated in numerous projects with architects, contractors, and construction workers to bring to life projects around the

city. We have created a network within the creative industries that span all disciplines and media that help individuals sustain their practices and do what they love.

We proudly carry the New York flag to every fair that we do and every project we initiate across the globe. We self-publish books printed in the United States. And, needless to say, we pay considerable federal and state taxes that help fund many of the societal aspects that fuel the American engine.

Although I am not an American citizen, Chamber is an American product that I hope adds to the cultural landscape of the country. The gallery was conceived in alignment with the same idea of inclusion that was found in the streets of the Lower East Side (where I live and was denied access to) not so long ago: a melting pot of all nationalities and religions, importing ideas from abroad to a culturally embracing metropolis.

We have worked with over 200 artists and designers, from Tokyo to Los Angeles, from Amsterdam to Santiago, in our less than three years of existence and rely heavily on social mobility to get our message across and display the works that we want to show.

To my American friends, I urge you to contact your congressmen and push for immigration reform. Push for a system that does not alienate, intimidate, and bully foreigners but that, on the contrary, welcomes and encourages citizens from all countries to want to keep investing in and contributing to your wonderful country.

This coming Thursday, I will not be able to celebrate the opening of our newest show, Domestic Appeal, which my team and I worked hard to conceive, and will not be able to meet some of the incredible participants that are traveling to the United States to take pride in displaying their creations in one of the most culturally relevant cities on the planet.

Please come see it, have a glass of wine, and enjoy it on my behalf!

Hope to see you all very soon.

JUAN GARCIA MOSQUEDA,
Buenos Aires, Argentina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 330, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Issa moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1573 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The material previously referred to by Mr. ISSA is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—No counsel accessed, consulted, or otherwise providing assistance pursuant to this Act, or the amendment made by this Act, shall be compensated at the expense of the United States Government for any such service or activity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

EXTENDING TEMPORARY EMERGENCY SCHEDULING OF FENTANYL ANALOGUES ACT

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2630) to amend the Temporary Reauthorization and Study of the Emergency Scheduling of Fentanyl Analogues Act to extend until September 2021, a temporary order for fentanyl-related substances, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2630

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Extending Temporary Emergency Scheduling of Fentanyl Analogues Act”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY ORDER FOR FENTANYL-RELATED SUBSTANCES.

Effective as if included in the enactment of the Temporary Reauthorization and Study of the Emergency Scheduling of Fentanyl Analogues Act (Public Law 116-114), section 2 of such Act (Public Law 116-114) is amended by striking “May 6, 2021” and inserting “October 22, 2021”.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2630.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise to seek support for the Extending Temporary Emergency Scheduling of Fentanyl Analogues Act.

As we continue to combat the COVID-19 pandemic, we are also facing a tragic, growing trend of overdose deaths across this country.

We have lost nearly 1 million Americans since the beginning of the Nation's drug epidemic. These Americans are sons, daughters, mothers, fathers, neighbors, coworkers, and members of our communities. Now, data tells us that the COVID-19 pandemic, increased isolation, and related economic hardships over the past year may be hampering efforts to turn the tide.

Last week, Madam Speaker, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention released its most recent data finding that, from August 2019 to August 2020, there were 88,000 overdose deaths reported. That is the highest ever recorded in a 12-month period.

This most recent data represents a worsening crisis driven primarily by synthetic opioids, such as illicitly manufactured fentanyl. This drug is 50 times more potent than heroin and 100 times more potent than morphine. Although fentanyl itself is often used for medical purposes, use of illicitly manufactured fentanyl has increased in recent years, including co-use with cocaine and methamphetamines. As little as 2 milligrams can cause a lethal overdose.

Congress has recognized this unprecedented threat and acted in strong bipartisan fashion to combat it with resources to communities around the country. We passed major pieces of legislation like the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, the 21st Century Cures Act, and the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act.

At the end of last year, in the final omnibus bill, we included over \$4 billion to increase mental health and substance use services and support. Recognizing the worsening trends early this year, we passed the American Rescue Plan last month that provided an additional \$4 billion in resources. This critical funding will be used to enhance mental health and substance use disorder services supported by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, the Health Resources and Services Administration, and the Indian Health Service.

Madam Speaker, while this critical assistance is on the way, unfortunately, due to the disturbing rates of overdose and substance use, more work is clearly needed. The Biden administration is asking Congress to extend a temporary tool we provided last Congress so that agency experts can come together to examine the facts and come up with an effective, long-term solution. That tool is the authority to temporarily classify fentanyl-related sub-

stances as schedule I substances under the Controlled Substances Act.

Ensuring fentanyl-related substances remain scheduled will maintain an important deterrent to traffickers, manufacturers, and those distributing this substance.

During an Energy and Commerce Committee hearing last week, the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy's Acting Director Regina LaBelle testified on the importance of this extension. Acting Director LaBelle highlighted ongoing discussions with the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Justice, and the Drug Enforcement Administration. She testified that an extension of this temporary authority would allow executive branch agencies time to convene and present a long-term solution to this ever-changing drug environment that balances the risk of illicit fentanyl with the need to ensure appropriate enforcement.

The Biden administration is taking this drug epidemic seriously and has delivered a thoughtful, thorough set of drug policy priorities. I ask my colleagues to join me in giving these agency experts time to produce a thoughtful, thorough solution to this scourge of overdose deaths.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am disappointed that we are kicking the can down the road on a short-term extension of DEA's emergency scheduling order to keep dangerous fentanyl analogues in schedule I.

While I will vote in favor of this bill today because allowing this lifesaving order to expire is unacceptable, this short-term extension from the Democratic majority fails to meet the gravity of the situation facing our communities, our border, and our country.

They have had 2 years to come to the table and work with us on a permanent solution to combat fentanyl and fentanyl analogues and the dangers that they pose to Americans. If we don't act, these dangerous drugs being smuggled across our southern border would effectively become street legal.

We need a permanent solution to save the lives of people in despair and to protect our communities, and we need Democrats in the House and the Senate to wake up and take it seriously. Nearly all States are seeing a spike in synthetic opioid deaths, with 10 Western States reporting a more than 98 percent increase. This pandemic has made it worse.

In my home State of Washington, the fentanyl positivity rate has increased 236 percent, more than any other State in the country. My community lost two teenagers recently from a suspected fentanyl-related death. They had their whole lives in front of them.

Just a few milligrams of fentanyl, what can fit on the ear of Abraham

Lincoln on our penny—that is a pretty small amount—is lethal.

Fentanyl analogues are oftentimes more potent, and more than a thousand of them have been created over the years to mimic fentanyl's opioid effects and outsmart the law.

With class-wide scheduling, any dangerous variant of fentanyl is controlled under schedule I. According to the DEA, right now, there are 27 new fentanyl-related substances that have been encountered and immediately controlled under the class-wide scheduling order. All of those substances are many times more potent than heroin and pose serious health and safety risks. One recently encountered substance was approximately eight times more potent than fentanyl.

In addition to the ongoing, unprecedented humanitarian crisis at the border, fentanyl and other dangerous opioids are also pouring across our border at an ever-increasing rate. The Border Patrol just reported a 233 percent increase in fentanyl seizures at the southern border just in the last year.

If the class-wide scheduling of fentanyl-related substances is allowed to expire, drug traffickers will be further emboldened to smuggle this poison into our communities.

The Trump administration also worked hard to make the Chinese Communist Party accountable for the fentanyl analogues that were being manufactured in China, forcing them to crack down on it. If we let this expire and do not make it permanent, we will be sending a clear message to the CCP that it is okay for them to ease up and let this illicit industry continue to grow.

Moving forward, we must work with the DEA and other agencies to make this scheduling permanent, just like Mr. LATTA's FIGHT Fentanyl Act, while making reforms to improve scientific research on these substances.

I am glad that the majority is agreeing with us that we cannot let this expire. I am gravely disappointed that it is only a few months. This extension will buy us far less time than the 1-year extension Republican leader JIM JORDAN and I put forward and the 7-month extension that was requested by the Biden administration.

If this 5-month extension is signed into law, I call on Democrats and Republicans to begin working immediately on a longer term solution. We stand ready to immediately begin the bipartisan work necessary to get a permanent fix signed into law. I am committed to working over the next 5 months to solve this issue once and for all and not just settle on a short-term extension.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this temporary extension, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Hampshire

(Mr. PAPPAS), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman PALLONE for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today and urge the swift passage of H.R. 2630. This legislation will save American lives by getting deadly chemical fentanyl analogues off our streets and allowing law enforcement to swiftly bring drug traffickers to justice.

The CDC reports that there were more than 50,000 deaths involving synthetic opioids in the 12-month period ending in July 2020—50,000 deaths in 12 months.

The addiction crisis has worsened as a result of this pandemic, and this is not the time to let regulations lapse or to back away from our commitment to get people the help that they need.

My State of New Hampshire, like so many, has been hit incredibly hard by fentanyl and its chemical analogues. Chemical versions of fentanyl are ever-changing, and we know that traffickers intentionally make small variations in substances, knowing that the scheduling process may take months in order to place these deadly drugs on schedule I where they belong. This means that traffickers are often one step ahead of law enforcement.

Madam Speaker, this legislation helps prevent that by ensuring all fentanyl analogues are categorized as schedule I.

The DEA first issued a temporary order in February of 2018, and Congress wisely passed legislation extending that order through May 6.

Madam Speaker, my legislation, the Extending Temporary Emergency Scheduling of Fentanyl Analogues Act, would extend that order and, again, ensure that constantly changing chemical versions of fentanyl, often smuggled in from Mexico and China, are labeled as schedule I.

The bill would prevent our communities from being flooded with synthetic opioids and will ensure that those trafficking them will be held accountable without delay.

People are in a fight for their lives right now. Our country continues to be ravished by addiction. To let down our guard at this moment would cause unmistakable harm to our families and our communities.

I am hopeful that we will see swift bipartisan action in Congress to grant this extension.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the lead Republican on the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today very concerned about the deadly threat of fentanyl and fentanyl analogues.

Last week, the Committee on Energy and Commerce held a hearing on this exact issue.

Here are the facts: More than 88,000 overdose deaths were reported by the

CDC in a 12-month period ending in August of 2020. This is a record for the highest number of overdose deaths ever recorded in a year.

In 2018, synthetic opioids, which includes these dangerous fentanyl analogues, were involved in 744 deaths in just Kentucky. I learned from a substance use healthcare provider in my district that almost all their patients have some sort of fentanyl in their system. Many of the patients are not aware of it themselves. Just last month a 2-year-old in Kentucky died from exposure to fentanyl; therefore, I support a permanent solution of scheduling fentanyl analogues.

Last week, some of my colleagues—and we had witnesses—tried to argue that a long-term solution for banning fentanyl is a social justice issue. In fact, one witness shared, "it is being argued that fentanyl class scheduling is suddenly unnecessary because of the low number of prosecutions to date—eight. However, eight mandatory minimum sentences in 3 years, four of them being members of a cartel, proves that prosecutors are not going after low-level users.

The witness also argued that this scheduling of fentanyl analogues—the decrease of new fentanyl analogues coming to this country was 90 percent.

If someone is being unjustly prosecuted for fentanyl analogues, then that should be addressed.

However, not scheduling fentanyl analogues, when we had a witness testify it drops 90 percent being imported, would be deadly for Americans since fentanyl and its analogues are responsible for thousands of deaths each year.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tampa, Florida, (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a leader on the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the United States remains in the grip of an overdose pandemic, unfortunately. I rise today in support of the Extending Temporary Emergency Scheduling of Fentanyl Analogues Act.

Madam Speaker, 3 years ago, DEA temporarily scheduled fentanyl analogues as controlled substances to crack down on China and drug traffickers smuggling fentanyl across the southern border. Last year, Congress passed the temporary extension that continued to criminalize fentanyl analogues until May 6 of this year.

Previously, drug traffickers could slightly change the molecules in the drug, so the formula was not technically considered fentanyl and was not prohibited, although it was still potent, leading to a lethal game of whack-a-mole.

Madam Speaker, locally, we have seen that fentanyl has been a major problem, even with the scheduling in place. Pasco County, in my district,

has already had 48 people die from overdoses since January of this year, and many communities throughout the country are experiencing the same overdose increases as the pandemic has only exacerbated the mental health and addiction crisis in our country.

Madam Speaker, if this scheduling ban expires, we expect far more fentanyl to flood our streets and many more lives to be tragically lost. We cannot allow this to happen.

I urge my colleagues to join us in extending this current ban and to work together in a bipartisan manner on a permanent solution—it must be a priority—a permanent solution to this scourge.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce for the constant diligence that he has in the landscape of healthcare and energy, consumer issues. Certainly, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, we are looking forward to working with this committee on a very important matter.

So I want to acknowledge the work of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and indicate that isn't it sad that we have not been able to find common ground to work on this issue. I am very concerned that what we are now doing, we probably would need more time for our committees to work together. I am concerned that we might be extending the Trump administration's temporary class-wide emergency scheduling of fentanyl, a substance that all of us vigorously opposed.

Madam Speaker, I think the chairman is well-aware of my longstanding concern on criminalizing substance abuse instead of preventing and treating it. I know that our two committees have a common perspective and agreement on that, but I have seen failed policies in my own neighborhood that have disproportionately impacted communities of color.

For instance, in the 1980s, Congress adopted harsh mandatory minimum sentences for crack cocaine offenses and putting many in unjust and lengthy terms of imprisonment.

Madam Speaker, I simply want to indicate an acknowledgment of fentanyl and its impact that it has had, and I want to acknowledge the importance of us working together. But I also want to put on the record my concern with the DEA's temporary order that would group all fentanyl-related substances under a class-wide ban.

You see, what I know we can document is that the recipient, the taker, gets the short end of the criminal justice stick, and with that, I have concerns. But as we take more time to do this, I want to make sure the traffickers, the cartels, the gangs, are put in the eye of the storm where they belong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, just to put on the record that the data shows that there are already significant racial disparities in some of the Federal cases and mandatory minimum sentences involving fentanyl analogues.

I don't want to put words in the mouth of my chairman, Chairman PALLONE, but I have heard him speak to these issues, and I am grateful for it. I am grateful for his sensitivity. So I wanted to come to the floor knowing the work that has been done, but also knowing your understanding. And I wanted to just make sure that these communities that cannot speak for themselves clearly are put on the record.

I need not say that the trial that we just had with the George Floyd case and what was trying to be represented in that case, albeit was a very tiny or minute or nonexistent amount. So I want to make sure that we do this right and we get the time to do it.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

WASHINGTON, DC,

April 19, 2021.

President JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.,

The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT BIDEN: We write to express our serious concerns with class-wide scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, joining with our colleagues Senators Booker, Hirono, Markey, Warren and Whitehouse, who wrote to you about this issue on April 14. We too commend your commitment to end mandatory minimums, to address racial disparities, and to achieve criminal justice reform. We also agree with the Administration's recognition of the pressing need to "eradicate racial, gender and economic inequities that currently exist in the criminal justice system. We look forward to working with your Domestic Policy Council and the interagency working group that has been formed to develop specific policy solutions for criminal justice reform. At the same time, we also hope to collaborate with you and your Administration to enact just and restorative policies that will meaningfully transform our nation's response to substance use disorders through the lens of public health and racial equity.

We agree with our Senate colleagues that fentanyl use is a serious concern. Combating substance use, including the illicit use of fentanyl, is a top priority for all of us. However, we ask that you reject the last Administration's misguided approach to the opioid epidemic, especially regarding class-wide scheduling of fentanyl analogues.

As an initial matter, federal prosecutors may already pursue charges concerning harmful fentanyl analogues, with or without class-wide scheduling. In addition, classifying all fentanyl analogues as Schedule I substances is unnecessary for federal prosecutions of these cases. Independent from any temporary scheduling order for certain substances, the federal government has the authority to prosecute anyone who possesses, imports, distributes, or manufactures any unscheduled fentanyl analogue with a high potential for abuse, no medical value, and the ability to cause overdose deaths. In addition, the Department of Justice can con-

tinue to prosecute any case involving the illicit manufacturing or distribution of any fentanyl-related substances under a separate statutory scheme established by the Federal Analogue Act. The DEA can also continue to use its existing authority to schedule specific fentanyl-related substances as Controlled Substances under the well-established interagency process.

However, under the Trump Administration, the Drug Enforcement Administration used its emergency scheduling authority to place certain fentanyl analogues onto Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act. The Temporary Scheduling Order ("the Order") scheduled a general "class" of "fentanyl-related substances." In doing so, the Trump Administration expanded the application of mandatory minimum penalties to a broader range of federal cases, while also creating additional barriers to medical research. The Order also circumvented the standard procedures for the scheduling of substances under the Controlled Substances Act, preventing input from the Department of Health and Human Services and other relevant interagency experts.

The Trump Administration's Order also widened the net as far as the application of mandatory minimum penalties. As you know, people of color have been disproportionately subject to mandatory minimum sentences, preventing judges from being allowed to apply penalties that fit the facts and circumstances of each case. Continuation of this Order will further perpetuate current racial disparities that exist throughout the criminal justice system. According to the most recent statistics from the U.S. Sentencing Commission, there are significant racial disparities in the prosecution of fentanyl cases, with people of color comprising almost 75% of those sentenced in 2019. This also holds true for federal convictions in cases involving fentanyl analogues, for which 68% of those sentenced were people of color. To keep this approach in place—even temporarily—will further exacerbate existing racial disparities.

In addition, mandatory minimum penalties continue to disproportionately impact individuals with a minor role in the offense. In 2019, more than half of all federal fentanyl-analogue prosecutions involved a street-level seller or other minor role. During this challenging time, our most vulnerable communities, especially communities of color, have been disproportionately impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Moving forward, we must not exacerbate these health and justice inequities. We need to reject approaches that expand criminal penalties, rather than prioritize evidence-based approaches to this public health crisis.

Moreover, we need to work to reduce barriers to research in order to expand opportunities to identify antidotes to fentanyl-analogue overdoses and to improve treatment options. By extending the Order, critical medical research will continue to be limited during a time when the country is facing even greater concerns regarding the opioid crisis and the rising number of overdoses. For these reasons, we urge you to discard this misguided approach.

Drug addiction is a serious problem in communities across the country, and we are profoundly concerned about fentanyl-related deaths. The current pandemic has furthered worsened the tragic impact of overdoses as so many Americans continue to struggle through this isolating and stressful crisis. We must learn from the lessons of the past as we prioritize evidence-based, public health approaches and pursue better and more just means to address this problem, rather than

the class-wide scheduling of fentanyl analogues.

Sincerely,

Jerrold Nadler, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Hakeem Jeffries, Ted Lieu, Val B. Demings, Sheila Jackson Lee, Theodore E. Deutch, David N. Cicilline, Pramila Jayapal, Mondaire Jones, Deborah K. Ross, Tony Cardenas, Yvette D. Clark, Cori Bush, and Bobby L. Rush, Members of Congress.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), the only pharmacist on our committee, and a leader on this issue.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am here today to ask my colleagues across the aisle to set aside this weak bill and support permanently—permanently as in forever—scheduling fentanyl and its analogues.

We just heard from the gentlewoman from Texas. We all agree: It is not good. Fentanyl is the problem.

Here, we have an opportunity for us to work together to help stem the flow of deadly fentanyl and its analogues in our country. This is an issue that impacts every one of us—every one of us. Whether we are Republican, Democrat, Independent, it impacts every one of us in our communities.

Just last week, in my home State of Georgia, the Georgia Attorney General announced that he is investigating fatal drug overdoses based on counterfeit medications laced with fentanyl and its analogues. These individuals bought illegal products they believed to be Xanax, Percocet, and oxycodone.

Overdoses like this happen every day all over the country—all over the country. Yet, some of my colleagues want to go soft on fentanyl analogues and let these products become legal in just mere weeks, or temporarily schedule it for a few months until they can craft another weak plan.

How can anyone seriously argue that a drug 50 times more potent than heroin and which almost always proves fatal when ingested, should ever be legal?

These products are manufactured illegally, and they are largely brought into the U.S. through the southern border. Every year, U.S. agents intercept enough fentanyl and its analogues to kill every single American several times over. In fact, Customs and Border Patrol announced in 2019, they had enough seized fentanyl to kill 800 million people. And that is what they had seized; we don't know what else came across.

I visited the border last week to see the crisis firsthand. Border patrol agents are so overwhelmed with a 20-year record high number of illegal immigrants that smugglers and cartels are using this as an opportunity to traffic more fentanyl substances.

If the President and Vice President would visit the border, they would be able to talk to the agents firsthand and see for themselves how serious the issue is.

Instead, they have elected to leave our border wide open. We are inviting drug traffickers to bring fentanyl substances into the country and distribute it in our streets. This should not be a partisan issue. Fentanyl does not discriminate. It does not.

The individuals manufacturing and distributing fentanyl and its analogues are criminals, and they are getting our neighbors killed. This is not an issue that is going away. It is only getting worse. The CDC reports that there were enough overdoses last year than any single year before.

This is the time for us to crack down on fentanyl-related substances, and I hope that we will do that.

□ 1530

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlemen from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), a great member and leader on the committee.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2630, to extend the temporary emergency scheduling of fentanyl analogues.

In the rural Pennsylvania communities that I represent, the fentanyl crisis is anything but temporary. Every day, we experience the ramifications of the opioid epidemic, which has only been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

As the Franklin County coroner, Jeff Connor, told me just this week, "Fentanyl is easy to get and fast to kill."

