

But the Senate minority leader and several of his colleagues seem to be hellbent on using archaic Senate procedural rules to allow the minority in the Senate to block any legislation designed to protect the voting and civil rights of our country's minority citizens as we continue our pursuit toward the fulfillment of liberty and justice for all.

We have been here before. During the 1940s and 1950s, the Senate filibuster was used to kill civil rights legislation and protect Jim Crow laws. Today, Senate Republican leaders are employing the same tactics to obstruct voting rights and civil rights legislation. Their efforts are designed to gain power for their party by suppressing political participation by minorities.

The minority leader has threatened that if Senate Democrats modify the filibuster rules to do to him as he did to President Obama, he will resort to scorched-earth tactics. This threat of scorched-earth tactics by the Senate minority leader in defiance of American democracy is reminiscent of "Mississippi Burning," which highlighted the lynching of three civil rights workers who were simply registering Black voters in Mississippi in June 1964. They were murdered by the KKK, with the cooperation of law enforcement officials, to keep them from assisting minority citizens who simply wanted to vote. It was 44 days before their bodies were located and four decades before anyone faced legal consequences for their deaths.

Today, Republicans are using the big lie about the 2020 elections as a pretext to advance a litany of minority voter suppression laws. They know that our vision of liberty and justice for all enjoys majority support among voters, so they seek to suppress enough votes so that their oppressive policies and bankrupt ideas can prevail. The minority leader wants to allow a minority of his minority to block measures that would prevent a return to bygone days.

To confront this threat, the Senate must eliminate the 60-vote threshold to end a filibuster on voting rights and civil rights legislation. Just as Mississippi Burning was met with the Civil Rights Act and Voting Rights Act, the threat of scorched earth must be met with the For the People Act and the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Act.

I didn't march in the streets and spend nights in jail as a young man to find myself fighting the same battles generations later, but it appears the minority leader and his Republican colleagues are preparing to retread old ground, and I am prepared to stand my ground.

To the minority leader and his colleagues, I say: This is not a political opportunity. This is a national emergency.

Since this country's inception, equal rights for people of color have been restricted by those in power who seek to hold on to power by using their power to deny the greatness of this country to those who do not look like them.

Extending debate on legislative issues is one thing, but when it comes to rights rooted in the Constitution, the filibuster has no place.

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

HONORING REV. DR. C.T. WRIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I am going to do a couple of things right now, and one of the first ones is a little conversation about someone we lost in my community who actually was a friend and a neighbor and had an impact in ways that are hard to describe. I desperately wish the Members of this body could have spent time with him and his wife.

It is Rev. Dr. Professor C.T. Wright. What was so unique about him is that he was a big man, and he had a voice that carried. You would have conversations with him, Madam Speaker, and realize just how incredibly brilliant he was.

He was born in Georgia. He struggled and worked his way up. He ended up with a Ph.D. in history from Boston College. He became a civil rights leader, yet when you would talk to him about that, Reverend Wright—Dr. Wright—actually often wouldn't refer to himself as a civil rights leader. He would say: I want to lead for humanity.

He loved people. It was a different view. He took his struggles, his success, and his academic prowess and said: We are going to make people's lives better. Why would you dare focus on the color of their skin?

I remember one of the most interesting conversations I had with him where he and I were in the back of the room and talked, and he saw many of—actually, almost an example of what we just saw on the floor—the discussions of politics and race, and said: DAVID, it is class and opportunity that divides us. It is not our color; it is our opportunity.

Dr. Wright was just a powerful and brilliant man.

Madam Speaker, you see his wife there, Mary. They were married in 1974. Mary was the epitome of love.

How many of us in our life have that one person?

I am blessed to have a 5-year-old little girl. But even when she was younger, when she would see Mary, Mary would sort of scream, and the two of them would run over and hug each other. She was just the epitome of love.

That made them incredibly powerful, as you felt good by just knowing Dr. Wright and Mary Wright in your community.

The other thing that also made him unique was that he was a passionate conservative. He was a Republican elector. He was the chairman of our

clemency board, and he was on my community school board. He was brilliant, and he cared about humanity. He ran charities and foundations to help all people. They helped people on the continent of Africa and even people all through our community. He was a powerful force for good because he was good, because he was passionate, and because he was caring.

We lost both Mary and Dr. Wright last year.

I am going to put in a much more detailed CV because his history goes on page after page, and we will put that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Individuals like them bring us together and also make us better. It breaks my heart that more will not get to spend time with him because, after a couple of minutes with him and Mary, you felt different.

The last thing I will say is he loved to give the opening prayer at Republican meetings. What was always so fascinating, Madam Speaker, is you would watch the room, and the room ends up standing and clapping. I was waiting for an altar call. Now, I am Catholic, so I am not used to the concept of an altar call, but watching someone be able to have so much energy, vigor, enthusiasm, love for people, and love for believing that conservatism is how you free people, he made an impact. He made an impact on my life, my family's life, my community, and my State, and I believe he made an impact on this country.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Dr. C.T. Wright, a passionate, faithful, and devoted public servant and valued neighbor. C.T. will be remembered as a mentor and true leader throughout the education, criminal justice, and faith communities in Arizona. He devoted much of his life to civil rights and education, working for many of the country's historically black colleges and universities, where he then moved on to his passion to help with human rights. He founded the Light of Hope Institute, which promotes human rights around the world. He also served as a delegate for the Electoral College and met six presidents. C.T. frequently led prayers at campaign rallies and promoted faith. He proudly served as the Chairman of the Board of Executive Clemency.