This is true across our entire Commonwealth. In my home of Blair County, we suffered an 80 percent increase in overdose deaths in 2020. As I have heard directly from our county coroner, Patty Ross, there is no question that the widespread availability of illicit fentanyl is a substantial factor in our region's drug epidemic.

Fentanyl already poses a deadly threat to our communities. If we don't act to extend the fentanyl import ban before it expires next month, we will invite massive vulnerabilities in our shared fight against the opioid crisis. In Pennsylvania and around the country, we need more accountability for those who bring illicit fentanyl into our communities.

H.R. 2630 is lifesaving legislation that will give law enforcement and the justice system the tools that they need to keep this dangerous illicit drug off of our streets. This temporary fix needs to be the bridge to a permanent solution to protect the American people. We do not have time to waste. By passing this bipartisan legislation, we can protect families, equip those on the front line, and prevent tragedy.

For the health and safety of our communities, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to

the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment with H.R. 2630.

What is happening down at our southern border is actually a crisis, and it is multiplying a crisis that has plagued this country for many years, and that is the opioid epidemic.

Customs and Border Patrol agents have seized more than 4,900 pounds of fentanyl during the first 5 months of fiscal year 2021, already surpassing the total from last year.

Mexican cartels are increasingly responsible for producing the supply of fentanyl into the U.S. market. China, we forget about China. China remains a key source of supply for the chemicals that the Mexican cartels are using to produce the fentanyl; all of this being smuggled into the U.S. through our western States.

Madam Speaker, I introduced, along with Senator JOHNSON, the SOFA Act to permanently designate fentanyl as a schedule I drug, closing a loophole in current law that makes it difficult to prosecute crimes involving some synthetic opioids.

The GAO report released last week on class-wide scheduling of fentanyl-related substances found fewer law enforcement encounters with fentanyl, and reduced incentives for cartels to circumvent the law through new and existing fentanyl substances.

While I plan to support this bill—I think everybody will—a 5-month extension is not nearly long enough. I urge Democrats to come back to the table to find a solution that will permanently keep fentanyl as a schedule I drug.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE).

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Madam Speaker, this issue should already have been taken care of.

Last week, my Republican colleagues and I offered an amendment to extend this ban until at least 2022, but it was blocked, only to see Democrats draft this much weaker bill. It is another game and example of why Americans are fed up with Congress.

When House Democrats rejected the Republican-led amendment banning fentanyl last week, they knew that fentanyl causes a massive blight in our communities across the country. They knew that tens of thousands are left dead from overdoses every year, but refused to support it because of the names on the bill. And now they want to extend the ban of this highly addictive, highly dangerous, deadly drug by only 5 months.

Last month, CBP agents seized 639 pounds of fentanyl, adding to the 2,098 pounds seized this year alone. That represents a 233 percent increase of drugs being smuggled across the border

this year. It is a direct result of Biden's border crisis.

Vice President Harris was appointed as the so-called immigration czar, but has spent more time in New Hampshire than at the border. And if she were to visit, she would see the toll that the influx of migrants is taking on our border. It is not just a humanitarian crisis, but it is leaving us vulnerable to increased drug smuggling that is ravaging our streets. She would hear directly from the DEA agents, just like my colleagues and I did, why it is so important to schedule fentanyl as a schedule I drug permanently, not just for 5 months.

A 5-month extension is not long enough. Let's just stop playing politics. There is no excuse why we are not working toward a permanent ban.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I would urge support for this bipartisan bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2630, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Temporary Reauthorization and Study of the Emergency Scheduling of Fentanyl Analogues Act to extend until October 2021, a temporary order for fentanyl-related substances."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ORIGIN-BASED ANTI-DISCRIMINATION FOR NON-IMMIGRANTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 1333) to transfer and limit Executive Branch authority to suspend or restrict the entry of a class of aliens, offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 208, nays 216, not voting 5, as follows:

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Billirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Bull
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—208

Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaull
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar

NAYS—216

Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Cabajal

Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahale
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch

Clarke (NY)
Clyde

Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan

NOT VOTING—5

Gibbs
LaMalfa
Smith (NE)

□ 1615

Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CHU, Mmes. TORRES of California and HAYES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. CHENEY and Mr. POSEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 126.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)
Barragán (Beyer)
Cárdenas
(Gallego)
Costa (Correa)
Crenshaw
(Fallon)
Donalds
(Cammack)
Gonzalez (OH)
(Timmons)
Gosar (Greene)
(GA)
Grijalva (García)
(IL)

Khanna (Gomez)
Kirkpatrick
(Stanton)
Langevin
(Lynch)
Lawson (FL)
(Evans)
Leger Fernandez
(Jacobs (CA))
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
Meng (Clark)
(MA))

Mfume
(Connolly)
Moulton
(Perlmutter)
Napolitano
(Correa)
Omar (Bush)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rush
(Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Speier (Scanlon)

Stefanik (Katko) Welch
Trahan (Lynch) (McGovern)
Watson Coleman Wilson (FL)
(Pallone) (Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 208, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—218

Adams	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Aguilar	Gonzalez,	Omar
Allred	Vicente	Pallone
Auchincloss	Gotthelmer	Panetta
Axne	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Barragán	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bass	Harder (CA)	Payne
Beatty	Hayes	Perlmutter
Bera	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Beyer	Himes	Phillips
Bishop (GA)	Horsford	Pingree
Blumenauer	Houlihan	Pocan
Blunt Rochester	Hoyer	Porter
Bonamici	Huffman	Pressley
Bourdeaux	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Bowman	Jacobs (CA)	Quigley
Boyle, Brendan	Jayapal	Raskin
F.	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Brown	Johnson (GA)	Ross
Brownley	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Bush	Jones	Ruiz
Bustos	Kahele	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Kaptur	Rush
Carbajal	Keating	Ryan
Cárdenas	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez
Carson	Khanna	Sarbanes
Cartwright	Kildee	Scanlon
Case	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Casten	Kim (NJ)	Schiff
Castor (FL)	Kind	Schneider
Castro (TX)	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Chu	Krishnamoorthi	Schrier
Cicilline	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Clark (MA)	Lamb	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Langevin	Sewell
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sherrill
Cohen	Lawrence	Sires
Connolly	Lawson (FL)	Slotkin
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Correa	Lee (NV)	Soto
Costa	Leger Fernandez	Spanberger
Courtney	Levin (CA)	Speier
Craig	Levin (MI)	Stanton
Crist	Lieu	Stevens
Crow	Lofgren	Strickland
Cuellar	Lowenthal	Suozzi
Davids (KS)	Luria	Swalwell
Davis, Danny K.	Lynch	Takano
Dean	Malinowski	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Carolyn B.	Titus
DeLauro	Maloney, Sean	Tlaib
DelBene	Manning	Tonko
Delgado	Matsui	Torres (CA)
Demings	McBath	Torres (NY)
DeSaulnier	McCollum	Trahan
Deutch	McEachin	Trone
Dingell	McGovern	Underwood
Doggett	McNerney	Vargas
Doyle, Michael	Meeks	Veasey
F.	Meng	Vela
Escobar	Mfume	Velázquez
Eshoo	Moore (WI)	Wasserman
Espallat	Morelle	Schultz
Evans	Moulton	Waters
Fitzpatrick	Mrvan	Watson Coleman
Fletcher	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Foster	Nadler	Wexton
Frankel, Lois	Napolitano	Wild
Galleo	Neal	Williams (GA)
Garamendi	Neguse	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (IL)	Newman	Yarmuth
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	
Golden	O'Halleran	

NAYS—208

Aderholt	Good (VA)	Mooney
Allen	Gooden (TX)	Moore (AL)
Amodei	Gosar	Moore (UT)
Armstrong	Granger	Mullin
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Murphy (NC)
Babin	Graves (MO)	Nehls
Bacon	Green (TN)	Newhouse
Baird	Greene (GA)	Norman
Balderson	Griffith	Nunes
Banks	Grothman	Obernolte
Barr	Guest	Owens
Bentz	Guthrie	Palazzo
Bergman	Hagedorn	Palmer
Bice (OK)	Harris	Pence
Biggs	Harshbarger	Perry
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Pfleger
Bishop (NC)	Hern	Posey
Boebert	Herrell	Reed
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Reschenthaler
Brady	Hice (GA)	Rice (SC)
Brooks	Higgins (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Buchanan	Hill	Rogers (AL)
Buck	Hinson	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Hollingsworth	Rose
Budd	Hudson	Rosendale
Burchett	Huizenga	Rouzer
Burgess	Issa	Roy
Calvert	Jackson	Rutherford
Cammack	Jacobs (NY)	Salazar
Carl	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Schweikert
Carter (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Scott, Austin
Chabot	Jordan	Sessions
Cheney	Joyce (OH)	Simpson
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Smith (MO)
Cloud	Katko	Smith (NJ)
Cole	Keller	Smucker
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Spartz
Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Staubert
Crawford	Kim (CA)	Steel
Crenshaw	Kinzing	Stefanik
Curtis	Kustoff	Steil
Davidson	LaHood	Steube
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Stewart
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Stivers
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Taylor
Donalds	LaTurner	Tenney
Duncan	Lesko	Thompson (PA)
Dunn	Letlow	Tiffany
Emmer	Long	Timmons
Estes	Loudermilk	Turner
Fallon	Lucas	Upton
Feenstra	Luetkemeyer	Valadao
Ferguson	Mace	Van Drew
Fischbach	Malliotakis	Van Dwyne
Fitzgerald	Mann	Wagner
Fleischmann	Massie	Walberg
Fortenberry	Mast	Walorski
Fox	McCarthy	Waltz
Franklin, C.	McCaul	Weber (TX)
Scott	McClain	Webster (FL)
Fulcher	McClintock	Wenstrup
Gaetz	McHenry	Westerman
Gallagher	McKinley	Williams (TX)
Garbarino	Meijer	Wilson (SC)
Garcia (CA)	Meuser	Wittman
Gimenez	Miller (IL)	Womack
Gohmert	Miller (WV)	Young
Gonzales, Tony	Miller-Meeks	Zeldin
Gonzalez (OH)	Moolenaar	

NOT VOTING—3

□ 1647

Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. CARL, and Mrs. HARTZLER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)	Gonzalez (OH)	Langevin
Barragán (Beyer)	(Timmons)	(Lynch)
Cárdenas	Gosar (Greene)	Lawson (FL)
(Galleo)	(GA)	(Evans)
Costa (Correa)	Grijalva (Garcia)	Leger Fernandez
Crenshaw	(IL)	(Jacobs (CA))
Khanna (Gomez)		Lieu (Beyer)
Kirkpatrick		Lowenthal
(Stanton)		(Beyer)

Meng (Clark)	Payne (Pallone)	Watson Coleman
(MA)	Porter (Wexton)	(Pallone)
Mfume	Rush	Welch
(Connolly)	(Underwood)	(McGovern)
Moulton	Sewell (DelBene)	Wilson (FL)
(Perlmutter)	Speier (Scanlon)	(Hayes)
Napolitano	Stefanik (Katko)	Wilson (SC)
(Correa)	Trahan (Lynch)	(Timmons)
Omar (Bush)		

ACCESS TO COUNSEL ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 1573) to clarify the rights of all persons who are held or detained at a port of entry or at any detention facility overseen by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 215, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—209

Aderholt	Fitzpatrick	Kustoff
Allen	Fleischmann	LaHood
Amodei	Fortenberry	LaMalfa
Armstrong	Fox	Lamborn
Arrington	Franklin, C.	Latta
Babin	Scott	LaTurner
Bacon	Fulcher	Lesko
Baird	Gaetz	Letlow
Balderson	Gallagher	Long
Banks	Garbarino	Loudermilk
Barr	Garcia (CA)	Lucas
Bentz	Gimenez	Luetkemeyer
Bergman	Gohmert	Mace
Bice (OK)	Gonzales, Tony	Malliotakis
Biggs	Gonzalez (OH)	Mann
Bilirakis	Good (VA)	Massie
Bishop (NC)	Gooden (TX)	Mast
Boebert	Gosar	McCarthy
Bost	Granger	McCaul
Brady	Graves (LA)	McClain
Brooks	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Buchanan	Green (TN)	McHenry
Buck	Greene (GA)	McKinley
Bucshon	Griffith	Meijer
Budd	Grothman	Meuser
Burchett	Guest	Miller (IL)
Burgess	Guthrie	Miller (WV)
Calvert	Hagedorn	Miller-Meeks
Cammack	Harris	Moolenaar
Carl	Harshbarger	Mooney
Carter (GA)	Hartzler	Moore (AL)
Carter (TX)	Hern	Moore (UT)
Cawthorn	Herrell	Mullin
Chabot	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (NC)
Cheney	Hice (GA)	Nehls
Cline	Higgins (LA)	Newhouse
Cloud	Hill	Norman
Cole	Hinson	Nunes
Comer	Hollingsworth	Obernolte
Crawford	Hudson	Owens
Crenshaw	Huizenga	Palazzo
Curtis	Issa	Palmer
Davidson	Jackson	Pence
Davis, Rodney	Jacobs (NY)	Perry
DesJarlais	Johnson (LA)	Pfleger
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)	Posey
Donalds	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Duncan	Jordan	Reschenthaler
Dunn	Joyce (OH)	Rice (SC)
Emmer	Joyce (PA)	Rodgers (WA)
Estes	Katko	Rogers (AL)
Fallon	Keller	Rogers (KY)
Feenstra	Kelly (MS)	Rose
Ferguson	Kelly (PA)	Rosendale
Fischbach	Kim (CA)	Rouzer
Fitzgerald	Kinzing	Roy

Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik

NAYS—215

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaunier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden

NOT VOTING—5

Clyde
Gibbs

Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne

Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

□ 1719

Messrs. PANETTA and PETERS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. STEWART, POSEY, NUNES, and FEENSTRA changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 128.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)	Langevin	Payne (Pallone)
Barragán (Beyer)	(Lynch)	Porter (Wexton)
Cárdenas	Lawson (FL)	Rush
(Gallego)	(Evans)	(Underwood)
Costa (Correa)	Leger Fernandez	Sewell (DelBene)
Crenshaw	(Jacobs (CA))	Moulton
(Fallon)	Lieu (Beyer)	Stefanik (Katko)
Donalds	Lowenthal	Trahan (Lynch)
(Cammack)	(Beyer)	Watson Coleman
Gonzalez (OH)	Meng (Clark	(Pallone)
(Timmons)	(MA))	Welch
Gosar (Greene	Mfume	(McGovern)
(GA))	(Connolly)	Wilson (FL)
Grijalva (García	Moulton	(Hayes)
(IL))	(Perlmutter)	Wilson (SC)
Khanna (Gomez)	Napolitano	(Timmons)
Kirkpatrick	(Correa)	
(Stanton)	Omar (Bush)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TLAIB). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 207, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—217

Adams	Cohen	Gomez
Aguilar	Connolly	Gonzalez,
Allred	Cooper	Vicente
Auchincloss	Correa	Gotthelmer
Axne	Costa	Green, Al (TX)
Barragán	Courtney	Grijalva
Bass	Craig	Harder (CA)
Beatty	Crist	Hayes
Bera	Crow	Higgins (NY)
Beyer	Cuellar	Himes
Bishop (GA)	Davids (KS)	Horsford
Blumenauer	Davis, Danny K.	Houlahan
Blunt Rochester	Dean	Hoyer
Bonamici	DeFazio	Huffman
Bourdeaux	DeGette	Jackson Lee
Bowman	DeLauro	Jacobs (CA)
Boyle, Brendan	DelBene	Jayapal
F.	Delgado	Jeffries
Brown	Demings	Johnson (GA)
Brownley	DeSaunier	Johnson (TX)
Bush	Deutch	Jones
Bustos	Dingell	Kahele
Butterfield	Doggett	Kaptur
Carbajal	Doyle, Michael	Keating
Cárdenas	F.	Kelly (IL)
Carson	Escobar	Khanna
Cartwright	Eshoo	Kildee
Case	Espallat	Kilmer
Casten	Evans	Kim (NJ)
Castor (FL)	Fletcher	Kind
Castro (TX)	Foster	Kirkpatrick
Chu	Frankel, Lois	Krishnamoorthi
Cicilline	Gallego	Kuster
Clark (MA)	Garamendi	Lamb
Clarke (NY)	Garcia (IL)	Langevin
Cleaver	Garcia (TX)	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Golden	Larson (CT)

Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross

O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman

NAYS—207

Aderholt	Franklin, C.	Long
Allen	Scott	Loudermilk
Amodei	Fulcher	Lucas
Armstrong	Gaetz	Luetkemeyer
Arrington	Gallagher	Mace
Babin	Garbarino	Malliotakis
Bacon	Garcia (CA)	Mann
Baird	Jimenez	Massie
Balderson	Gohmert	Mast
Banks	Gonzales, Tony	McCarthy
Barr	Gonzalez (OH)	McClain
Bentz	Good (VA)	McClintock
Bergman	Gooden (TX)	McHenry
Bice (OK)	Gosar	McKinley
Biggs	Granger	Meijer
Billakis	Graves (LA)	Meuser
Bishop (NC)	Graves (MO)	Miller (IL)
Boebert	Green (TN)	Miller-Meeks
Bost	Greene (GA)	Moolenaar
Brooks	Griffith	Mooney
Buchanan	Grothman	Moore (AL)
Buck	Guest	Moore (UT)
Bucshon	Guthrie	Mullin
Budd	Hagedorn	Murphy (NC)
Burchett	Harris	Nehls
Burgess	Harshbarger	Newhouse
Calvert	Hartzler	Norman
Cammack	Hern	Nunes
Carl	Herrell	Obernolte
Carter (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Owens
Carter (TX)	Hice (GA)	Palazzo
Cawthorn	Higgins (LA)	Palmer
Chabot	Hill	Pence
Cheney	Hinson	Perry
Cline	Hollingsworth	Pfluger
Cloud	Hudson	Posey
Cole	Huizenga	Reed
Comer	Issa	Reschenthaler
Crawford	Jackson	Rice (SC)
Crenshaw	Jacobs (NY)	Rodgers (WA)
Curtis	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Davidson	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (SD)	Rose
DesJarlais	Jordan	Rosendale
Diaz-Balart	Joyce (OH)	Rouzer
Donalds	Joyce (PA)	Roy
Duncan	Katko	Rutherford
Dunn	Keller	Salazar
Emmer	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Estes	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Fallon	Kim (CA)	Scott, Austin
Feenstra	Kinziger	Sessions
Ferguson	Kustoff	Simpson
Fischbach	LaHood	Smith (MO)
Fitzgerald	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Fitzpatrick	Lamborn	Smucker
Fleischmann	Latta	Spartz
Fortenberry	LaTurner	Stauber
Fox	Lesko	Steel
	Letlow	

Stefanik	Turner	Webster (FL)	Cicilline	Johnson (SD)	Pascrell	Welch	Williams (GA)	Wittman
Steil	Upton	Wenstrup	Clarke (NY)	Johnson (TX)	Payne	Wenstrup	Williams (TX)	Womack
Steube	Valadao	Westerman	Cleaver	Jones	Pence	Wexton	Wilson (FL)	Yarmuth
Stewart	Van Drew	Williams (TX)	Cline	Jordan	Perlmutter	Wild	Wilson (SC)	
Stivers	Van Duyn	Wilson (SC)	Clyburn	Joyce (OH)	Perry			
Taylor	Wagner	Wittman	Cohen	Joyce (PA)	Peters			
Tenney	Walberg	Womack	Comer	Kahele	Pfluger			
Thompson (PA)	Walorski	Young	Connolly	Kaptur	Phillips			
Tiffany	Waltz	Zeldin	Cooper	Katko	Pingree			
Timmons	Weber (TX)		Correa	Keating	Pocan			

NOT VOTING—5

Brady	Gibbs	Smith (NE)
Clyde	Miller (WV)	

□ 1750

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, I was denied my vote, by being held up illegally by the person in front of me in the metal detector—they kept wandering him. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 129.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)	Langevin	Payne (Pallone)
Barragán (Beyer)	(Lynch)	Porter (Wexton)
Cárdenas	Lawson (FL)	Rush
(Gallego)	(Evans)	(Underwood)
Costa (Correa)	Leger Fernandez	Sewell (DelBene)
Crenshaw	(Jacobs (CA))	Speier (Scanlon)
(Fallon)	Lieu (Beyer)	Stefanik (Katko)
Donalds	Lowenthal	Trahan (Lynch)
(Cammack)	(Beyer)	Watson Coleman
Gonzalez (OH)	Meng (Clark)	(Pallone)
(Timmons)	(MA))	Welch
Gosar (Greene)	Mfume	(McGovern)
(GA)	(Connolly)	Wilson (FL)
Grijalva (Garcia)	Moulton	(Hayes)
(IL))	(Perlmutter)	Wilson (SC)
Khanna (Gomez)	Napolitano	(Timmons)
Kirkpatrick	(Correa)	
(Stanton)	Omar (Bush)	

PROTECTION OF SAUDI DISSIDENTS ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1392) to protect Saudi dissidents in the United States, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 350, nays 71, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—350

Adams	Bilirakis	Bush
Aderholt	Bishop (GA)	Bustos
Aguilar	Bishop (NC)	Butterfield
Allred	Blumenauer	Carbajal
Amodel	Blunt Rochester	Cárdenas
Auchincloss	Bonamici	Carl
Axne	Bost	Carson
Bacon	Bourdeaux	Carter (GA)
Barr	Bowman	Cartwright
Barragán	Boyle, Brendan	Case
Bass	F.	Casten
Beatty	Brown	Castor (FL)
Bentz	Brownley	Castro (TX)
Bera	Buchanan	Cawthorn
Bergman	Bucshon	Chabot
Beyer	Burchett	Chu

Cicilline	Johnson (SD)	Pascrell
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (TX)	Payne
Cleaver	Jones	Pence
Cline	Jordan	Perlmutter
Clyburn	Joyce (OH)	Perry
Cohen	Joyce (PA)	Peters
Comer	Kahele	Pfluger
Connolly	Kaptur	Phillips
Cooper	Katko	Pingree
Correa	Keating	Pocan
Costa	Keller	Porter
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Pressley
Craig	Kelly (PA)	Price (NC)
Crawford	Khanna	Quigley
Crist	Kim (CA)	Raskin
Crow	Kilmer	Reed
Cuellar	Kim (NJ)	Rice (NY)
Curtis	Kind	Rodgers (WA)
Davids (KS)	Kinzinger	Rogers (AL)
Davis, Danny K.	Kirkpatrick	Rogers (KY)
Dean	Krishnamoorthi	Rose
DeFazio	Kuster	Rosendale
DeGette	Kustoff	Ross
DeLauro	LaHood	Roybal-Allard
DelBene	Lamb	Ruiz
Delgado	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Demings	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Deutch	Larson (CT)	Rutherford
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Ryan
Dingell	LaTurner	Salazar
Doggett	Lawrence	Sánchez
Doyle, Michael	Lawson (FL)	Sarbanes
F.	Lee (CA)	Scalise
Duncan	Lee (NV)	Scanlon
Emmer	Leger Fernandez	Schakowsky
Escobar	Letlow	Schiff
Españillat	Levin (CA)	Schneider
Estes	Levin (MI)	Schrader
Evans	Lieu	Schrier
Feenstra	Lofgren	Schweikert
Ferguson	Long	Scott (VA)
Fischbach	Lowenthal	Scott, Austin
Fitzgerald	Lucas	Scott, David
Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer	Sewell
Fleischmann	Luria	Sherman
Fletcher	Lynch	Sherrill
Fortenberry	Mace	Simpson
Foster	Malinowski	Sires
Fox	Malliotakis	Slotkin
Frankel, Lois	Maloney	Smith (MO)
Franklin, C.	Maloney, B.	Smith (NJ)
Scott	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)
Fulcher	Mann	Smucker
Gallagher	Manning	Soto
Gallego	Massie	Spanberger
Garamendi	Matsui	Spartz
Garcia (IL)	McBath	Speier
Garcia (TX)	McCarthy	Stanton
Jimenez	McCaul	Stauber
Golden	McClintock	Steel
Gomez	McCollum	Steil
Gonzales, Tony	McEachin	Steube
Gonzalez (OH)	McGovern	Stevens
Gonzalez,	McHenry	Stewart
Vicente	McKinley	Stivers
Gottheimer	McNerney	Strickland
Graves (LA)	Meeks	Suozzi
Graves (MO)	Meijer	Swalwell
Green (TN)	Meng	Takano
Green, Al (TX)	Meuser	Tenney
Grijalva	Mfume	Thompson (CA)
Grothman	Miller (WV)	Thompson (MS)
Guest	Miller-Meeks	Thompson (PA)
Guthrie	Moolenaar	Tiffany
Hagedorn	Moore (AL)	Timmons
Harder (CA)	Moore (UT)	Titus
Harshbarger	Moore (WI)	Tlaib
Hartzler	Morelle	Tonko
Hayes	Moulton	Torres (CA)
Herrera Beutler	Mrvan	Torres (NY)
Higgins (NY)	Murphy (FL)	Trahan
Hill	Murphy (NC)	Trone
Himes	Nader	Turner
Hollingsworth	Napolitano	Underwood
Horsford	Neal	Upton
Houlahan	Neguse	Valadao
Hoyer	Nehls	Vargas
Hudson	Newhouse	Veasey
Huffman	Newman	Vela
Huizenga	Norcross	Velázquez
Issa	O'Halleran	Wagner
Jackson Lee	Oberholte	Walberg
Jacobs (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Walorski
Jacobs (NY)	Omar	Waltz
Jayapal	Owens	Wasserman
Jeffries	Pallone	Schultz
Johnson (GA)	Panetta	Waters
Johnson (LA)	Pappas	Watson Coleman
Johnson (OH)		Webster (FL)

NAYS—71

Allen	Donalds	Mast
Armstrong	Dunn	McClain
Arrington	Fallon	Miller (IL)
Babin	Gaetz	Mooney
Baird	Garcia (CA)	Mullin
Balderson	Gohmert	Norman
Banks	Good (VA)	Nunes
Bice (OK)	Gooden (TX)	Palazzo
Biggs	Gosar	Palmer
Boebert	Granger	Posey
Brady	Greene (GA)	Reschenthaler
Brooks	Griffith	Rice (SC)
Buck	Harris	Rouzer
Budd	Hern	Roy
Burgess	Herrell	Sessions
Calvert	Hice (GA)	Stefanik
Cammack	Higgins (LA)	Taylor
Carter (TX)	Hinson	Van Drew
Cheney	Jackson	Van Duyn
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Weber (TX)
Cole	LaMalfa	Westerman
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Young
Davidson	Lesko	Zeldin
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	

NOT VOTING—8

Clark (MA)	DeSaulnier	Gibbs
Clyde	Eshoo	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Garbarino	

□ 1822

Mrs. McCLAIN, Messrs. BAIRD and PALMER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)	Langevin	Payne (Pallone)
Barragán (Beyer)	(Lynch)	Porter (Wexton)
Cárdenas	Lawson (FL)	Rush
(Gallego)	(Evans)	(Underwood)
Costa (Correa)	Leger Fernandez	Sewell (DelBene)
Crenshaw	(Jacobs (CA))	Speier (Scanlon)
(Fallon)	Lieu (Beyer)	Stefanik (Katko)
Donalds	Lowenthal	Trahan (Lynch)
(Cammack)	(Beyer)	Watson Coleman
Gonzalez (OH)	Meng (Clark)	(Pallone)
(Timmons)	(MA))	Welch
Gosar (Greene)	Mfume	(McGovern)
(GA)	(Connolly)	Wilson (FL)
Grijalva (Garcia)	Moulton	(Hayes)
(IL))	(Perlmutter)	Wilson (SC)
Khanna (Gomez)	Napolitano	(Timmons)
Kirkpatrick	(Correa)	
(Stanton)	Omar (Bush)	

ELECTING THE SERGEANT-AT-ARMS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 339

Resolved, That William Joseph Walker of Maryland be, and is hereby, chosen Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives, effective April 26, 2021.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR THE HOOSIERS KILLED AND INJURED IN THE SHOOTING AT THE FEDEX FACILITY IN INDIANAPOLIS

(Mr. CARSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today, joined by my fellow congressional colleagues from Indiana, as well as our two Senators, to honor the eight Hoosiers we lost in last week's senseless shooting at the FedEx facility in Indianapolis. We also honor those who were injured and pray that they have a fast and speedy recovery.

The deceased were our friends, family, and neighbors. They had hopes, Madam Speaker, dreams, and plans for the future, only to have their lives tragically cut short. And, sadly, they are part of a much larger group of Hoosiers and Americans we have lost to gun violence.

As our community and our State grieve, and as we seek to move forward, we pledge to never forget those we lost in this shooting and any other senseless act of violence. Their legacies will live on through our efforts to save lives in the future.

Hoosiers are resilient, Madam Speaker, and we will continue working hard to create safer communities across America, always carrying the memory of those we lost in our hearts. We will never forget them.

Please join us for a moment of silence.

□ 1830

HONORING JUANA SEQUEIRA SOLIS

(Mr. GOMEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in memory of Juana Sequeira Solis, who passed away in April at the age of 94. Juana was the mother of former Congresswoman, former Secretary of Labor, and now L.A. County Supervisor Hilda Solis.

Juana was born in 1926 in Nicaragua, the eldest of five. She immigrated to America when she was just 18, in search of a better life.

After moving to Los Angeles, Juana met her late husband, Raul Solis, while taking citizenship classes. They raised seven children and taught them the values that define who we are as Americans: the importance of community, education, and respect for our environment.

Juana spent over 20 years on the assembly line at Mattel and was an active union member with the United Rubber Workers until her retirement in 1991.

Let us always remember Juana for her kindness, determination, and fighting spirit.

CELEBRATING CORPUS CHRISTI ARMY DEPOT'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. CLOUD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Corpus Christi Army Depot, which celebrates its 60th anniversary today.

CCAD is the premier rotary-winged helicopter repair and maintenance facility for the U.S. Army.

Like a battle-hardened soldier, CCAD remains strong, committed, and dedicated to answering the Nation's call and keeping the Army flag flying.

The freedom and security that Americans enjoy today are a direct result of the hard work and continuing commitment of CCAD to the mission given by the U.S. Army.

Thousands of military, civilian, and contractor employees have walked the halls, worked in the hangars, turned the wrenches, flown the aircraft, and dedicated themselves to the operation that began in 1961.

The community leaders and citizens of Corpus Christi, Texas, recognize and appreciate the service of all personnel of CCAD, past and present.

We salute this great organization's unending mission. I wish the Corpus Christi Army Depot a happy 60th birthday today.

CELEBRATING EARTH DAY

(Mr. MCEACHIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCEACHIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today as the proud sponsor of the resolution honoring Earth Day.

For over 50 years, people have come together on April 22, which is tomorrow, to support protections for our air, water, and land, and to increase appreciation for Mother Earth.

But every day, not just on Earth Day, we must commit ourselves to protecting our planet. We must embrace our shared responsibility to preserve our Earth, not only by increasing environmental and climate literacy but by building upon efforts like the Paris Agreement to ensure that future generations inherit a livable, sustainable, and ecologically rich planet.

Throughout the past year, the COVID-19 pandemic has devastated our Nation. However, our natural environment, including parks and green spaces, has been a haven for communities to come together safely.

This past year has reinforced the importance of protecting these natural spaces and ensuring the continued cleaning and greening of all communities.

Like those who celebrated the first Earth Day in 1970, tomorrow we must continue our work to address environmental challenges, large and small, from climate change to litter; to edu-

cate friends, neighbors, and elected representatives about the need for year-round action; and to honor the stewardship ethic that serves as the foundation of this special day.

Together, we can protect our planet, public health, and overall well-being of all people and wildlife.

ENACTING GREEN NEW DEAL WILL DESTROY JOBS

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, just yesterday, the squad and other Democrats reintroduced the socialist Green New Deal.

This dangerous proposal costs over \$90 trillion and will destroy thousands of American jobs. But Speaker PELOSI and President Biden have no intention of stopping it. In fact, they are planning to use their partisan infrastructure package as a vehicle to enact several Green New Deal priorities.

While details of what they consider infrastructure, and I use that term loosely, are not finalized, it does not inspire confidence that the Democrats are already turning away from regular order, which requires bipartisanship to get the bill through Congress.

Here is what we know about the package so far. It advances \$600 billion to Green New Deal priorities. Only 5 percent will go toward roads and bridges and 2 percent for airways, waterways, and ports. They are planning the largest tax hike since 1968 to pay for their agenda, and an estimate from the National Association of Manufacturers shows that their proposed corporate tax hike would cost 1 million jobs.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL DAY OF SILENCE

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Day of Silence this Friday, April 23.

It is a day when people around the country and in my community on the central coast of California take a vow of silence to raise awareness surrounding the many hurdles that LGBTQ youth face.

One of those students will be Lucia Umeki-Martinez. Lucia is a gay woman of color and a student leader at Watsonville High School. As co-class president and member of the Sexuality and Gender Acceptance Club, Lucia works to build bridges between her classmates and community.

She told me that taking the vow of silence for 1 day was her way of paying tribute to those who have been silenced by homophobia and hatred. It also is a way to show solidarity to those, like Lucia, who have ever felt unwelcome or

unsafe in an environment where they are supposed to thrive.

Countless students across this country will take the vow of silence on Friday for the same reasons as Lucia. That is why we as leaders must continue to step up every day to ensure that all Americans, whoever they are, are accepted and respected.

VOICING CONCERN ABOUT SOUTHERN BORDER

(Mr. HERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HERN. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to give voice to the concern of millions of Americans, the crisis at our southern border.

I saw it for myself. Not only are our facilities packed to 10 times beyond capacity, but the influx is growing.

Biden revoked Trump's effective border policies and put nothing in place to make up for it, creating the current crisis that is spiraling out of control.

We need to send immediate aid to our Border Patrol. They need it.

But here is what Congress is doing instead:

We are voting to provide legal welfare services to people illegally in our country while millions of Americans are denied help.

We are voting on D.C. statehood, a violation of the constitutional function of our Capital City.

The Speaker pushed 16 bills together in an en bloc last night, preventing Members of Congress from voting on separate pieces of legislation.

The American people are watching what we do here. They see unserious people doing unserious work. It is why our approval rating is so poor. It is time to stop letting them down and do something real.

PREVENTING DISCRIMINATION

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1333, the NO BAN Act, of which I am an original cosponsor and which passed the House earlier today. I thank and salute our good friend JUDY CHU as well as Chairman NADLER and the Speaker for their leadership in bringing this to the floor.

This bill strengthens the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of religion and restores the separation of powers by limiting overly broad executive actions.

President Biden's recent executive order overturned Donald Trump's racist and discriminatory ban, but we need to ensure that broad, xenophobic policies that are not based on actual national security concerns do not ever go into effect again.

Make no mistake, the NO BAN Act would help ensure that this kind of dis-

crimination ceases, prevent future such discrimination, and promote our Nation's core value of religious freedom.

The Muslim and African bans were an abuse of Presidential authority and based off of hateful campaign promises. The ban separated parents from their children and spouses from one another. This bill begins to repair the damage of the past 4 years.

OPPOSING BIDEN INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN

(Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the \$2¼ trillion boondoggle my colleagues across the aisle are trying to pass off as an infrastructure bill.

Sadly, this bill is a socialist wish list. Less than 8 percent of President Biden's infrastructure plan goes to roads, bridges, waterways, ports, and airports.

What it does include is \$400 billion for home-based caregivers. While that may be a good issue for review, it is not infrastructure.

This comes as no surprise, considering D.C. Democrats are trying to lump a radical, progressive agenda into a so-called infrastructure bill. Still, the leftist fringe that has highjacked what used to be the Democratic Party doesn't think it goes far enough.

Madam Speaker, we spent trillions of dollars on COVID recovery and unrelated measures. Now is not the time for a socialist wish list. Americans need a strong economy and real infrastructure, and they need it now.

ALLOWING CHILD TAX CREDIT TO EXPIRE IS MISJUDGMENT

(Mr. TORRES of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, according to The Washington Post, the administration plans to propose only a temporary rather than a permanent expansion of the child tax credit.

Allowing the child tax credit to expire in 2025 is a colossal misjudgment whose consequences we could live to regret.

We cannot and should not be the party that cuts child poverty in half only until 2025. We should and must be the party that champions a permanent breakthrough against child poverty.

Instead of making the most of our FDR and LBJ moment, we are in danger of inexplicably putting an expiration date on our own legacy. Did President Roosevelt put an expiration date on Social Security? Did President Johnson put an expiration date on Medicare? Why should we put an expiration date on the Social Security and Medicare of our own time?

I urge President Biden to make his greatest achievement a permanent legacy.

REVIEWING DEMOCRATS' INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, with so much talk about infrastructure in the air lately, let's do a quick review.

The last sizeable infrastructure bill was done in 2015, to the cost of about \$300 billion. Now, what we see is a so-called infrastructure plan put out by the Biden administration and the House and Senate Democrats nine times that size, \$2.7 trillion.

We can probably find that much infrastructure to do, except there is a whole lot in this bill that is not infrastructure. Much is social spending and other things that might be good in a different bill, but not this bill.

Also, in order to pay for it, they would seek to dismantle the 2017 tax reforms that did so much to promote and boost our economy and bring jobs back to the United States. It unleashed record growth. Instead, we would hurt that economy by what is in the plan.

How about, instead of tax hikes to cover what is essentially socialist spending tucked into a bill being labeled as infrastructure, let's focus on the work needing done: highways, bridges, levees, dams for water storage, and broadband. These are the things people need and can actively use. What they don't need are choking taxes that harm our economy.

STIFLING PROGRESS WITH FILIBUSTER

(Ms. NEWMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. NEWMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the millions of Americans who are outraged as they witness mass shooting after mass shooting, with no action from their government; the millions of Americans who are struggling to make ends meet every day, while their government hasn't raised the minimum wage in a decade, so they are struggling more than ever; and, similarly, Americans who are fighting for equality and civil rights while they see nothing being done in Congress.

Every single week, this House passes legislation that is overwhelmingly popular among Americans, yet not one of these bills has seen the light of day because of the filibuster. It is truly a death grip on our democracy.

The filibuster is being used by a handful of people to stifle progress that Americans overwhelmingly want, progress that would ban pay discrimination, progress that would protect our unions, progress that would protect voters' rights, progress that would literally save lives by passing common-sense gun reform.

It is past time we get rid of the filibuster as it is today. The filibuster

should not take precedence over American lives.

I thank the gentleman who just spoke about our great bill that is coming up because it is wonderful that all those ideas are in there, so I am so glad we are on the same page.

□ 1845

HONORING DARREN CRUZAN

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Assistant Director Darren Cruzan for his outstanding career as assistant director for National Capital Region Training Operations at the Department of Homeland Security, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, FLETC, in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Cruzan has had a long distinguished career as a Federal, local, and Tribal law enforcement official. His law enforcement career began in 1992, as a reserve patrol officer with the Joplin, Missouri Police Department. As he rose through the ranks of law enforcement from police officer to criminal investigator, Mr. Cruzan's service has always focused on the critical needs of Indian Country, especially law enforcement training for police, corrections, and telecommunications officers.

In 2017, the Secretary of the Interior honored Mr. Cruzan with the Department of Interior's Distinguished Service Award, the highest recognition an employee within the Department can receive for his outstanding contributions.

During his time, he has provided FLETC with tremendous executive leadership and management. Mr. Cruzan has dedicated his life to protecting others, and I thank him for his years of service.

TRIBUTE TO THE FAMILY OF GEORGE FLOYD

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to George Floyd's family, a family that I have come to know even more than the time we spent together in Houston, Texas.

The family grew up in my congressional district, and they lived in what is called Cuney Homes, which stands today proud, as I know they are, of this family. And they, of course, went to the famous Jack Yates High School.

Why would I pay tribute to this family?

Because I think America has come to see them as America's family, and the world has come to admire them for their steadfastness, their passion and compassion, as well as their calm and peaceful understanding of the crisis and the terrible tragedy that has be-

fallen them. They have acted in generosity. They have prayed. They have embraced those who have come to honor them. They realize the symbol that they stand for, yet they were hurting—hurting and hurting.

Thank goodness for the decision yesterday, the judgment, the just justice for them, for they are America's family; and their commitment is that they will continue to serve this country to bring about justice for all.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS CELEBRATES THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE ALCEE L. HASTINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MANNING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening for the Congressional Black Caucus' Special Order hour, the CBC's Celebration of Life of Congressman Alcee L. Hastings, and to echo: Our Power, Our Message.

The Special Order hour is generally regarded as a solemn moment and gives the yCBC an opportunity to speak directly to the American people and to reflect on ideas and policies critical to our constituents.

I can't think of a better way to share the life and legacy of our friend and colleague. To his family, to Patricia, to his son, Alcee—or "Jody," as we called him—to his daughter, granddaughters, and all watching, we say: Thank you for sharing Alcee with us.

Lastly, on behalf of the 56 members of the Congressional Black Caucus, we say: Thank you, Alcee, for a job well done.

Because it is without a doubt I can tell you that Alcee left this place, the people's House, better than he found it. All of us were enriched by his dapper style, his keen intellect, and his larger-than-life presence. You never had to guess what Alcee thought or believed. He made it clear, whether you liked it or not. But he was the same man on the United States House floor; in the powerful Rules Committee; or in greeting foreign dignitaries under the auspices of the Helsinki Commission as he was on the streets of Florida, where he served his constituents so well.

Madam Speaker, to all gathered here today, I say to our brother: You will be sorely missed.

We will miss his smile. We will miss his wise counsel. And as I look to my left, in that chair, where he sat faith-

fully, we salute and honor him. Alcee did it his way.

Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield tonight's anchor of the Special Order hour paying tribute to a legend, to a friend, to a colleague, to the gentlewoman from Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE got to know Congressman Alcee Hastings in a very special way. Both scholars, both liking to debate, both being very clear in their message, both members of the Congressional Black Caucus. Oh, how great it was to watch Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE and Congressman Alcee Hastings take on an issue and mentor someone like me.

Madam Speaker, with great pleasure I turn the microphone over to Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who will manage the rest of the hour, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, with humility, gratitude, and a broken heart, I rise to anchor this Congressional Black Caucus Special Order in remembrance of Congressman Alcee Hastings, senior member of the Committee on Rules, a man who travelled the world leading congressional delegations to defend, protect, and strengthen democracies while serving as Chair of the Helsinki Commission, a highly respected and valued member of the Congressional Black Caucus, one of this House's greatest debaters, one of the first three African Americans elected to this body from Florida since Reconstruction, a member of Congress for 28 years, my mentor, a beloved colleague, and dear friend who died Tuesday, April 6, 2021, at the age of 84.

Madam Speaker, Alcee Hastings, who was affectionately referred to by his colleagues and constituents as "Judge Hastings," was a statesman and strong supporter of equality, economic and social justice, civil rights, Israel, and human dignity for all.

He took to heart and lived the admonition he received from his father as a young child "Be your own boss man," who through it all was his own man as he blazed trails and pioneered paths to improve the lives and life chances of the was so honored to serve.

Alcee Lamar Hastings was born September 5, 1936, in Altamonte Springs, to Julius Hastings, a butler, and Mildred nee Merritt, a maid.

His parents left Florida to find jobs to earn money for Alcee's education, during which time he was raised by his maternal grandmother and attended Crooms Academy in Sanford, Florida, which was founded for African-American students, graduating in 1953.

Five years later, Alcee Hastings graduated from Fisk University with dual majors in zoology and botany.

Alcee Hastings started law school at Howard University before transferring to Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University in Tallahassee, from which he received his law degree in 1963.

Always a fighter and foot soldier for justice, Alcee Hastings was involved in early civil rights struggles, including the famous sit-ins in drugstore lunch-counters in North Carolina in 1959.

About those times, he later said: "Those were the early days of the civil rights movement, and the people in Walgreens were breaking eggs on our heads and throwing

mustard and ketchup and salt at us. We sat there taking all of that."

"After graduating from Florida A&M law school, Alcee Hastings went into private practice as a civil rights lawyer in Fort Lauderdale, but when he first arrived a motel refused to rent him a room; a humiliating experience inflicted on African Americans whenever they traveled in the United States before passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

As a civil rights lawyer, Alcee Hastings successfully filed lawsuits to desegregate the public schools in Broward County, Florida, as well as the Cat's Meow, a restaurant that was popular with white lawyers and judges but would not serve African Americans.

It was poetic justice indeed when then Florida Governor Reuben Askew appointed Alcee Hastings to the circuit court of Broward County in 1977 and held the investiture ceremony at a high school he had helped desegregate.

In 1979, Alcee Hastings was nominated by President Jimmy Carter to serve as United States District Judge on the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, becoming the first African American federal judge in Florida; he was confirmed by the U.S. Senate on October 31, 1979, sworn in on November 2, 1979, and served for a decade until leaving the bench in October 1989.

As a judge, Alcee Hastings established his own style, eschewing the typical judicial mien of grave reserve; he cracked jokes from the bench, dropped slang in rulings and interviews, and was unflinching in his support for the poor and the dispossessed.

In 1981, Judge Hastings exasperated the Department of Justice when he extended a court order blocking the deportation of 76 Haitians after the Immigration and Naturalization Service had stepped up removals.

Many thought that with his departure from the federal bench, Alcee Hastings's career in public service had come to end but they underestimated this irrepressible and indomitable human being, who never forgot the lesson taught him years ago by his father: "Be your own boss man!"

So three years later, in 1992, Alcee Hastings ran for Congress from the newly created 23rd Congressional District of Florida and won election in November of that year and, along with Congresswomen-elect Carrie Meek and Corrine Brown, became the first African Americans elected to Congress since Reconstruction, where he would go to be a productive and constructive member as Dean of the Florida Congressional Delegation, Vice-Chair of the Committee on Rules, and Vice-Chair and senior member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

One of the great joys of my life was serving with Alcee Hastings when he chaired the Helsinki Commission, the Organization for Cooperation and Security in Europe, and we traveled often to distant capitals to meet with our counter-parts in Europe and work on ways to strengthen economic and political ties and support their democratic aspirations.

Alcee Hastings was held in such high esteem by international legislators that he was elected the first African American president of the 323-member OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, an institution of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe charged with facilitating inter-parliamentary dialogue, an important aspect of the overall effort to meet the challenges of democracy throughout the OSCE area.

Madam Speaker, in these days of trial and challenge, I am reminded that our dear departed colleague Alcee Hastings always counseled us to remain steadfast, saying:

"Continuing to do nothing in the face of continued threats to our people and our way of life is hardly what the American people elected us to do."

Alcee Hastings, the recipient of numerous honors and awards bestowed on him from organizations both at home and abroad, firmly believed that progress and change can be achieved through mutual respect and appreciation, and that individuals and communities can see beyond the limits of parochialism, enabling them to better understand each other.

And we all know how proud he was to be a Nupe, a member of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc., and a member of the National Bar Association.

Alcee Hastings' commanding presence will forever be missed; we all mourn his loss and extend our deepest sympathies to his wife Patricia Williams; his children, Alcee Hastings II, Chelsea Hastings and Leigh Hastings; his stepdaughter, Maisha; and all the relatives and friends who loved him so dearly.

My deepest sympathies go out to them, and I pray they find consolation in the certain knowledge that the Judge is now resting in the Heavenly Chorus.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring the life and legacy of our dearly departed friend and colleague Congressman Alcee Hastings, who passed away earlier this month.

Alcee and I were both elected to Congress in 1992. We were part of a historic class of new African American lawmakers from the South. Few would make such a tremendous and impactful mark on this institution than Alcee Hastings. He was one of Congress' most steadfast advocates for civil and human rights, working families, and the most vulnerable in our society.

He bravely battled pancreatic cancer for the last year and a half. And despite this devastating diagnosis, Alcee remained a powerful and active voice for his constituents and the state of Florida.

I will miss seeing him on the House floor. I will miss his sharp-witted questioning in the House Rules Committee. I will miss his friendship.

Madam Speaker, our nation lost one of its most dedicated public servants. And in Alcee Hastings, we lost one of our most unique, friendly and hardest working colleagues. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife Patricia, children, staff, constituents and many, many friends.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor our friend and colleague, Alcee Hastings—a pillar of our Congressional Black Caucus.

Congressman Hastings was a compassionate leader who always spoke his mind and served his constituents with purpose.

For nearly thirty years, he used his position in Congress to speak truth to power and advocate for our country's most vulnerable.

I admired both his courage and his unique ability to bring reason and deep thought to the many conversations we had together. He was a friend and mentor we all respected.

One thing I'll never forget about Congressman Hastings is his wonderful sense of style, his fun, colorful socks, and—I have to say—his great taste in hats.

And, while he will be deeply missed here in Congress and within our Caucus, we will carry on in his memory by advocating for the causes he dedicated his life to—supporting working families, communities of color, children, immigrants and all those in need.

His legacy as a civil rights activist, judge, and powerful, passionate leader in Congress will live on, and be a model for us all.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Congressman Alcee Hastings.

Congressman Hastings spent more than 30 years in Congress and fought for racial equality during his storied and historic life. At the time of his passing, he was the Dean of the Florida Congressional delegation as the Representative from Florida's 20th District. Before that, he was Florida's first African-American federal judge and a strong civil rights advocate. Congressman Hastings died on April 6, 2021 after a long bout with pancreatic cancer.

Congressman Hastings was a life-long public servant. He served as a Circuit Court Judge in Broward County, Florida and then became a U.S. District Court Judge for the Southern District of Florida. After his election to Congress in 1992, Congressman Hastings was a leading member of the Congressional Black Caucus and a senior Democratic whip. He served as a member of the House Rules Committee and a senior member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, where he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. He was an esteemed member of Congress throughout his time there.

Personally, I am devastated at the loss of my colleague and mentor, the Honorable Alcee Hastings. We would talk about his time spent in Newark as a child and his fond memories of growing up there. While voting, I would spend many days sitting next to him and listening to the wisdom he imparted on me. His blunt honesty and brilliance as a legislator were second to none. We even shared our love of colorful socks. The Lord has another one of my Fathers on the Floor of Congress with him no and I will miss him dearly.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS CELEBRATES THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE ALCEE L. HASTINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman so very much for yielding tonight, and I thank her for establishing the uniqueness of this Special Order.

It is a special Special Order in tribute and in remembrance of Alcee Lamar Hastings, a tireless fighter for justice and equality, dean of the Florida Congressional Delegation, former United States District Court judge, first African American elected to Congress from Florida since Reconstruction, vice chair of the Committee on Rules, and former member of the Intelligence Committee, chairman of the Helsinki Commission, Member of Congress for 28 years, mentor, beloved colleague, and dear friend.

Madam Speaker, tonight, with humility, gratitude and a broken heart, I rise to anchor this Congressional Black Caucus Special Order in remembrance of Congressman Alcee Hastings, a senior member of the Committee on Rules, a man who traveled the world. Most of all, he loved his family, he loved his country, he loved his State of Florida, loved his friends and his colleagues. We humble ourselves today to honor him.

Madam Speaker, I will reserve my words and tribute so that I can acknowledge one of his dear friends, the Honorable BENNIE THOMPSON. BENNIE THOMPSON, the chair of the Homeland Security Committee, a distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, a fighter for justice himself, but as well, the opportunity to be able to lead this country into safety.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), and if I might say, the gentleman with the white jacket as a member of the great Divine Nine, the Kappas.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman allowing me to talk about my friend, Alcee Hastings.

Madam Speaker, Alcee Hastings to a lot of us, is what we call a Renaissance man. When you knew Alcee, you knew somebody who knew exactly what he was talking about at all times. I carried Alcee Hastings to the Second District of Mississippi a number of times. You know, for a Florida boy, he could have been a Mississippi boy. He knew Bobby Rush, the blues singer. He knew how to go to catfish fries. He could just about adapt to any situation. But Alcee Hastings, more importantly, provided significant direction and guidance to a number of us who came to this body.

Madam Speaker, so today I rise to pay a special tribute to a close and dear friend that I shared many memories with: The Honorable Congressman Alcee Hastings.

Alcee was a champion civil rights legend, who served the people of Florida and this country for over 28 years as a Member of Congress. He dedicated his life to uplifting and empowering his constituents, colleagues, and our Nation. All of us have at least one Alcee Hastings story. Some of us have two or three or more Alcee Hastings stories, and they all are memorable.

All through my district, he was one of those individuals who people wanted to know what was Alcee Hastings like. And the only thing I can tell you is you have to meet him because you really can't describe him. The dictionary doesn't provide enough adjectives to give you who he is, but that is the kind of person Alcee Hastings was.

To Patricia and the kids: We all miss him. Absolutely, I know that all of you will miss him, too.

You know, I wonder what Alcee would be saying to us right now. I have a good idea. And he probably would say: "Look, I don't have time for all that noise. Get on with the business of helping our people."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those words of reminding us how forthright and direct Alcee Hastings was.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), distinguished majority leader of the House, who gave an eloquent portrayal this morning at our celebration service of his relationship with Congressman Hastings and his understanding of Congressman Hastings' contribution and value to all of us.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her service. I thank Chairwoman BEATTY and members of the Congressional Black Caucus for organizing this Special Order tonight.

Madam Speaker, Alcee Hastings was a dear friend, a close friend, a wonderful supporter, adviser, counselor, a friend who will be greatly missed not only by me, but by so many with whom he served on both sides of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, he and I served together in this House for 28 years, almost three decades. Over the course of that time, I came to know him very well. I visited his district. I know his wife. I saw his passion for public service, his sharp intellect and ability as a legislator, and his kindness and decency as a human being.

□ 1900

Alcee was someone who held strong convictions, as all of us know, and he would impart those to you, and he fought hard for what he believed in. One of those convictions was that all people on this Earth deserve the same basic freedoms and access to democracy as Americans are privileged to enjoy.

Madam Speaker, he and I served together on the U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and Alcee later served as its chairman, as I once did. He was the first African American to lead that body. And he was also honored, Madam Speaker, by legislators from 57 different nations when he was chosen as president of the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe's Parliamentary Assembly. The only American, the only African American, obviously, to have had that honor, and the only person of African descent to have that honor.

Before the pandemic, Alcee traveled the world to promote democracy and human rights where they were newly enjoyed or not yet achieved. Wherever he went, he brought his deep commitment to constitutionalism, rule of law, equality, justice, and opportunity for all.

In doing so, he was an excellent envoy of this House of Representatives, the people's House, and the democratic mission it embodies to the nations of the world.

I want to take a moment to speak about a part of Alcee's life that shows his true character. It is no secret that Alcee faced difficult and painful rebuke earlier in his career. I am not going to

go into the specifics. Most people know the outlines.

But what stands out, Madam Speaker, for me and for others more than anything about what happened is that most people, after having been through such an experience, might have turned away from public service and harbored a debilitating anger and self-pity. Not our friend Alcee Hastings.

He was determined to continue giving back and serving his State and his country. So he ran for Congress and received the imprimatur of his neighbors and friends and constituents as a person of great worth whom they wanted to represent them. He served his constituents faithfully and with great ability for 28 years and, indeed, prior to that as well.

Those he served and those with whom he served are grateful that he made that choice. We are grateful that he persisted and persevered. And we are so fortunate, Madam Speaker, to have been blessed in our own lives by the wonderful life of service and contributions by Alcee Hastings.

I join others in offering my condolences to his wife, Patricia; to his family; to his devoted staff; and to the communities of southern Florida he represented so skillfully in this House.

Another Representative of southern Florida, my dear friend, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, will be relating from her personal experience serving with him from southern Florida the extraordinary impact that he had on Florida and that region.

Madam Speaker, I spoke this morning at a memorial service led, again, by the Congressional Black Caucus for Alcee, and I related the story that a few days before his death, I had called Patricia and talked to her about how Alcee was doing, and she said: Not well.

Two days later, I called her back. It was probably 7 o'clock, about this time, in the evening. I said: How are things?

She said: Not good.

I said: Can I talk to him?

She said: I don't think he will understand you and I don't think he will be able to respond, but I will put the phone to his ear and you can say something to him.

She did that, and I said a few words very briefly, and then I closed with the sentiment that I have today and that I had for most of the time that I had known him. I said to him: I love you, Alcee.

I said this morning that I don't know whether he could hear or understand what I said at that point in time, but the good news for me is I knew that he knew that I loved him. He was a man of great worth, of great feelings, of great expectations, of great service, of great vision. I will miss Alcee, my friend.

May Alcee's memory be a blessing and inspiration to us as we continue to work here in this institution that he loved and served so well.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the majority leader for that

personal tribute of the bond of love between his friend, Alcee Hastings, and himself. I thank him for that story and tribute.

Madam Speaker, it is now an honor to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the co-chair of the Florida delegation, the cardinal of the Appropriations Committee, but I think this evening what she would most want to be known as, certainly a mentee of earlier years, but a very dear friend of Congressman Alcee Hastings.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor one of the foremost fighters for justice Florida has ever known, Congressman Alcee Hastings.

Throughout my public service, I have been proud to be associated with and stand alongside this fierce but gentle and courageous statesman. The shadow he casts in my own political life is long. It started at the University of Florida, when I ran for Student Senate side by side with his son, Alcee "Jody" Hastings, II. Twenty years later, I had the honor and pleasure of serving alongside his father, a man who was my dear friend and mentor.

Alcee revered this institution, and he loved his 20th District, from Belle Glade to Broward, and the Sawgrass to Sistrunk. Anyone who knew him knew he was Florida through and through, and he brought that to these Halls of power. He valued every part of the cultural and ethnic mosaic that enriches our great State, and he contributed to that throughout his life.

With his passing, his constituents lost a brilliant, fearless, and giant-hearted advocate for the community he so dearly loved. Our folks back home will miss their "on his mind, on his tongue," firebrand voice in these Halls of power.

The common refrain among anyone unfortunate enough to follow Alcee Hastings on a speaking program was: Well, this is the last place on a program you want to be.

He was a powerful, impactful orator. Here in Congress, as you all know too well, each of us lost a wise, patient, and humane statesman; and our delegation lost a seasoned, thoughtful, forceful leader.

Personally, I lost a treasured friend and trusted teacher. I can't count the times I leaned on him for his honest, perceptive counsel. Even when I didn't know I needed that advice, Alcee did, and he provided it generously. Afterwards, I was always grateful for his words of wisdom.

Alcee Hastings devoted his life to righting the world's wrong. He championed the most vulnerable, and he himself knew what it meant to overcome. He fought for human rights at home and abroad. Alcee was a champion of the U.S.-Israel relationship, and a steadfast friend to the Jewish community. He knew that Jews and African Americans were much more alike than we were different, and we often joked about the similarities.

Years ago, as police brutality stretched the fabric holding our community together, he and I joined together to ensure that law enforcement and our people would be able to pledge to protect one another and had a safe forum to communicate.

When it came to protecting the world's most unique tropical wetlands, Alcee always spearheaded our Everglades restoration efforts. In just the last month, he led the delegation in a letter to the President advocating for record-level funding. Even on battles dearer to me, he poured his own heart in it.

Alcee was one of my most fierce allies in battling breast cancer. These last 10 months, I spoke to him almost every day. It was an honor to cast his proxy vote. Good days or bad, he made sure he personally told me his vote preferences. Some days he might say in his Alcee kind of way: Why are we even voting on this?

And I left out some of the choicer words.

I cherished catching up with him every opportunity. Other days, he would just share his vote, and that call would end far too quickly. No matter how he felt, he always ended those calls by saying: "DEBBIE, thank you for this."

He was always gracious, always grateful. But it was I who was grateful for the gift of this man.

I was also so proud to swear him into this 117th Congress. He took what he must have known was his final oath with such pride, dignity, and authority.

In our last conversation, he told me he was at peace.

And why shouldn't he be?

He rose from a young man in the orange groves of the segregated South to become the first African-American Federal jurist in Florida and part of a historic 1992 class of the United States Congress. His political life took him as far off as the Parliamentary Assembly in Europe.

Congressman Hastings did it his way, and he leaves an immense personal and political legacy, both in these Halls and in our hearts. I know that I and this hallowed body are better off from having been in Alcee's midst. And that lasting impression he left behind, we will always carry with us. May his memory be for a blessing.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, it is certainly a privilege as well.

I thank Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for the personal stories she has shared with us, and her friendship.

Madam Speaker, it is now my privilege to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), known as an expert on all things agricultural; a civil rights leader; as well in this place, in this House, a cardinal himself. But I believe what he will share with us tonight is a personal relationship with Congressman Alcee Hastings, a Kappa. And, yes, Congressman BISHOP is a Kappa.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Shakespeare wrote: All the world is a stage. And all the men and women, merely players. Each has his entrance and his exit. One man in his time may play many parts.

So it was with our beloved Alcee Hastings. He was a son, father, grandfather, husband, civil rights activist, attorney, judge, Member of Congress, international parliamentarian, colleague, my brother in Kappa Alpha Psi fraternity, a faithful friend, and a fearless foe.

His performance in each of these roles was always par excellence. His was a life well-lived. He was authentic, brutally frank, but always a powerful advocate for marginalized humanity. He did so much for so many for so long. We will miss him, but the world is a better place because of the life of Alcee Lamar Hastings.

My wife, Vivian, and I send our heartfelt condolences to his wife, Patricia, his other family, his staff, and all who mourn his loss.

□ 1915

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman BISHOP for letting us know that the world is a better place because of Alcee Hastings.

Now it is my privilege again to introduce another of Congressman Hastings' dear, dear friends, the chairwoman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee as well as a proud member of the Divine Nine and a great Texan.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON).

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I simply cannot eulogize the life and legacy of Congressman Hastings every single minute, but I will try my best.

Alcee and I came to Congress together in the class of 1992, and almost instantly I knew that I was in the presence of a giant.

Our class doubled the size of the CBC.

Alcee let everyone know that he came from humble beginnings. But I can say this: he carved for himself a path to success first in the field of law and ultimately in Congress.

As many have already noted, he was a man of sharp words, and perhaps sharp is an understatement.

Who could forget his infamous declaration that Texas is a crazy State?

We shared so many laughs and quiet whispers. A story that many may not know is that I convinced him to come to Texas and speak in our crazy State, to which he responded, "Y'all may want to hear me speak now, but after I'm done, you won't ever invite me back."

Well, it was colorful.

Alcee and I cofounded the Congressional Homeless Caucus and served as co-chairs together until his passing. Because of his tireless advocacy on behalf of the homeless, more constituents in his district and mine and across the

country now sleep with a roof above their heads.

His wife and I were close, and we shared many social occasions together.

So I say: So long my dear friend, rest in peace. And kudos from the 30th District of Texas based in Dallas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her recognition of Alcee's complimentary words about Texas, but he was still our friend. I thank Congresswoman JOHNSON for that tribute.

Again, this is a very special tribute, and I might say special, special tribute to our friend, the late Alcee Lamar Hastings.

To provide another tribute is one of our members of the Congressional Black Caucus, a member of the leadership of the cochair of the Democratic Policy and Steering Committee, a cardinal on the Appropriations Committee, and it is known that often people say: BARBARA LEE speaks for me.

The Honorable Congresswoman BARBARA LEE is from California, a State that loves Texas as well.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman JACKSON LEE for yielding. I also was born and raised in El Paso, Texas, so I thank my sister.

Let me say tonight that I rise to celebrate the remarkable life of our dear friend, a dedicated public servant and a warrior for justice, the Honorable—he truly was the Honorable—Alcee Hastings.

I thank Congresswoman BEATTY for organizing this Special Order to honor our friend this evening.

I would like to offer my deepest condolences to Congressman Hastings' family; his wife, Patricia; his staff; all of his loved ones; his children; and his grandchildren. I know that this loss is deeply felt, and I am praying for the Hastings family and also for his constituents whom I had the honor to meet during my visits to his district.

Congressman Hastings was a trailblazer, and he lived a life of firsts as the first African-American Federal judge appointed to the State of Florida and the first African American to lead the Helsinki Commission.

I have had the privilege to travel with Alcee to Europe several times and to work with him to establish a transatlantic dialogue to improve social and political inclusion of people of African descent in Europe and the United States. This was a visionary idea that Congressman Hastings wanted to see happen in his lifetime, and he has made so much progress toward achieving that goal and his dream.

Alcee's political and diplomatic acumen was strengthened by his very warm and caring spirit. Many may not be aware, but while he was fighting the fight for human rights and democracy, he was also a devoted caregiver to his ailing mother. When I was struggling with the health challenges of my own

beloved mother, he was there to offer comfort and guidance. He made me realize how blessed I was to be able to take care of her during her last years on Earth. For that I will be deeply grateful.

When I first met Judge Hastings back in the 1980s, even before I was an elected official, I knew I had met someone special. He gave me his honest opinion and offered guidance without hesitation even before I was elected to office.

Despite his no-nonsense attitude and direct nature, myself, like all of us, had our own inside jokes. He called me Bob. I loved his socks—like so many of us—so much so that he gave me six pairs for my birthday. They are my Alcee socks which I will always cherish and wear.

Congressman Hastings always supported and guided me when I presented my bills to the Rules Committee, and he encouraged me by always saying: "I'm with you, Bob. I'm with you, Bob." Even if he disagreed with my progressive bills, he would say: "I'm with you, Bob. I'm with you, Bob. We are going to get this out."

He taught me some colorful words to use during very challenging times.

I feel beyond blessed to have known Alcee Hastings. His loss will be felt not only in Florida, in his district, throughout the country and here in Washington, D.C., but also around the world. He was truly a beloved and brilliant world leader.

I am reminded of 2 Timothy 4:7. I am reminded of Alcee tonight as I think about and read this Scripture: "I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have kept the faith."

Yes, our brother, our friend, our colleague, our warrior for justice and for peace fought the good fight, and now may he rest in peace and may he rest in power.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman JACKSON LEE for yielding and for this Special Order tonight.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. We will be reminded of those colorful socks. That was his trademark, and that is very special. This is a special tribute to Congressman Alcee Hastings.

Our next tribute presenter is GWEN MOORE from the great State of Wisconsin. GWEN MOORE has been a fighter for the vulnerable and serves on the distinguished and powerful Ways and Means Committee. I thank my colleague and friend on the Helsinki Commission.

Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas has 25 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding, and I want to thank the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus for pulling this all together.

I am GWEN MOORE from the great State of Wisconsin, and I was first elected in 2005. I was so excited about becoming a Member of Congress and especially excited about becoming a member of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Every year the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation hosts a great gala, and I was eager in September of 2005 to march across the stage with the likes of John Lewis, BARBARA LEE, and MAXINE WATERS with my brand new classmates, CLEAVER, G.K. BUTTERFIELD, AL GREEN, and Senator Obama. I was ready for the pageantry. All my relatives were coming to see me curtsy in my African outfit made with red and gold African wedding cloth. But then I learned that all but one member of the Congressional Black Caucus would suit up. Then when I discovered that, I commissioned myself to implore him not to ruin the evening with his recalcitrance.

Mr. Alcee Lamar Hastings' prompt and declarative declination was peppered with his famous street vernacular. Even though he was disinterested in the pomp and ceremony of the CBCF gala, he attended CBC meetings regularly. His excellent judgment, powers of discernment, and strategic thinking silenced the room every time and had Members on the edge of their seats as he weighed in on tactics and strategy.

I wondered: Where in the world did this man get his confidence that he exhibited on a daily basis?

Where did he get the courage?

His swagger was more than just his socks and his tie. There was something that I wanted to know about him.

Well, fortunately for me, Mr. Hastings drew me in as a mentee. He was familiar with my legislative agenda around equity and justice for women and people of color. So he invited me to accompany him in 2006 to the annual session of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, held in Brussels that year, wherein he was serving his third term as parliamentary assembly president of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

He was first elected in 2004. You have heard from other speakers, Madam Speaker, that this is an international organization of 57 member countries, and he is the only person of African descent to ever hold this position and he is the only American to ever hold this position. He would have to whip and get votes and everything, and Alcee did that.

When I saw him, I was stunned to witness on this international stage the mastery of his indefatigable leadership. He commandeered the agenda on human rights to take a deeper dive into minority rights, and not just Black versus White, but Jews and other ethnic minorities, gypsies, women, and migrants.

In fact, under his leadership the OSCE broadened its mandate to address human rights to include intolerance, migration, and organized crime.

The global consensus around the plight of Blacks at the hands of police was a topic of this international body. Indeed, I learned that racial oppression was global, and Alcee shepherded this international body through dozens and dozens of resolutions around global racial equity.

I was hooked. I went with Alcee every time. What I found is that language was not a barrier, culture was not a barrier, and even adversarial relationships with people like the Russians or some of the other known dictators who attended the meetings did not prevent him from engaging them in side meetings to advance the international dialogue.

Because of my association with Mr. Hastings, I have met around 300 parliamentarians of African descent in Europe, Spain, Italy, Germany, Sweden, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Canada just to name a few.

The last trip I took with Mr. Hastings—we all knew it was his last trip—we went to London, and we gathered in a circle with parliamentarians from Britain. We talked about the historic relationship of the United States and Britain, and indeed that same connection that BARBARA LEE referred to, he made us promise to continue the Atlantic engagement with our brethren. We have to keep that promise to him because he gave birth to those relationships over 30 years.

□ 1930

Do you know what? I figured out where he got his swagger from. He was not concerned with little things and petty things, what people thought, and pomp and circumstance.

He was a universal human rights leader. When I thought about him, I don't know why I thought of this song that I first heard Sarah Vaughan singing. But some of the lyrics in "Universal Prisoner" were:

Most people go around thinking they're free
Believing it's an easy way to be
They run in guilt and fear
From all the things they truly hold dear
The question is asked, do you give the love
that is inside
Or do you run to the phony world where
most people hide?

Mr. Hastings embodied the universal precepts of equality, equity, and justice. He was a true humanitarian.

Enjoy your flight into the universe, Mr. Hastings.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin for her kind words. Those were memorable times, and the historic nature of his leadership was not only national; it was international.

I am privileged again in this very special tribute to be able to yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia. States are quite close to each other, and of course, her passion matches the deep passion of Congressman Alcee Hastings. That is the obvious reason for her kinship to Congressman Hastings, but also the ability to have suffered in loss but stand up to fight for justice,

and that is our friend and colleague, LUCY MCBATH, from Georgia.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise in celebration of the remarkable life of our dear friend and colleague, Congressman Alcee Hastings, known affectionately as The Judge. People called him that long before I got here. He was the first African-American Federal judge in the State of Florida, appointed by President Jimmy Carter, where he served for 10 years before being elected to Congress in 1992.

I know that a lot of my colleagues and persons in this great Chamber tonight might wonder what kind of a relationship I would have had with Alcee Hastings. I would have only been here for 2 years. But what I do know is that I recognize Alcee truly from his spirit.

He and I both had cancer. I was a cancer survivor, and oftentimes, here on the floor, every single day, I would come to his side and sit next to him, and I would say: "How are you doing today?"

He would say: "Not so good today," or he would say: "Today is a great day."

But I remember his kindness, and I remember his words of wisdom to me, always telling me: "You are doing the right thing. You are standing up. Stay strong. Look forward."

I am really grateful for even that 1 year that I had to stand and to serve with a giant such as Alcee Hastings.

Alcee and I were both very proud to serve in the House together as fellow members of the Congressional Black Caucus. We talked about it, and oftentimes, I said to him: "I still can't believe I am here. I cannot believe I am here, but I am so grateful to be here to serve with you."

As I said, we were also bonded over our shared kinship as cancer patients because I understood what he was going through. I understood the treatment and the pain and the suffering. But what I admired about him the most is his tenacity, his strength, and his fortitude to come here every single day in spite of it and to push his way through for the sake of this Chamber, for the sake of this body, for the sake of the people who he loved so dearly in his community.

He offered me encouragement, telling me to stay the course and to continue to work on behalf of the American people. I remember he said to me: "I may not be here when you pass that gun bill, but you must pass it."

I will always be grateful to him for his friendship and for the wisdom and leadership that he shared with this body and with me.

I always find that I am so grateful to be in this body, to be among some of the most wise, intelligent, compassionate, and driven people I have ever met in my life, particularly those of

the Congressional Black Caucus like Alcee Hastings, a giant among us.

Madam Speaker, I am so grateful today to be able to stand here and pay reverence to him, the giant among us.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for that sense of kinship, with her tribute and a reference to his kindness and his wisdom.

I hope everyone knows that we are telling a very special story this evening. To join us in that is a Floridian. I always like to pronounce it in a way that indicates the bonding of Floridians, but, certainly, Floridians of a certain kind, like Alcee Hastings with the distinguished former chief of police, VAL DEMINGS, a senior member of the Intelligence Committee, a member of the Judiciary Committee and Homeland Security Committee, and a Floridian with deep roots and a friend of Congressman Hastings.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS).

Mrs. DEMINGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Congressman Alcee Hastings.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., once said: "The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of convenience and comfort, but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy."

Madam Speaker, what we all know in this Chamber is that Congressman Alcee Hastings was never afraid to stand during times of challenge and controversy. You see, Congressman Hastings was born in central Florida in Altamonte Springs. He was always so proud to share his stories with me about growing up in a city not far from the district I now represent.

Alcee Hastings was a giant in our State, the dean of the delegation. When I think about what it meant for Alcee, being the dean was a lot more than being the longest serving Member.

Alcee Hastings was a giant of a man in Florida, but he was a giant of a man around the Nation and a giant of a man in our world.

As you have heard, he was the first Black person, period, man or woman, appointed as a Federal judge in Florida. We all know the joys and the pain of being a first and paving the way for others to follow, paving the way for other boys and girls and men and women, regardless of the color of their skin, paving the way for them as a first.

I remembered that appointment. I was working at the Orlando Police Department, and I was so proud to know of this giant of a man who was appointed as the first Black man to serve as a Federal judge. We were all so proud of him.

One of the things I most appreciated about Congressman Hastings, my colleague from Florida—and hear me clearly, there were many things that I loved and appreciated about him. But

one of the things was that he was big enough to share his space with you regardless of whether you were a freshman or you had been here for a considerable amount of time. Congressman Hastings never hesitated to share his space with you. He never hesitated to give advice. He never hesitated to mentor, and he genuinely wanted you to do well.

Congressman Hastings was a true friend, and it didn't matter if he agreed with everything you said. He didn't have to. If you were his friend, he understood that friends didn't always agree on everything because, see, Alcee was his own man. We heard the song earlier today, and he did it his way.

He was his own man with his own beliefs, his own principles. He allowed me to be my own woman with my own beliefs. He allowed all of us, in our respective places. That is the kind of man, the giant of a man, that he was.

Congressman Hastings didn't waste a lot of time fighting over trivial matters. He was on a mission. He was fighting for justice. I really can't remember a time he was not fighting for justice. He didn't mind fighting for women's rights even after he had made it himself. He didn't mind fighting for equal rights. He didn't mind fighting for human rights. He didn't mind fighting for the LGBTQ community. He didn't mind standing up and fighting for people who were different from him.

Congressman Hastings dedicated his life to fighting for a better Florida and, therefore, fighting for a better Nation.

I say to my colleagues that if you were in a fight, you wanted Congressman Hastings on your side. Madam Speaker, as we know, someone will take his space, but I don't believe that anyone can ever take his place.

I would like to close with just a short scripture from Psalm 56 that says: "In God I trust; I will not be afraid. What can man do to me? I am under vows to You, O God; I will present my thank offerings to You. For You have delivered me from . . . stumbling, that I may walk before God in the light of life."

Congressman Hastings was not afraid, and we are forever grateful for his life well lived.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. We are truly grateful for his life.

Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas has 4 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I will bring this Special Order to a close, and I want to remind our colleagues of this very special Special Order led by Chairwoman JOYCE BEATTY. Then, we heard from DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, SANFORD BISHOP, BENNIE THOMPSON, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, our Majority Leader HOYER, BARBARA LEE, and GWEN MOORE. We heard from LUCY MCBATH and VAL DEMINGS, and we heard from others in their voices throughout the day and in their statements.

□ 1945

So let me try to summarize this life. This giant of a man was a Federal judge and a tireless fighter for justice and equality. He was the dean of the Florida delegation. He led an international organization never before led by an American, never before led by an African American.

But let me tell you what I believe really meant something to Alcee's life. First, his beautiful wife, Patricia, and all of his family members who we pay tribute to for sharing him with us. But he was a Florida A&M man. He was a Fisk man. All over the country, I would hear Fiskites saying: "Alcee Hastings went to Fisk." And Alcee Hastings would let you know he went Fisk University. He honored that university, and they honored him.

As a member of the National Bar Association myself, that is where I got to know Alcee Hastings. Oh, as a little, small pip of a lawyer myself, I looked up to Alcee Hastings and the words that he would say. In his own organization, he would be a guest speaker, a civil rights lawyer, as well as a civil rights fighter.

Yes, Alcee Hastings was born to a butler and a maid who left the South so that they could get money for him to go to school. And his dad said to him: "Be your own boss."

As I said, he ultimately went on to law school. But he also sat at the sit-in counters: Walgreens, where the individuals put ketchup and smashed eggs on him. Oh, Alcee could have turned around with vengeance, but he understood the message of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., that violence begets nothing, and he peacefully sat. But that didn't mean that he was going to allow them to get the best of Alcee Hastings.

He went on to be a civil rights lawyer. He went on to file lawsuits and desegregate the schools and the Cat's Meow restaurant that he had gone to.

Wasn't it poetic justice when he was named a circuit court judge and the investiture ceremony was at the high school that he had helped desegregate?

Yes, he was a Federal judge. Yes, of course, he did great things. He stopped the deportation of 76 Haitians, when they thought they were gone.

Then, in 1992, he made history again, becoming one of the first African Americans coming up to this great body from Florida since Reconstruction, joining Corrine Brown and Carrie Meek.

The Helsinki Commission was a special love for him. Can you imagine an international organization led for the first time—they had to vote for him. And that was a place where they raised up the issue of slavery. They raised up reparations. They raised up human rights. They raised up stopping hatred around the world. Alcee set that tone.

Then, of course, he continued to counsel, even in these times. I would come to him. LUCY MCBATH reminded me, as a cancer survivor, you would always check on him. But I tell you, he

would walk in with those socks and those suits, and he would be having a pep in his step.

But let me leave you with this: Continuing to do nothing in the face of continued threats to our people and our way of life is hardly what America elected us to do.

So as I close, let me simply say: Deepest sympathy. But let me remind his family that those who die in the Lord—and I paraphrase—they will, in fact, rest from their labor, but their deeds will follow them. Alcee Hastings' deeds will follow him. A tribute to America, a Floridian, a son, and a great man, both of this Nation and as a freedom fighter.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE BIDEN BORDER CRISIS AND SO-CALLED INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, during my Special Order tonight, my colleagues and I will address the inaction by the Biden administration and House Democrats to address this major crisis that we see on our southern border, this humanitarian crisis. And, yes, that is the right word. It is a crisis by any objective measure.

We are also going to address tonight the President's so-called infrastructure plan. That is a lot for us to talk about. So we will squeeze it into this hour.

When President Biden was inaugurated, the American people will remember, Madam Speaker, that he called for unity. He promised to work across the aisle, to work with Republicans in Congress. But so far those words have been completely empty promises.

Everyone can acknowledge and everyone can see on television that there is a real crisis at the southern border,

and it is a crisis of the administration's creation.

President Biden has stopped construction of the border wall. He re-implemented the catch-and-release policy of the Obama administration. He reversed the remain in Mexico policy of the Trump administration. And he selectively is enforcing immigration laws.

The results are not surprising. Our Border Patrol is now completely overwhelmed, and the southwest border encounters have reached a 15-year high. I want you to look at these numbers, Madam Speaker. This is the border crisis. The first column here is January of this year. We had 78,323 southwest border encounters. The next month, in February, it goes up to 100,441. Last month, in March, it was 171,700. This is a crisis. We all know the numbers for April are going to be staggering.

I know that there are Members on both sides of the aisle here—I know there are Members, our Democrat colleagues, who want to join us to take action to fix this. But we can't do it without the administration.

Look, here are five simple steps that we can take that would help end the border crisis:

Number one, finish the wall;

Number two, reinstate the remain in Mexico policy;

Number three, turn away high-risk individuals at our border. These are dangerous folks, some of them, coming across, and we know that.

Number four, require negative COVID tests before releasing migrants, illegal immigrants, into the U.S.;

Number five, let's send a clear message to the whole world to discourage illegal immigration.

What a concept. These aren't difficult things. The Trump administration had it all figured out, but now politics has gotten in the way of good policy.

In addition to finally solving the border crisis, there is another item in the news that Americans desperately want us to address, and that is the need for an infrastructure package. That could be a bipartisan solution that we could all work on together. It should be non-partisan, but because it impacts every single congressional district in every State, all of us, every American, wants this to happen.

But the plan that the White House introduced isn't really about infrastructure at all. In fact, only 6 percent of the \$2.5 trillion proposal would go towards bridges, highways, and roads. The rest goes to fund Democrat Big Government priorities, like the Green New Deal, and payoffs to liberal special interest groups. What an outrage.

The facts are that the House majority is the slimmest of any House majority since World War II, and the Senate is divided 50/50. Given these facts, we just want our Democratic colleagues and President Biden to end this partisan agenda for the sake of the American people.

I look forward, Madam Speaker, to hearing from my Republican colleagues tonight about both of these issues.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), who represents the Sixth Congressional District of Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to address the Chair with regard to the upcoming infrastructure bill. I am going to talk about some numbers. I don't mean to bore you with numbers.

When you put together a bill, you don't want to be an outlier. I am going to address two areas in which I think this bill makes this an outlier in very, very serious ways.

The first one is, you have changes in the tax law. And when you look at the taxes that a business pays in this country, a corporation, you have to look at kind of a double taxation. They will tax you at a corporate rate when the business earns the money; and when the business gives the money to its shareholders, you will be taxed at a dividend rate.

There is a graph here comparing all of the OECD countries around the world as to where they stand on this combined tax rate. The lowest countries, the Baltic countries, Latvia and Estonia, are 20 percent.

Right now, the United States, even after the last tax cut, at 47 percent, is middle of the pack. Actually, a little bit higher. If the tax hikes are put in effect that are published right now, you are going up to 62.7 percent. In other words, of the over 20 countries here, the United States will have the highest combined dividend, plus corporate tax rate. That is an outlier and a dangerous place to be an outlier.

There are a lot of things that go into a decision as to where you put a manufacturing facility, but taxes is certainly one of them. And given one of our goals should be to bring manufacturing back to the country, it is a bad place to be as the highest combined corporate tax rate, plus dividends.

The next area I am going to address is the money supply. To a certain extent, because of previous bills passed during the COVID crisis, we have had a rather dramatic increase in the money supply.

I would suggest you google "M1." You will see that, in the last 6 months, the amount of dollars floating around has gone through the roof. Some people, including me, would say M2 would be a better measurement. But even if you look at M2, we have a 27 percent increase in the money supply over the past year. That is just screaming we are going to have a lot of inflation in the very near future.

It is certainly not the only reason, but we already see the rapid increase in the cost of housing construction. We see an increase in food prices and an increase in energy prices. This is given what we have already done.

Now, you are going to tell us—or some people are going to say that we

are going to raise enough taxes to pay for this spending. But we are going to be raising enough taxes over the next 10 or 15 years. We know around here that when we say we are going to make a pay-for the next 10 or 15 years, a lot of times that pay-for never materializes.

So I am afraid we are going to have another big increase in the money supply when we have already had a 27 percent increase in the last year, and this is going to come back and cause serious concern. I beg the majority to look at a graph of the combined tax rates, us compared to the other OECD countries, and I beg them to look at the money supply and don't make us any more of an outlier on either.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for that dire warning. I guess if you subscribe to modern monetary theory, none of this is a concern, but it is for those of us who live in the real world.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON), who represents the Fourth Congressional District of Texas.

Mr. FALLON. Madam Speaker, the Biden infrastructure plan is another classic example of the old bait-and-switch. Much like the COVID relief bill, where only 9 percent of the \$1.9 trillion price tag actually went to COVID relief, this plan has very little to do with infrastructure.

The definition of the word in the Cambridge Dictionary is: The basic system and services, such as transport and power supplies, that a country or organization uses in order to work effectively.

So we know what it really means: roads, bridges; and, in the 21st century, broadband internet would qualify.

How much of the \$2.2 trillion is actually going to infrastructure?

\$115 billion is set aside for bridges, roads, and highways; just 5 percent. And under a more broad definition, if we include public transportation and broadband, the total grows to \$405 billion, which is still just 18 percent of the new spending.

So where does the other 82 percent go?

Democrats across the country have said their definition of infrastructure includes universal pre-K, climate action, climate justice, eradicating right-to-work environments, caregiving, affordable housing, police accountability, and paid leave.

This ain't infrastructure.

So we all know what this is: The largest corporate welfare slush fund in American history.

Joe Biden will have virtual carte blanche to nepotistically dole out hundreds of billions of dollars to curry favor with allies, supporters, friends, and family.

This isn't the hallmark of innovation, but it will ensure that the D.C. swamp continues to be a festering pool of corruption.

□ 2000

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

We came here to drain the swamp, but it is really difficult during the current administration. We will get back to it soon, though, I am confident of that.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), who represents the Fifth District.

Mr. LATTA. I thank my friend for yielding and hosting tonight's Special Order.

Quite a few of us have gone down to the border in the last several weeks, and, Madam Speaker, we do have a crisis at the border. When I say, a crisis, I mean an unmitigated crisis at the border.

We were at McAllen and going in to see the border crossing that night and the people streaming across, the Border Patrol was probably going to process over a thousand people that night. A thousand people.

The next morning, we were able to go to the Donna facility. And the Donna facility, the best way to describe it, it is a canvas building, you might say, a very nice building. It has air conditioning and all, but it was only built to hold 250 people. The day we were there, there were 3,500 people being housed there, the vast majority being kids.

We went into the pods they have. These pods are only supposed to hold 33 children. One held 412. Another had 450. And the week before there were over 600 in one.

There is a problem; it is a crisis. But it is not being seen as a crisis down at the White House. I implore the President and the Vice President to go down there and see what is happening. It is absolutely essential, because these children that are being held there, according to what they say, they are supposed to only be there for 72 hours. Some are being held for 3 weeks. One little girl was there for over 28 days.

So we do have a crisis at the border. It has got to be noted, and the President and Vice President have to know it. It is absolutely essential.

Let me just finish with this: The other thing that is happening, when you take 40 percent of our Border Patrol offline and put them into the facilities and also in processing, we have got drugs flowing across the border. Last year we had 88,000 people in this country die of overdoses. That is going up exponentially.

So let's get something done down there, Mr. President. It is essential. We have got to do it today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. I thank my friend for that compelling eyewitness account. Anyone who is looking at the evidence cannot deny this is a problem.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO). Being from a border State, she knows a whole lot about this.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, there is a border crisis. Let's just face it.

President Biden even slipped over the weekend and said it was a crisis. Then the White House had to pull it back. When thousands of people are crossing the border each and every day, it is a humanitarian crisis, it is a health crisis, and it is a national security crisis because we now know that at least a couple of the people that they caught were on the terrorist watch list.

Just yesterday, the Governor of Arizona declared a State emergency and sent National Guard to help our law enforcement in our border communities. You know what the Customs and Border Patrol did under the Biden administration? They dropped off 16 people, including kids, in the middle of a park in a small community 80 miles north of the border, Gila Bend, Arizona.

They don't have a shelter; they don't have a hospital there. They have nothing. The mayor and his wife had to borrow a van to transport these people to a Phoenix shelter. Now, what kind of President does that?

If this happened, if these unaccompanied children were just left to be handled by cartels, by a U.S. citizen, that U.S. citizen would be charged with child abuse and be in prison right now. This is unconscionable, and it needs to stop now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. I thank the gentlewoman for that passion. She is right, she has been there, and she sees it herself.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS), who represents the 22nd Congressional District and will bring another border State perspective. He also knows a lot about law enforcement.

Mr. NEHLS. Madam Speaker, for weeks now our country has witnessed the never-ending horrific images and stories from our southern border. We have heard from Border Patrol that they don't have enough agents to secure the southern border and babysit—yes, babysit—the tens of thousands of migrant children flooding across our southern border. As a result, criminal illegal aliens are slipping through undetected.

We are a nation of laws and law and order, or at least we used to be. Ever since this current administration assumed control of the White House, there has been an outright refusal—yes, refusal—to put the American people first and address the crisis at our southern border.

The administration's inactions will cost American lives, will cost billions of taxpayer dollars, and once again put the responsibility of the Federal Government on individual States.

I know this. I dealt with it firsthand as a sheriff in Fort Bend County, Texas. I had to tell dozens of residents in my home county whose homes were burglarized by a ring of illegal aliens from Honduras and Colombia that many of the illegal aliens had been deported multiple times.

In January of 2020, in my office, I had to sit and tell a son whose mother was

killed in a hit and run that the illegal alien that ran his mother over had been deported six—yes, six—times prior. That fellow right there.

Madam Speaker, enough is enough. End this crisis. Put the American people first and secure our southern border.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. I am so grateful for those comments and for the gentleman's expertise. This passion that you see, Madam Speaker, is deserved. We are so concerned that the President doesn't share it, and that is what you are hearing echoed over and over tonight.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TAYLOR), who represents the Third District.

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, as I walked through rows and rows of children who had just made a long and dangerous journey to Texas' southern border sitting on cots in a crowded room three times the size of the room that we are in right now, it has never been more clear to me than right there that illegal immigration benefits no one.

I have witnessed the heartbreaking conditions inside these emergency intake sites. In the words of one facility commander, the volunteers and staff that were working there tirelessly, they were operating under a crisis level of care. A crisis level of care. There is no doubt that we are facing a humanitarian crisis, a health crisis, and a national security crisis, all of great proportions.

We didn't get here overnight. The Biden-Harris administration made a reckless decision, choosing to overturn policies implemented by President Trump. But those policies were working, and the Biden-Harris administration had no replacement policy, no strategy, no plan to replace it.

During my visit to this facility in north Texas, I listened to the stories of cartels and coyotes advertising that they could get your children across the U.S. border on television. That is right. The cartels are advertising on television that they can get children smuggled across our southern border.

By stopping construction and the strategic importance of the border wall and rescinding the remain in Mexico policy, President Biden and Vice President Harris are sending a clear message: If you come to the United States, we will let you in.

Currently, as cartels are exploiting this administration's irresponsible open border policies, the cartels are raking in roughly \$14 million a day. That is right, you heard me correctly. \$14 million a day going straight into the hands of criminals because of the reckless policy decisions of the Biden administration.

If that statistic isn't enough on its own, DHS is projecting 117,000 children without their parents will arrive at the border this year alone. That is a 45 percent increase over the highest we have ever had.

Madam Speaker, this is a crisis, and this administration and Democrats in

Congress need to call it just that and fix it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for that perspective from Texas again. So we've got Texas and Arizona. Madam Speaker, we are going to move a little further west, all the way west to California.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARCIA), who represents the 25th District there.

Mr. GARCIA of California. I thank Mr. JOHNSON for hosting this very important Special Order hour.

I rise today to share my concerns about our crisis at the southern border. As a first-generation American, I understand the opportunities that this Nation provides and why every human being on this planet should want to come to the United States. I am a product of the American Dream, but I also value the law. I value law and order.

The first step in fixing our broken immigration system must be securing our border. In March we saw over 172,000 migrants attempt to illegally cross our border. That is a 71 percent increase in just one month.

The Biden administration continues to fail to address this crisis. This is no doubt a product of the Biden administration's policy, but make no mistake, this is now our collective problem. It is affecting our local neighborhoods, it is affecting our governments, it is affecting those who have come here legally, who are now being cut in front of by folks who are breaking the law to come here.

Communities in border towns are stretched thin and running low on local resources as more migrants flood their communities. This isn't just about the border. The crisis impacts all of us across America, including my district, the beautiful 25th District, where we see a rise in crime tied to illegal immigration and human trafficking. This is being aggravated by the defund the police movement.

The crisis at our border is about security. It is about safety, and it is about humanity. No human being should be experiencing in their entire lifetime what hundreds of thousands of humans are experiencing right now at our own southern border.

Let me be clear. We can be a welcoming nation, but we can also be a nation that abides by its own laws and enforces them simultaneously. We need to secure the border, provide the resources to our Border Patrol agents, and stop incentivizing people to come here illegally. When we do those things, we can address the rest of our problems.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for that compelling testimony from a first-generation American. That is meaningful. We prize immigration, the legal kind. We believe in the rule of law, and that is what maintains order.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. CAWTHORN), the youngest Member of Congress, but he is wise beyond his years.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Madam Speaker, if Americans like what Democrats did for Baltimore, then they will love what Democrats will do for the planet.

The Biden infrastructure bill and the stimulus bill before it shows that Democrats are more interested in transforming our Nation's definitions of words than they are our physical infrastructure of roads and bridges. We need to cut government waste, not create more.

And now the left wants to drag the Green New Deal through America's back door without any regard for the wishes of millions of Americans. Make no mistake, this infrastructure proposal is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is a Socialist wish list disguised as a roads and bridges initiative.

This is exactly what Democrats have been doing since the day I was sworn in. They know that America is in desperate need of infrastructure reform, and they know that Republicans and Americans nationwide would vote for a commonsense infrastructure proposal, but have they proposed such an initiative? Absolutely not.

□ 2015

They will pretend that this legislation deals with infrastructure, and then they will stand on the steps of their multimillion-dollar mansions and decry any votes against their Trojan horse of a bill.

Americans are fed up. Why aren't we passing legislation that does what it claims to be doing? Why are my colleagues on the left so excited to pretend critical race theory is the same as critically needed roads?

Let's dispense between this false equivalency. Let's build bridges, not just the physical but actual bipartisan bridges here in Congress. Why aren't we working together on the pitifully few issues that we still happen to agree on these days?

I am wondering. My constituents are wondering. America is wondering.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. CAWTHORN for that perspective.

Madam Speaker, I will move briskly because we have a lot of Members, as you can see, who are passionate about these issues and want to weigh in tonight.

I yield to the gentleman from the First District of the great State of Alabama (Mr. CARL), who will take the podium here.

Mr. CARL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my concern for the unprecedented crisis at our southern border because of the Biden administration's reckless open-border policy and failure to enforce our Nation's immigration laws.

We are seeing thousands of illegal immigrants crossing the border every single day, and there is no sign of letting up. The President and the Vice President are nowhere to be found.

That is not leadership. We need leadership. We have a crisis at the border,

and leadership, we are making a call for help, please.

The Vice President was appointed as the border czar weeks ago and has yet to take a single trip to the southern border. That is unacceptable.

We must have strong border protection for the health, safety, and security of American citizens. It is time for this administration and the far left to put America first by enforcing our immigration laws and putting an end to this horrific crisis at our southern border.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Louisiana for yielding and for holding this Special Order tonight.

The American people are frightened by what they are seeing unfold at the southern border. That fear is real, and it is only amplified by an administration that has chosen to sit back and do absolutely nothing.

For months, the Biden administration has struggled to decide what to call this situation, often scrambling to find the newest and less severe synonym to the word "crisis." The word "crisis" suits this situation perfectly, but apparently, that word is too harsh, according to the White House.

Pretty soon, this administration won't have any words left to use, and they will accept the reality that they need to own up to the crisis they created.

Republicans are not interested in letting complacency take hold while the country we love is left open and vulnerable and changed forever. We will continue to call out this administration for its failures, and we will continue to fight to protect America and its citizens.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her remarks, and we do call out the administration. That is what this Special Order is all about.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee's Second District (Mr. BURCHETT).

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I thank Vice Chairman JOHNSON for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the crisis at the southern border is a problem of the Biden administration's own creation. As soon as they took office, the Biden administration slapped an "open for business" sign on our southern border. They scrapped commonsense immigration policies that were keeping our country secure. Now, our southern border is overwhelmed with immigrants who expect to enter the country without proper vetting.

Hiding among those massive crowds of people are drug smugglers, child traffickers, and terrorists who have no intention of positively impacting American communities.

We need to know who is coming into our country and why, for the sake of national security.

Ironically, even though Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS decried this practice, children are still being packed into overcrowded detention facilities and sleeping in cages. They were outraged about this back when they were campaigning for President, but now they are actually silent on the issue.

We need to get back to the successful border security policies of the Trump administration, including construction of our border wall. I am an original cosponsor of the Finish the Wall Act, which would resume construction of the border wall and make it more difficult for folks, especially the bad actors, to cross the southern border illegally.

House Republicans are ready to secure the border, and I am proud to join my colleagues on the floor this evening to call out the Biden administration's ongoing inaction. If President Biden is not physically or mentally capable of addressing this problem, he should step down.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for those bold words, and he is right. I think that expresses the sentiment of a lot of Americans.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIMENEZ), who knows a lot about immigration as well as infrastructure because he is a former fire chief and mayor and now a Member of Congress.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Madam Speaker, over the past several weeks, I have joined Leader MCCARTHY and House Homeland Security Committee Republicans on two separate trips to our southern border. What I saw on the ground is heart-breaking: countless unaccompanied minors, often very young girls, left at the hands of international cartels, many of them violated; migrants packed into cramped processing facilities; and seizures of illicit narcotics being trafficked into the United States.

Unfortunately, the Biden-Harris White House has drastically shifted from the previous administration's policies on immigration and border security through executive order. At no point during the crafting of these executive orders were congressional Republicans consulted, nor have Republicans had a proper venue for input on plans from the White House. The result? Day by day, the crisis along our southern border is getting worse.

It has been a month since President Biden named our Vice President, KAMALA HARRIS, as the border czar. What have we seen so far? Zero media appearances about the border, no press conferences, no trips to the border, radio silence for the Vice President.

She said she is going to the Northern Triangle to meet with Guatemalans and Hondurans. She doesn't need to. She can come to the southern border and talk directly to Guatemalans and Hondurans, and migrants from many other countries, while they are illegally crossing the border.

While she is at it, Vice President HARRIS should speak with Customs and

Border Protection agents who are on the ground handling the situation instead of Federal bureaucrats sitting in their offices in Washington.

As an immigrant, I call on Vice President HARRIS to do her job and fix this crisis.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for speaking with such authority.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania's Ninth District (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, Vice Chair MIKE JOHNSON, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, we can all agree our Nation's transportation and infrastructure system is in need of investment to improve our quality of life and economic competitiveness. Very unfortunately, the Biden administration has thus far chosen a go-it-alone approach in solving this problem with a \$2.3 trillion proposal, whereby less than 8 percent would go toward improving our Nation's roads, bridges, highways, airports, ports, and waterways, traditional infrastructure.

The rest is filled with provisions that have nothing to do with traditional T&I as we all know it, including \$173 billion for electric cars and car electrical ports for powering; \$400 billion to expand Medicaid programs, which is not infrastructure; and hundreds of billions of dollars to implement provisions of the Green New Deal.

As a means to pay for it, the Biden administration and Democratic leadership plan to raise taxes by over \$2 trillion. At a time when our economy is in recovery, and we are supposed to be on the side of American manufacturing and repatriating jobs, bringing these companies back to America, the idea of significant tax increases is another upside-down policy and will certainly not attract business but only export them.

Additionally, our infrastructure plan needs to be supplemented by private capital investment. That is where accountability comes from. That is why I plan to introduce the Infrastructure Bank for America Act, which would add to existing government funding with private investment, increasing access to capital for worthy infrastructure projects that deliver on R&I and deliver value to the American people at a fraction of the cost to the taxpayer.

Contrary to the Biden infrastructure plan, IBA investments would not be restricted and would help finance surface transportation projects, grid security, broadband, and revitalization of cities and towns across America and my district.

Thus far, the Biden administration has failed to reach across the aisle in a meaningful way to accomplish anything. We should unite to fix our roads, bridges, highways, airports, and other gateways to growth and innovation, not exploit this opportunity and pass a \$2 trillion liberal wish list that will raise taxes, impose Green New Deal

mandates, and add trillions to our national debt.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for mentioning just one of the many Republican ideas we have. And as he said, we are not there at the table.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee's Sixth District (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a critical need for infrastructure for all of America, and especially in my home State of Tennessee.

I believe it is past time that we build new transportation systems and refurbish structures to accommodate our modern economy and our growing workforce. I am a strong proponent of fixing our crumbling roads and bridges and expanding access to broadband internet in unserved areas.

In Tennessee, over half a million residents only have access to one internet service provider, and 274,000 Tennesseans still have no access at their place of residence. These are real infrastructure projects that desperately need our attention.

Unfortunately, President Biden's most recent multitrillion-dollar giveaway has little to do with actual infrastructure, with only 6 percent of this bill going to projects that fund roads, bridges, or highways.

Even if we use the most expanded definition of infrastructure, which might include upgrading wastewater and drinking water systems, expanding high-speed broadband internet service to 100 percent of the Nation, modernizing the electric grid, and improving infrastructure resilience, infrastructure in this plan is only 24 percent of its total cost.

President Biden is attempting to redefine infrastructure to include all of the Democratic Party's pet projects and extreme priorities. In this case, it means enacting Green New Deal-style programs and implementing job-killing tax hikes on Americans and their businesses.

Since this proposal has little to do with infrastructure and grossly inflates the number of jobs it would actually create, we should call this proposal what it really is, a con job.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, it is a con job, indeed.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan's First District (Mr. BERGMAN), who is the highest ranked military officer ever elected to the United States Congress and also my dear friend and classmate.

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative JOHNSON for yielding. It is an honor to be here on the floor with him tonight.

Our country recognizes leadership at all levels, regardless of party ideology,

and I see here on the floor real leadership, committed leadership.

I rise today to express deep concern for the state of our Nation's southern border. Words matter, and it is time we start calling this situation what it really is: a crisis. In simple words, it is what it is. Don't try to paint it in many different ways.

President Biden has invited this crisis through his words and in his executive actions, including terminating construction of the wall on our southern border.

We need real leadership now. Now is not the time to be hiding. We need the leaders to step out and step up. It is time to put up and put out the political gamesmanship, put that all behind us and take a serious look at what is happening on the southern border. When I say a serious look, I mean that literally.

Vice President HARRIS, let alone President Biden, has yet to visit the border since being charged with addressing the crisis there. The United States is and must always remain a free and welcoming Nation.

We are all immigrants. We are immigrants by generations who came here for one of two reasons, for an opportunity or fleeing persecution. That hasn't changed.

□ 2030

We are also, and by all standards measured, a Nation of law and order, and our laws must be followed.

Madam Speaker, I urge Congress to take up critical legislation, such as Representative ANDY BIGGS' Stopping Border Surges Act and Representative JEFF DUNCAN's H.R. 88, Build up Illegal Line Defenses with Assets Lawfully Lifted Act of 2021. These bills will begin to address the root cause of our immigration issues.

In addition, the bureaucracies here in D.C. can play a positive role, such as Department of Labor and DHS. They can help. Because when you look at those who seek to come here legally and work as guest workers, we can bring good people from around the world here through the H2B and H2A programs. They do not seek permanent status; they come here to work, and they go home. The bureaucracies can get involved to help good, legal immigration occur after you separate out the guest worker programs.

Madam Speaker, we can secure our border, protect those wishing to come here legally, and crack down on those who wish to do us harm—and I mean, crack down on those who wish to do us harm. It is time this body gets to work to address this critical issue immediately.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the general. I appreciate that so much.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD), Fourth District, another American hero, another hero of mine, a gentleman who sacrificially served his

country and deserves to speak here tonight and has great insight for us.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Louisiana for yielding. I appreciate the opportunity to be here.

Madam Speaker, this evening I really rise to voice my concerns over the President's \$2 trillion infrastructure plan.

One concern is the steep price tag, but a bigger concern is what the administration is trying to classify as infrastructure. These attempts from some on the other side of the aisle to classify their partisan priorities as infrastructure, is inexcusable and it is irresponsible.

The President is asking American taxpayers to fork over \$2 trillion. If the President is asking Americans to make a substantial investment, it is Congress' responsibility to ensure that these tax dollars are spent wisely.

Unfortunately, the President's proposed bill doesn't do this. How can it be infrastructure legislation when less than 6 percent goes to roads and bridges and less than 5 percent goes to broadband infrastructure?

There is a true need for infrastructure. For instance, in my district, our rural communities need help getting their last mile of broadband. This pandemic has proven that high speed broadband must be addressed.

Madam Speaker, I hope we can remove the partisan approach to this bill and solve the real infrastructure challenges of our country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend. It is so sad that broadband needs are not being met because politics are in the way.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today with serious reservations about the proposed infrastructure policies coming before this body.

Every Member in Congress represents a district with infrastructure needs. Urban or rural, conservative or liberal, we all represent communities that have dire infrastructure needs we should be addressing.

That is why President Biden's recent discussion about infrastructure, along with his comments about wanting to establish a bipartisan legislative effort were encouraging.

Unfortunately, none of this would come to fruition. We didn't see a bipartisan push. We didn't see significant input taken from Members and Senators on our side of the aisle. We didn't see a willingness to want to work together.

The \$2.2 trillion plan wasn't released after significant back-and-forth discussions. No, it was released after development by the White House and then pushed out in a media blitz.

As anticipated, the package was a partisan exercise. Just 5 percent goes

to repairing roads and bridges. As the core definition of infrastructure, there is very little attention shown. Only 1 percent goes to airports. Other countries around the world continue to build state-of-the-art airports, as airports here in the United States struggle to keep up with demand. Ports and inland waterways, an issue important to me as the representative of two major seaports, is even more astounding. Just one percent of this bill goes to ports and inland waterways. Ridiculous.

Now is the time for real infrastructure investments, but this isn't the plan Americans need.

I urge my colleagues to start from scratch and focus on the real issue here: Our Nation's infrastructure needs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for that.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to go back across the country again to the great State of California's Eighth District. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE).

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Madam Speaker, infrastructure is a bipartisan issue. We all agree that one of the primary functions of government is to provide for the people collectively what they are unable to individually provide for themselves. I am talking about things like highways and roads and dams and harbors and airports. Things that represent long-term investments in the future of our country.

Unfortunately, the infrastructure package we are currently considering only devotes 12 percent of the over \$2 trillion of spending to infrastructure projects like those.

To give you some egregious examples, the proposed infrastructure package devotes substantially more money to subsidizing the purchase of electric vehicles than it does to building the roads and the highways that those vehicles would drive on.

The proposed infrastructure package devotes over ten times as much money to expansion of Medicaid than it does to the construction of water infrastructure, of dams and of airports put together.

It is not to say that these other projects are without merit, but the problem is that almost every dollar of this spending contributes to our national debt. That means that we need to consider only the projects that represent a true, long-term investment in our country.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pare this package down to the projects that accomplish exactly that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that California perspective.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), the Republican leader of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the Democrat's infrastructure bill.

We have seen a lot in the news over the last few weeks about President Biden's not-so-much infrastructure plan. There is so much unrelated pork in this bill that even Washington reporters are hesitant to call it an infrastructure plan.

When we think of the word "infrastructure," we think roads, bridges, highways. We can expand further and think of ports, waterways, and airports. Democrats so-called infrastructure plan is not really about infrastructure—6 percent is allocated to roads, bridges, and highways, and a mere 2 percent for airways, waterways, and ports. Together, we are just barely getting to 8 percent of the \$2.3 trillion plan to focus on infrastructure.

But what is the rest focused on? Well, it is a wish list of Progressive policies and it is an excuse for Democrats to give \$600 billion—over half a trillion dollars—to the Green New Deal.

While I believe there is an opportunity for bipartisanship—a successful infrastructure bill must be bipartisan—the majority must be willing to make reasonable concessions to address our reasonable concerns. If we do this right, it should look like a bill that we wrote together.

This bill has the chance to fix our infrastructure, provide jobs, and jumpstart our economy following COVID-19, but it will only succeed if Democrats choose to include Republicans and bring us to the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. That went so well, I think we will stay in the State of Pennsylvania, going to the 12th District.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding.

Madam Speaker, improving America's infrastructure should be bipartisan. Revitalizing our Nation's roads and bridges, delivering broadband to rural America, and working together to build a more connected society are all things we can and should strive to accomplish.

The Biden administration's so-called infrastructure plan is not infrastructure, and it is definitely not bipartisan. Less than 2 months removed from the last multi-trillion-dollar bill, the American people are about to be saddled with another massive tax-and-spend package—this time with a price tag of \$2.3 trillion and a bag of empty promises.

With only a fraction of the \$2.3 trillion going toward things like roads, bridges, waterways, dams, airports, and broadband, the majority of the plan is instead filled with non-infrastructure items.

Case in point: Joe Biden spends 74 percent more of your money on subsidies for electric vehicles than it allo-

cates for rural broadband. It is ironic that Washington Democrats talk about improving infrastructure while simultaneously working to dismantle and eliminate American energy jobs. Make no mistake, it takes American energy to build American infrastructure.

While Washington Democrats talk about improvements to American infrastructure, they fail to recognize that Biden's \$2.3 trillion plan is not the answer. Instead, we must embrace America's domestic energy industry, which has made greater strides in investing in our Nation's infrastructure than Joe Biden's wasteful spending plans ever could.

If Joe Biden truly believes this is an infrastructure package, it is evidence that he has been in Washington, D.C., for far too long.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. And he has indeed been in Washington too long.

Madam Speaker, there is a common denominator tonight. The crisis at the border and the problems with the infrastructure package were both entirely created by the Biden administration.

They were both thus completely avoidable, completely predictable, and they have done and are doing an extraordinary disservice and real damage to the American people.

We ask, again, of all of our Democrat colleagues and President Biden and his administration, please, please, for the sake of our country, put the partisanship aside. Let's govern with common sense, let's fix these problems before they become so great that we are unable to do so.

Madam Speaker, we end the Special Order, and I yield back the balance of my time.

UNEMPLOYMENT BY EDUCATION LEVEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, this is going to be one of those evenings where you have a lot of things to share, but they are actually really about two subjects. And I am going to ask us to try to think about things a little bit differently. And as is my bad habit, I brought a number of charts to just try to get our heads around it.

Some of what I am going to share tonight—I am going to try to dial back the sarcasm, but we have got to get our heads around facts and reality.

One of the first things I want to go through is what we did employment-wise, who got hurt during this last year.

Our brothers and sisters who have sort of less-than-a-high-school education, if you see this green chart right there, this is sort of talking about the unemployment levels for those who are lower on education.

You have got to understand, this last year was absolutely crushing to our brothers and sisters who really either didn't graduate high school or barely graduated high school. Their value that they sell is their labor. And the numbers are still just really, really high. Look at the disproportion between those of us who have bachelor's degrees or graduate degrees. We had a blip, but not much of one.

Individuals here who didn't graduate high school, they are getting their heads kicked in, and they still are. So we are going to talk about some of the policy going around us.

□ 2045

And the next part is, it is beyond just unemployment. For those of us in the Joint Economic Committee, those on Ways and Means, those who actually pay attention to the numbers, the U-6, and all these things put out by the Labor Department, the real number we need to pay attention to is actually something called labor force participation.

What does it mean when someone is not in the labor force with their skill sets, age?

Their attachment to work gets broader and more difficult to reattach. Their ability to climb to a supervisor or watch their pay go up gets really damaged.

And on this one, do you see this line down here?

We are, right now, seeing some labor force participation by education levels. For those who didn't finish high school, half of them aren't in the labor force.

Do you understand what is going on right now with what we would traditionally refer to as the working poor, except they are not working?

Now, part of this is because of the absurd policies we have engaged in. What happens when you make public policy by your heart, by feelings, instead of math, instead of facts, instead of actual compassion that understands what makes someone's life better?

We just financed keeping people out of the labor force.

Do you understand? Do we understand? Do we understand? As a body, do we understand what we just did to the future earning powers of those individuals that we incentivized not to be in the labor force?

And we are already seeing it.

Was the goal here to make these individuals permanently poor?

Because that is what we are accomplishing right now.

So, obviously, because the rhetoric around here, particularly from the left, is that they care about the working poor, we would be seeing public policy that actually takes care and helps the working poor, makes the value of their labor more valuable.

What is the single number one thing that crushes the labor value of the working poor?

It turns out—and we were a little surprised, but we did a bunch of research—it is when you have an open

border policy, because, all of a sudden, you have those who actually—their value economically is selling their labor.

You now have decided you are going to make them compete with those coming across the border. And, on occasion, we will be here on the floor and we will hear arguments about compassion for individuals from around the world who have presented themselves at our border in Arizona. And I just desperately wonder, Where the hell is the compassion for the working poor in our own country?

Here is the math. I mean, you know, the peak pandemic unemployment rate was well over 20 percent for those who didn't finish high school, for those who basically—their economic value is their labor. But it is worse than that. When you have an open border policy, you have basically crushed their wages. Their future wages go negative.

You know, I know we all just heard an hour of border policy and those things. Maybe I see too much of the world through sort of an economic lens, but I think that is also a fairer lens. It is not meant to be brutality right or left. It is a love and compassion for those in our society who were being left behind for so long. We are crushing them again.

I mean, the best math we have come up with is if you didn't finish high school and you have a society that has moved to open borders, which functionally is the math you have added hundreds of thousands of new moderate- to low-skill workers.

What is the value of the skills or lack of skills of a population who are already with you?

On the chart, it goes down well over 6 percent. They are going to be paid less. We have just created more poverty not by those who have presented themselves at the border, but to our domestic population here.

This is a type of economic cruelty. I mean, it may be a little rhetorically flamboyant, but it is a type of economic cruelty on the very population that so many of us here talk about we care, talk about we want to help. And what is going on right now to the working poor with the policy, particularly being promulgated by the left, is crushing. And this is just the open border side.

Do we understand that what we have also done economically?

Say I came to you tomorrow and said, Hey, here is what we are going to do. We are going to pump stunning amounts of money into the economy, and we are going to look the other way when we start to see inflation on commodity prices, on food prices, and on a lot of the basics. A lot of our constituents are going to shrug, and say, Okay, a little bit of inflation, fine.

Has anyone also talked about what inflation does to the working poor?

The fact of the matter is, when you start to look at the actual data—if you are in the top 10 percent of income, a

little bit of inflation actually makes you wealthier because you own real estate, you own assets. They become more valuable. But if you are an individual where a substantial portion of your income just goes to pay your food bill—what we have engaged in in economic policy this last year is substantially malpractice. We are making their lives miserable. And the solution from the left is, well, we will just subsidize them more.

So let's talk about that. Do we understand what you have just done?

If I incentivize you by—we are going to send you a check, and then we are going to give you an additional monthly check, an enhanced unemployment benefit, and we will give you maybe some more money for this and that. None of those things incentivize you, saying, we know you need help, we are going to help you get reattached to work so you can gain skills, so you can move up in the organization, so your wages can go up so there is actually productivity in the society, so you are actually paying taxes into what is your Social Security and Medicare account, so you have, what is it, your 60 quarters, all of those things that are so important to raising the poor out of poverty.

Instead, we have done just the opposite. We have financially incentivized millions of Americans not to be part of the labor pool. We have incentivized millions of Americans for a year to not gain the skill sets, the labor attachment.

There are some of our economists we are talking to that say we are going to spend decades paying for this. And it is right in front of us. We all knew what we were doing. It was just easy, because creating policy says, hey, we are going to give you this to help you work through the devastation of this last year, but here is the incentive to get back in the labor pool and the market.

So when we actually have our small employers complain to us that they can't hire anyone, yet at the same time—we go back to my previous slide about labor participation. We have millions and millions and millions of Americans who aren't working. Unemployment has been going down. It is because these folks have dropped out. They are not counted as unemployed.

We will pay a devastating societal price for doing this to so many people.

And why is this so important and why is it such a contrast to where we were in 2018, 2019, and the first quarter of 2020?

Do you understand what a miracle we were living for a couple of years there?

The fact of the matter is, if you look at income and equality, which used to be the harbinger of society fairness after tax reform, as to the regulatory reform, after making labor valuable for our working poor, they got dramatically less poor, and we have lost that.

In this last year, we have basically wiped out one of the steepest curves of progress in economic history of the

United States. You take a look at this chart and you start to think about the wage gains that Hispanics, African Americans, Asians were having. Their wage gains were going up much faster than Anglos.

This is what we all claim we desire. This makes a much fairer, more egalitarian society. We made the value of our brothers' and sisters' talents, skills, labor, much more valuable. And then now we have adopted policies that crush them. We have done everything half-ass backwards.

And you start to take a look at what happened after tax reform, regulatory reform, and many of the things we did before. It really was just stunning. One of the most interesting numbers was the value of female participation in the economy. Remember, before the pandemic, we actually had more females working than males. They had a dramatically faster wage gain. We had one of the year's—actually, I think if I do 2018, 2019, African-American females had double-digit wage gains, finally.

The rhetoric in this place for decades: We need to think and care about the working poor.

Suddenly, economic policy did something for the working poor. It just happened to be making tax policy and regulatory policy that invested in plants and equipment and technology that made those businesses more productive. Meaning—because you all remember your elementary economics class.

What are the two common factors that change your wages?

Inflation. Okay. That doesn't get you anywhere. Your wages go up just to catch up with buying the same thing with more dollars.

Productivity. Wages go up with productivity. This was a productivity curve because of what was done in tax reform. And it was the beneficiaries—they weren't rich people. They were poor people, except it is heresy to tell the truth with the math around here.

So what breaks my heart is we have come so far and we have lost it. We keep adopting policies, whether it is what is going on at the border, what we have done to subsidize people not to join the labor pool, what we have done to promote inflation. All these are things that will crush the working poor.

Once again, if you take a look at just the employment groups of the population that had just amazing growth, Hispanic women, African-American women and men, White men, down here, White women. It was all the groups that my brothers and sisters on the left claim they care about. In 2018, 2019, these numbers are miraculous. They aren't little fractions. These are big deals.

So why would this body on one hand be rhetorically—that this is the populations they care about, and then turn around and knife them with economic policy that will make the working poor poorer.

Is it they don't know better? Is it they are just leading with their hearts

and their feeling instead of some calculator math?

I do this because there is a path. We can be compassionate, but we need to understand what makes poor people less poor. What actually drives income and equality. It is not trying to make rich people less rich. The idea is to make the multitudes of poor people less poor.

And I can give you sort of a disruptive thought. In Ways and Means, we have had hearings and discussions of the healthcare outcome differential by populations from COVID. It is absolutely real. If you are a Native American, which I represent a couple of Tribal communities that are good friends; if you happen to be an urban minority, you have had much worse healthcare outcomes.

But if you want to be honest about what you are seeing, is that racist?

Well, the data says no. What it says is there were precursors in those communities of health presentations that were much worse. So if you take a look at the charts—and we are working on this chart now—the early numbers are fascinating.

Take a look at an urban minority population, my diabetes, my hypertension, the still use of tobacco products, and you line that up with the bad outcomes from COVID, they almost line up exactly.

□ 2100

Madam Speaker, if you give a damn about poor people, minority populations—and my Native Americans who are suffering in remarkable numbers from diabetes, which actually turns out to be the key precursor for why they have had such horrible outcomes during COVID—then it is time to step up and say that we can basically do the typical vision of the left which will put in some more health clinics, because we are going to try to make your misery more tolerable, or we can do a disruption and end the misery.

It is time for something like an Operation Warp Speed for diabetes. Instead of patching over the misery, let's find a way to cure it. I understand type 1 autoimmune, type 2 lifestyle, these are complicated and difficult. But if I came to you a couple years ago and said, mRNA vaccines, we are going to do it in just several months, you would have thought I was out of my mind, Madam Speaker. You see the discussions now that we just leaped 10 years in technology of using the mRNA. We are functioning, it is a software problem now.

The ability to cure virus infections, a number of cancers, and a number of other diseases is now a software problem. We are on the edge of miracles.

Is this going to be the continued policy of, well, we are going to just patch over people's miseries, or are we going to cure them?

There are some brilliant examples in just the last couple years.

Do you remember hepatitis C, the projections it was going to cost for the

coming liver transplants and the number of people who had served in the military who were going to be dying miserable deaths waiting for that liver transplant?

Then what did we do?

We came up with a cure. The cure was really expensive at first—dramatically less expensive than a liver transplant—and now with competition and technology we have crashed the price.

We have a cure for hemophilia.

Madam Speaker, you saw that with the mRNA technology, we may be on the cusp finally for a vaccine for HIV.

As a body and as Members, we talk about how much we love and care about the minority populations we represent, and then we are not willing to think disruptively on what ends the misery. We seem to have our heads stuck somewhere decades ago that we are just going to make the misery more tolerable. My passion is let's make it go away.

Madam Speaker, if you really care about healthcare differentials between ethnic populations, understand what caused it—we have that data—and go at it. Let's cure it.

It turns out over the next 30 years—the best number I have come up with for the next 30 years of Medicare—Medicare will be the primary driver of U.S. debt. Ten years from now, we are at \$42 trillion of debt and the curve steepens. It is demographics. It is just baby boomers are getting older, and we are going to consume a lot of resources. But it turns out 30 percent of that healthcare spending in Medicare, it actually turns out that over 30 percent is diabetes.

If compassion and love for our brothers and sisters in curing something like diabetes isn't what drives you, Madam Speaker, how about just the debt?

The single biggest impact we can have on the debt, it turns out, would be a cure for diabetes.

So if you are a fiscal hawk, Madam Speaker, go at it. If you claim to be compassionate, go at it. If you want to keep people just having a nicer way to suffer, then leave the types of policies we are doing right now where we are going to do a patchwork quilt of a couple more healthcare centers.

So, Madam Speaker, I am incredibly distressed that the Democrat policies adopted so far this year, when you lay them out—when our brothers and sisters who are on the sidelines, because they have been able to financially live—survive, if that is what you want to call it, and they are out of the workforce, what is their economic skill set a year from now when the rug is pulled out from underneath them when we go back to something semi more normal?

What violence have we done to their futures?

I hope someone out there is listening and thinking about this.

One of the other things I want to walk through is: my understanding is, over the next couple weeks we will talk infrastructure, we will talk the envi-

ronment, we will talk global warming, and we will talk greenhouse gasses.

Can I beg of some of the folks around here to actually read?

The amount of folklore that is spewed at these microphones is just intensely frustrating.

Madam Speaker, can I give you a simple, simple example?

I have used this one before, but it is sort of the hallmark of the thought experiment.

Madam Speaker, if I came to you tomorrow and asked you: Do you care about plastic in the oceans?

Yes.

Should we get rid of plastic straws in Washington, D.C., in your community? Of course.

How many plastic straws are in the ocean from North America?

None.

We do an amazingly good job in our waste management, so why is there so much plastic floating in the ocean?

It doesn't come from the U.S. straws. There are 10 rivers in the world. Nine of them are in Asia and two are in Africa that account for 90 percent of the plastic in the oceans.

Getting rid of your plastic straws is called virtue signaling. Hey, look at me, I care. Except that caring doesn't do anything. It may make you feel better, it may give you a selfie you can put up on your social media, but it didn't do anything.

Madam Speaker, if you actually cared about plastic in the ocean—and we have dozens of variations of this type of thing where we have folklore around the environment.

We need to start doing the math. Go to the 10 rivers—eight in Asia and two in Africa—and finance the collection of the plastic. Create the recycling. Yes, it is a type of foreign aid. Yes, it is the adoption of technology. But if you want to deal with 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean, then go to where the plastic in the ocean is coming from, and it is not straws in your community. That is theater. This place rewards theater. We get campaign contributions from theater. We get behind these microphones so we can do theater.

If you actually give a darn, Madam Speaker, then do something where the math actually says it has an actual impact.

One of the other proofs—and oddly enough, we relate this to tax policy. One of the really neat things that has been happening the last several years—and this goes back to the Obama administration and the last administration—do you see this line here, Madam Speaker?

That is GDP growth. This curve coming down, particularly after tax reform where the curve dramatically steepens—we are still working on our 2019 numbers, we believe it steepens even more—this is greenhouse gases going into the environment.

Do you notice something, Madam Speaker?

We were growing as a society and economy, yet environmental pollutants were crashing. We believe some of this inflection had to do with tax reform, the expensing portion where a company can say, I get to deduct 100 percent of the new, cleaner, better, faster, cheaper and more environmentally sensitive equipment, and we saw massive capital expenditures where productivity went up and greenhouse gases came down.

It is a demonstration that if you get the regulatory and the tax policy right, you can have economic growth. People can have those opportunities. It doesn't have to be a Malthusian world where you crush people.

Some of this is new. If I came to you right now and said, hey, here is a ton of carbon, here is a ton of methane, the math is changed. So that is why a lot of the environmental calculations have changed the last couple years.

My best guess is, from the latest things I am reading, methane has about a 9-1 ratio as a greenhouse effect. But also its half-life has been cut back dramatically in some of the formulas. If you wanted to have a remarkable impact on greenhouse gases, then stop the flaring and design a way to go collect the methane where we are producing natural gas.

It turns out we now have the technology where you pull up a truck, it super chills, compresses it, takes it away, and it is useable fuel; and it has a remarkable calculus.

We actually did a thought experiment—actually, it was more of a math experiment. I was blessed to have a Ph.D. of nuclear physics on staff, so his math was just remarkably good.

We did a thought experiment. If I could run a major pipeline through west Texas capturing methane, did you know you basically come within a fraction of hitting the Paris accords, Madam Speaker?

When I proposed that to a number of my Democrat colleagues who are my friends, they said, DAVID, I love the math. This is exciting. But you have to understand, I can't support a pipeline, because pipelines are heresy on our side.

□ 2110

I said, if we would basically find the tax regulatory policy to make a pipeline work like this that collects methane where you compress it and make it a usable fuel, it turns out you could get all the way to the Paris accord by a single major project.

Yes, DAVID, but you don't understand. It is actually not about hitting

the numbers. It is about surviving politically.

I am going to beg of us to start using actual math and science instead of worrying about our next campaign contribution or our feelings.

The last one on this tirade—and when we come back, we have a stack of these. There is a revolutionary technology that is happening at this moment. Remember that curve we showed where we were having economic growth, GDP growth, yet greenhouse gases, particularly carbon, were going down for the United States? We can make that curve dramatically steeper.

This is a facility that is about to be built by Occidental Petroleum in west Texas. There has also been a remarkable improvement in the technology. MIT, about a year ago, had a major breakthrough and almost doubled the capacity of taking ambient air and pulling carbon right out of it. It is almost carbon mining out of the air.

This is a really big facility about to go in. They are going to take the carbon and shove it back into the ground. It is a negative calculator. We should be finding joy as conservatives and liberals that technology has brought us these types of opportunities.

If we get the regulatory, if we get the Tax Code, and we update our thinking to this century, we can stop arguing about greenhouse gases and how much of the economy and how many people you want to unemploy or, you know, green jobs don't pay as much, and say: Let's just have the disruption in the economy like we always do. Let's promote the things that make our world cleaner, healthier, more prosperous. Then, if we do things like this, maybe we end the economic violence on the working poor.

Maybe this could be a really amazing decade instead of what I see going on right now, where we are pandering to functional extremists in so many of the environmental and other types of communities. They may be passionate, but their math is really, really bad.

Madam Speaker, I think I have had far too much caffeine today. I yield back the balance of my time.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2021

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, April 21, 2021.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congress-

sional Budget Act of 1974, I am transmitting an updated status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2021. This status report is current through April 2, 2021. The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

Table 1 compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues to the overall limits filed in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2021 for fiscal year 2021 and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030. These comparisons are needed to implement section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which establishes a rule enforceable with a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2021 because appropriations for those years have not yet been completed.

Table 2 compares the current status of appropriations for fiscal year 2021 with the limits filed in the Congressional Record on February 25 for fiscal year 2021 for the Committee on Appropriations. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which prohibits the consideration of measures that would breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority.

Table 3 compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for legislative action completed by each authorizing committee with the limits filed in the Congressional Record on February 25 for fiscal year 2021, and for the 10-year period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030. These comparisons are needed to enforce the point of order under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. It is also needed to implement section 311(c), which provides an exception for committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

Table 4 displays the current level of advance appropriations in fiscal year 2021 appropriations bills. This table is needed to enforce a rule against appropriations bills containing advance appropriations that: (i) are not identified in the statement of the Chairman published in the Congressional Record on May 1, 2020 or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in section 203 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019, as continued in effect by the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2021.

In addition, a letter from the Congressional Budget Office is attached that summarizes and compares the budget impact of legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution against the budget resolution aggregate in force.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Wheelock or Raquel Spencer.

Sincerely,

JOHN YARMUTH,
Chairman.

TABLE 1.—REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2021, AND 2021–2030 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF APRIL 2, 2021

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year 2021	Fiscal Years 2021–2030
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	5,868,572	n.a.
Outlays	5,998,437	n.a.
Revenues	2,523,057	35,075,136
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	5,786,297	n.a.
Outlays	5,862,608	n.a.

TABLE 1.—REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2021, AND 2021–2030 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF APRIL 2, 2021—Continued

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year 2021	Fiscal Years 2021–2030
Revenues	2,463,210	35,047,816
Current Level over (+) / under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	– 82,275	n.a.
Outlays	– 135,829	n.a.
Revenues	– 59,847	– 27,320

n.a. = Not applicable because the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2021 (S. Con. Res. 5) does not provide an allocation for the Appropriations Committee beyond the budget year.

TABLE 2.—APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021, COMPARISON OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ACTION WITH 302(a) ALLOCATION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF APRIL 2, 2021

[Unified budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year 2021
302(a) Allocation:	
Discretionary: ¹	
Budget Authority	1,396,516
Outlays	1,457,891
Current Law Mandatory:	
Budget Authority	1,370,975
Outlays	1,321,625
Enacted Legislation:	
Discretionary:	
Budget Authority	1,396,516

TABLE 2.—APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021, COMPARISON OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ACTION WITH 302(a) ALLOCATION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF APRIL 2, 2021—Continued

[Unified budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year 2021
Outlays	1,457,891
Current Law Mandatory:	
Budget Authority	1,370,975
Outlays	1,321,625
Difference:	
Discretionary:	
Budget Authority	— — —
Outlays	— — —
Current Law Mandatory:	
Budget Authority	— — —

TABLE 2.—APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021, COMPARISON OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ACTION WITH 302(a) ALLOCATION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF APRIL 2, 2021—Continued

[Unified budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year 2021
Outlays	— — —

¹ The allocation filed on February 25, 2021 pursuant to the S. Con. Res. 5 is consistent with appropriations amounts enacted in fiscal year 2021, including cap adjustments.TABLE 3.—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION, COMPARISON OF AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE LEGISLATIVE ACTION WITH 302(a) ALLOCATIONS ¹ FOR BUDGET CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF APRIL 2, 2021

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	Fiscal Year 2021		Fiscal Years 2021–2030 Total		House Committee	Fiscal Year 2021		Fiscal Years 2021–2030 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays		BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:					Judiciary:				
Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —
Enacted Legislation	16,092	12,644	16,092	16,091	Enacted Legislation	1,000	200	1,000	1,000
Difference	16,092	12,644	16,092	16,091	Difference	1,000	200	1,000	1,000
Armed Services:					Natural Resources:				
Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —
Enacted Legislation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	Enacted Legislation	1,005	409	1,005	1,005
Difference	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	Difference	1,005	409	1,005	1,005
Education and Labor:					Oversight and Reform:				
Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —
Enacted Legislation	220,795	26,836	220,892	220,749	Enacted Legislation	362,950	284,451	362,950	362,810
Difference	220,795	26,836	220,892	220,749	Difference	362,950	284,451	362,950	362,810
Energy and Commerce:					Science, Space, and Technology:				
Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —
Enacted Legislation	121,784	34,110	138,713	137,909	Enacted Legislation	750	125	750	750
Difference	121,784	34,110	138,713	137,909	Difference	750	125	750	750
Financial Services:					Small Business:				
Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —
Enacted Legislation	77,500	37,294	76,780	75,397	Enacted Legislation	53,600	63,550	53,600	64,940
Difference	77,500	37,294	76,780	75,397	Difference	53,600	63,550	53,600	64,940
Foreign Affairs:					Transportation and Infrastructure:				
Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —
Enacted Legislation	10,000	1,159	10,000	9,526	Enacted Legislation	96,213	28,645	96,213	91,225
Difference	10,000	1,159	10,000	9,526	Difference	96,213	28,645	96,213	91,225
Homeland Security:					Veterans' Affairs:				
Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —
Enacted Legislation	1,560	311	1,560	1,529	Enacted Legislation	17,080	10,510	17,065	16,653
Difference	1,560	311	1,560	1,529	Difference	17,080	10,510	17,065	16,653
House Administration:					Ways and Means:				
Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	Change in Allocation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —
Enacted Legislation	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	Enacted Legislation	607,457	602,864	829,040	818,037
Difference	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	Difference	607,457	602,864	829,040	818,037

¹ Amounts for reconciliation instructions included in S. Con. Res. 5 were not distributed in Committee allocations. However, reconciliation amounts enacted in the American Rescue Plan (P.L. 117–2) have been distributed by Committee. Those distributed amounts are \$53,598 million less over the 2021–2030 budget window than was assumed in S. Con. Res. 5.

TABLE 4.—ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 203 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF APRIL 2, 2021

[Budget authority in millions of dollars]

For Fiscal Year 2022:	
Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations:	
Appropriate Level	28,852
Enacted Advances:	
Employment and Training Administration	1,772
Education for the Disadvantaged	10,841
School Improvement	1,681
Career, Technical, and Adult Education	791
Special Education	9,283
Tenant-based Rental Assistance	4,000
Project-based Rental Assistance	400
Subtotal, Enacted Advances	28,769
Enacted Advances vs. Limit	– 83
Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations:	
Appropriate Level	n.a.
Enacted Advances:	
Veterans Medical Services	58,897
Veterans Medical Support and Compliance	8,403
Veterans Medical Facilities	6,735
Veterans Medical Community Care	20,148

TABLE 4.—ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 203 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF APRIL 2, 2021—Continued

[Budget authority in millions of dollars]

For Fiscal Year 2022:	
Subtotal, Enacted Advances	94,183
For Fiscal Year 2023:	
Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations:	
Appropriate Level	n.a.
Enacted Advances:	
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	475
Subtotal, Enacted Advances	475

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, April 14, 2021.Hon. JOHN YARMUTH,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2021 budget and is current through April 2, 2021. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2021, pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2021 (S. Con. Res. 5).

Since our last letter dated October 15, 2020, the Congress has incorporated legislation

that cleared in the 116th Congress as previously enacted and therefore this current level letter only itemizes the legislation that cleared beginning with the 117th Congress. The Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following legislation that has

significant effects on budget authority, outlays, and revenues in fiscal year 2021 for the 117th Congress:
American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117-2); and

PPP Extension Act of 2021 (Public Law 117-6).
Sincerely,
PHILLIP L. SWAGEL,
Director.
Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2021 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH APRIL 2, 2021
(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted: ^{a,b}			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,538,727
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,420,529	2,896,181	n.a.
Authorizing and Appropriation legislation	2,809,248	2,895,033	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-1,031,266	-1,031,714	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	4,198,511	4,759,500	2,538,727
Enacted Legislation			
Authorizing Legislation: ^b			
American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (P.L. 117-2)	1,587,786	1,088,108	-75,517
PPP Extension Act of 2021 (P.L. 117-6)	0	15,000	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	1,587,786	1,103,108	-75,517
Total Current Level: ^{a,b}	5,786,297	5,862,608	2,463,210
Total House Resolution	5,868,572	5,998,437	2,523,057
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	82,275	135,829	59,847
Memorandum			
Revenues, 2021-2030			
House Current Level ^b	n.a.	n.a.	35,047,816
House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	35,075,136
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	27,320

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = public law.
^a Sections 1001-1004 of the 21st Century Cures Act (P.L. 114-255) require that certain funding provided for 2017 through 2026 to the Department of Health and Human Services—in particular the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health—be excluded from estimates for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Deficit Control Act) and the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Congressional Budget Act). Therefore, the amounts shown in this report do not include \$474 million in budget authority and \$733 million in estimated outlays.
^b For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the aggregate spending and revenue levels for 2021 published in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2021, by the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2021 (S. Con. Res. 5), do not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, amounts in this current level report do not include those items.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 422.—An Act to allow Senators, Senators-elect, committees of the Senate, leadership offices, and other offices of the Senate to share employees, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 22, 2021, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-893. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a Department's 2021 Report, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113 note; Public Law 115-232, Sec. 2862(f); (132 Stat. 2284); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-894. A letter from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's 2021 annual report to Congress on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1692m(a); Public Law 90-321, Sec. 815(a) (as amended by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1089(1)); (124 Stat. 2092); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-895. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services,

transmitting the Department's final rule — Electronic Import Entries; Technical Amendments [Docket No. FDA-2016-N-1487] received April 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-896. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Technical Amendments [Docket No.: FDA-2021-N-0246] received April 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-897. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Requirements for Foreign and Domestic Establishment Registration and Listing for Human Drugs, Including Drugs That Are Regulated Under a Biologics License Application, and Animal Drugs; Correcting Amendments [Docket No.: FDA-2005-N-0464] (RIN: 0910-AA49) received April 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-898. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Rhode Island; Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions [EPA-R01-OAR-2020-0712; FRL-10022-16-Region 1] received April 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-899. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; West Virginia; 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard Second Maintenance Plan for the West Virginia Portion of the Wheeling, WV-OH Area Comprising Marshall and Ohio Counties [EPA-R08-OAR-2020-0198; FRL-10022-11-Region 3] received April 1,

2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-900. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; New Mexico and Albuquerque-Bernalillo County, New Mexico; Control of Emissions From Existing Other Solid Waste Incineration Units [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0513; FRL-10021-41-Region 6] received April 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-901. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Maine; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements for the 2015 Ozone Standard and Negative Declaration for the Oil and Gas Industry for the 2008 and 2015 Ozone Standards [EPA-R01-2020-0327; FRL-10021-93-Region 1] received April 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-902. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Texas; Interstate Visibility Transport [EPA-R06-OAR-2016-0611; FRL-10021-20-Region 6] received April 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-903. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; South Dakota; Control of Emissions From Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [EPA-R08-OAR-2020-0516; FRL-10020-22-Region 8] received April 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-

121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-904. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Extension of 2019 and 2020 Renewable Fuel Standard Compliance and Attest Engagement Reporting Deadlines [EPA-HQ-OAR-2020-0725; FRL-10021-95-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AV07) received April 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-905. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Approval and Partial Disapproval of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; California; Infrastructure Requirements for Ozone [EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0096; FRL-10015-36-Region 9] received April 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-906. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyriofenone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0335; FRL-10019-55] received April 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-907. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-908. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of a proposed license for exports; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-909. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of a proposed license for exports; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-910. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of a proposed license for exports; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-911. A letter from the Senior Advisor, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-912. A letter from the Solicitor, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting a designation of acting officer, and a change in previously submitted reported information, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-913. A letter from the Chair, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's 2020 No FEAR Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-914. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a notification of a designation of acting officer, and a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York: Committee on Oversight and Reform. Supplemental report on H.R. 51. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union. (Rept. 117-19, Pt.2).

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (for herself, Mr. BRADY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 19. A bill to provide for certain reforms with respect to the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, the Medicaid program under title XIX of such Act, the Food and Drug Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. OMAR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SCANLON, and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H.R. 2716. A bill to suspend certain United States assistance for the Government of Honduras until corruption, impunity, and human rights violations are no longer systemic, and the perpetrators of these crimes are being brought to justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 2717. A bill to establish a grant program to encourage schools to conduct independent facility security risk assessments and make hard security improvements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. TIMMONS, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. HILL, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. BABIN, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CAR-

TER of Georgia, Mrs. McCLAIN, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. STEIL, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BARR, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. CARL, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HERN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BRADY, Mr. BACON, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. FALLON, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. MANN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. PALMER, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. LATTI, Mr. ROY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. DUNCAN, and Ms. FOXX):

H.R. 2718. A bill to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran and modify other existing sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, the Judiciary, Oversight and Reform, Ways and Means, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 2719. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to make modifications to the passenger facility charge program administered by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 2720. A bill to provide for domestic sourcing of personal protective equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Veterans' Affairs, Homeland Security, Education and Labor, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 2721. A bill to reauthorize the Clean School Bus Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CORREA, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2722. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require local educational agencies to implement a policy on allergy bullying in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUELLAR (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 2723. A bill to promote bilateral tourism through cooperation between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELGADO (for himself and Ms. MACE):

H.R. 2724. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for peer support specialists for claimants who are survivors of military sexual trauma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 2725. A bill to establish a commission to address the fundamental repercussions of a misguided intervention, by the United States on the Dominican Republic between 1916-1924 and 1965-1966, including to study and consider an apology and proposals for the repair of relations and reconciliation with the people of the Dominican Republic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLEG0 (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina):

H.R. 2726. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a plan to reduce the backlog of requests for information made to the Department of Veterans Affairs pursuant to section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDEN (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLAGHER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. PALMER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. GUEST):

H.R. 2727. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt certain 16- and 17-year-old individuals employed in timber harvesting entities or mechanized timber harvesting entities from child labor laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. FALLON):

H.R. 2728. A bill to require the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to review any purchase or lease of real estate near a military installation or military airspace in the United States by a foreign person connected to, or subsidized by, the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, the Islamic Republic of Iran, or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, Armed Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BUDD, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. ROY, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. GUEST, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. BERGMAN, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MAST, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MELJER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. MANN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. LATURNER):

H.R. 2729. A bill to immediately resume construction of the border wall system along the international border between the United States and Mexico to secure the border, enforce the rule of law, and expend appropriated funds as mandated by Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. OMAR, Mr. POCAN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. BUSH, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MENG, Ms. CHU, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H.R. 2730. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure College for All; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. GALLAGHER, Ms. WILD, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. SHERRILL):

H.R. 2731. A bill to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 2732. A bill to provide for the discharge of parent borrower liability if a student on whose behalf a parent has received certain student loans becomes disabled; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2733. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to States to establish a comprehensive school career counseling framework; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. CHU, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 2734. A bill to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to certain members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr.

GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. JONES, Ms. OMAR, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 2735. A bill to impose a tax on certain trading transactions to invest in our families and communities, improve our infrastructure and our environment, strengthen our financial security, expand opportunity and reduce market volatility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 2736. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to prohibit State and local governments from obligating any coronavirus relief funds provided by the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 until all coronavirus relief funds made available by the CARES Act are obligated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 2737. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain rules applicable to qualified small issue manufacturing bonds, to expand certain exceptions to the private activity bond rules for first-time farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 2738. A bill to amend section 2702 of title 18, United States Code, to prevent law enforcement and intelligence agencies from obtaining subscriber or customer records in exchange for anything of value, to address communications and records in the possession of intermediary internet service providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 2739. A bill to amend the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 to secure urgent resources vital to Indian victims of crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 2740. A bill to protect Native children and promote public safety in Indian country; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. ESTES, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. DEAN, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 2741. A bill to modify rules relating to 403(b) plans; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DELGADO, and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 2742. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish and maintain a registry for certain individuals who may have been exposed to per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances due to the environmental release of aqueous film-forming foam on military installations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a

period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mr. SAN NICOLAS):

H.R. 2743. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a process to review applications for certain grants to purchase equipment or systems that do not meet or exceed any applicable national voluntary consensus standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NEWMAN, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 2744. A bill to provide hazardous duty pay for Federal employees who may be exposed to COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2745. A bill to provide incentives for businesses to keep jobs in America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Oversight and Reform, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROSS (for herself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. FOX, Ms. MANNING, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CAWTHORN, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. BUDD):

H.R. 2746. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to redefine the eastern and middle judicial districts of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCANLON (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2747. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to provide for better protections for children raised in kinship families outside of the foster care system; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. MEIJER, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 2748. A bill to encourage the normalization of relations with Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. MRVAN, and Mr. PAPPAS):

H.R. 2749. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to update the Lethal Means Safety and Suicide Prevention training course of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK (for himself, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that a new State may only be admitted into the Union upon a vote of two-thirds of each House of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. OMAR, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. POCAN, Ms.

JACOBS of California, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MENG, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BASS, and Mr. NADLER):

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution recognizing that the climate crisis is disproportionately affecting the health, economic opportunity, and fundamental rights of children, recognizing the importance of renewed leadership by the United States in addressing the climate crisis, and recognizing the need of the United States to develop a national, comprehensive, and science-based climate recovery plan to phase out fossil fuel emissions, protect and enhance natural sequestration, and put the United States on a path towards stabilizing the climate system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H. Res. 339. A resolution electing the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. MEIJER):

H. Res. 340. A resolution condemning the Government of Russia's attempted assassination of Mr. Navalny and criminal acts to intimidate and silence Russian freedom defenders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Ms. CHU, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. CORREA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LIEU, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MENG, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. VELA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H. Res. 341. A resolution urging the promotion of equity in the distribution and allocation of COVID-19 vaccines among Hispanic, Black, Asian-American, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, and Native American communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington:

H.R. 19.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18.

The Congress shall have Power . . .

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas:

H.R. 2717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 2718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 2720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: "Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States" and "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 2721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representative.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 2723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DELGADO:

H.R. 2724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 2725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "The Congress shall have Power [. . .] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States . . ."

By Mr. GALLEGO:
H.R. 2726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

[The Congress shall have Power . . .] To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H.R. 2727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas:

H.R. 2728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 2729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S.C. Article I Section 8

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 2730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 2731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to make laws that are necessary and proper to carry out its enumerated powers.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 2732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution in that the legislation exercises legislative powers granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or any Department or Office thereof."

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 2733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution in that the legislation exercises legislative powers granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or any Department or Office thereof."

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1—all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 2735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 2736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(Art. I, §8, cl. 3)

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 2737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into the Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I to the Constitution

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 2739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 2740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 2741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 2742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 15:

Congress shall have Power to provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 15:

Congress shall have Power to provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 2745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. ROSS:

H.R. 2746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 9, which states "The Congress shall have Power . . . To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court."

In addition, Article III, Section 1 states that "The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress

may from time to time ordain and establish."

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 2747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 2748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 2749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.J. Res. 42.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 5, which confers on Congress the power, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, to propose Amendments to this Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 243: Mr. BRADY.

H.R. 255: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 256: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. DAVIDSON.

H.R. 426: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 461: Mr. SUOZZI and Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 471: Mr. GRIFFITH and Mr. LATURNER.

H.R. 476: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 496: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 521: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 541: Ms. LETLOW and Mr. BRADY.

H.R. 558: Ms. LETLOW.

H.R. 568: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana and Mrs. HINSON.

H.R. 620: Mr. BRADY.

H.R. 666: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 682: Mr. DAVIDSON.

H.R. 686: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 705: Mr. BRADY.

H.R. 708: Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 826: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 856: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 881: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 890: Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 909: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1012: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1015: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1035: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1036: Mr. PERRY, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1080: Mr. BRADY.

H.R. 1111: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1115: Mr. BARR, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. FALLON, and Mr. BUCHSON.

H.R. 1117: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1145: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 1155: Mr. LIEU, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 1179: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 1194: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1219: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1259: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1346: Mr. HUIZENGA and Mr. PENCE.

- H.R. 1488: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1496: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1534: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 1548: Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 1650: Mr. COMER.
H.R. 1656: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1667: Mrs. LURIA and Mr. MRVAN.
H.R. 1695: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1703: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1718: Mr. JACKSON.
H.R. 1769: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 1807: Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 1929: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1931: Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. WELCH, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. KIM of California, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1974: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 2042: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2059: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2062: Ms. SALAZAR.
H.R. 2096: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 2100: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.
H.R. 2103: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
H.R. 2125: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2165: Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 2168: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 2182: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2198: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2218: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 2222: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2224: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 2226: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 2282: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
H.R. 2283: Ms. STRICKLAND and Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 2294: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 2328: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2349: Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 2372: Mr. KAHELE and Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 2373: Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 2378: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2380: Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 2399: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 2400: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 2469: Mr. DAVIDSON.
H.R. 2483: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 2488: Mr. DAVIDSON and Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 2500: Mr. ROSENDALE and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 2579: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 2598: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. JONES, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2600: Mr. NEHLS.
H.R. 2606: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2608: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 2619: Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. BRADY, and Mr. MAST.
H.R. 2639: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 2646: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2651: Mr. BIGGS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 2660: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 2661: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 2662: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2705: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. COLE, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MAST, Mr. HAGEDORN, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2708: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Ms. HERRELL.
H.R. 2712: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H. Con. Res. 19: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 29: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. DEAN, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. TITUS, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 47: Mr. NORCROSS and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
H. Res. 114: Ms. CHENEY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. REED, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
H. Res. 118: Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. REED, Mr. PFLUGER, and Mr. TAKANO.
H. Res. 186: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MEUSER, and Ms. SPANBERGER.
H. Res. 225: Ms. NEWMAN and Ms. ESHOO.
H. Res. 289: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 294: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LIEU, Mr. REED, and Mr. FOSTER.
H. Res. 309: Mr. JACKSON.
H. Res. 317: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. LIEU, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H. Res. 334: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.