C.T. Wright had great passion for his family, education, faith, and freedom. Many will always remember and consider him as their brother. He leaves behind a great legacy that has reached out to communities across Arizona. He was a thoughtful, compassionate, and kind man who always cared for others while ensuring a good future for all.

C.T. Wright served countless communities unselfishly and served as a great leader. May we continue to honor his memory through our passion and service to our communities.

REVISITING NET NEUTRALITY

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I want to do a handful of other things because, with the craziness of our schedule, we haven't had a chance to sort of walk through a lot of policy thoughts. But there was one that has been bugging me. I have the hour, so I was going to share something that has just been in my craw for a while.

Do we all remember a few years ago—ancient history; in politics, we seem to have, shall we say, the attention span of a gnat—one of the pop culture debates we on the right and left were having was something called net neutrality? The Democrats were all into net neutrality, even though, I will debate, most of this body had no idea what net neutrality was. I want to sort of argue that thank heaven and thank the internet gods that the Democrat net neutrality push only lasted 1 year or think about how miserable this last year would have been.

We should be held accountable for our policy beliefs. This is an occasion where I have heard no one get up here and talk about what society would have looked like in the United States during the pandemic if the Democrats' net neutrality policy—remember, they did it for 1 year, through regulatory fiat.

The only reason I show this chart is, do you see, Madam Speaker, the crash here in spending? It was scheduled to continue to crash in spending. That spending was the internet—the pipes, the robustness, the speed, and the carrying capacity of the internet—which crashed during the Democrat administration's FCC 1 year of functionally doing an administrative fiat of net neutrality.

If that line had continued, how many of you were educating your kids on Zoom? How many of you were holding meetings on the internet? How many of you had to work from home? How many of us in this body were doing committee hearings over the internet?

Yet, the internet in the United States in 2017, 2018, and 2019 actually got dramatically more robust and dramatically faster. In many communities—particularly on the East Coast, oddly enough—there are communities that doubled their speed and the robustness of the pipes.

□ 1330

It happened because of the massive investment because, thank heaven, the crazy policy of what was net neutrality was taken away.

We need to be honest. Sometimes one needs to be willing to walk up and admit, hey, that was a really stupid idea. The one reason this country was able to have this disruption and transfer to basically a knowledge-based, web-based, internet-based economy was because the crazy policies that came with net neutrality of having a robust internet only lasted 1 year.

You can actually see that this is what happened. This is us. This is America trying to survive economically and educationally. When you see these charts, this was not possible. If that trend, regulatorily, and then therefore investment-wise that started in 2016, when the policy shift happened, if it had lasted more than a year, this year would have been a lot different.

It is just an occasion where 4 years ago, 5 years ago, some of us would get

up here and try to explain what it would mean to the efficiency, the robustness, the opportunity for even gamers being able to use the internet, and we would get great rhetorical comments back, often having nothing to actually do with how the internet worked. Thank heaven another bad policy only lasted a short time.

BUILDING A ROBUST ECONOMY

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, the other thing I also want to talk about is why so many of us who actually own calculators are intensely concerned about the left's policy in the last couple of months.

This is one of those things that I genuinely believe both sides here passionately care about and want society to do well, to have opportunity, the working poor to become less poor, the poor to become less poor, the middle class to be able to thrive; but we just see the basics of economics differently.

I want to spend just a couple of moments and walk through what is fact, and we have the facts. Now, first off, how many times over, and over, and over do we hear, Hey, post-tax reform, the rich are getting richer; the poor are getting poorer?

That is mathematically absolutely not true. It is a lie.

It turns out, policies like we have been engaged in just recently make the wealthy wealthier. It is a simple thought. When you pump massive amounts of liquidity into a society, into an economy, those people who own assets get richer. Their stocks go up, their house values go up, and other assets they have go up.

But if you are part of the poor or working poor, how many stocks do you own? How much real estate do you own?

Yet the basic economic principles that you get to look at over and over, the \$1.9 trillion spending bill violated almost all of the principles.

So you say, okay, so we are going to deliver actual checks. Great. Okay. That will have an impact for several months. It will reduce poverty for several months, but it doesn't change the base.

A year later, are you being paid more? Are there more job opportunities? Is your labor valuable?

Because the remarkable thing that happened in 2018 and 2019 is the working poor, their labor became valuable. They became essential to the society, to economic growth.

I sat through joint economic hearings in previous years and listened to the arrogance of the economists, the arrogance of the political class who said: Well, they didn't finish high school. They are going to be part of the permanent underclass. We will just find a way to subsidize them and write them off in society instead of making them valuable.

And that is what we have gone back and done again. And the problem is that we have done it in a way where we think we have big hearts. We are going to send checks.

But what about the year after? Did they make their labor, their skill sets, or their lack of skill sets, desirable in the economy?

So a simple point—and if I actually even had better data, this would even be more dramatic—in 2013 to 2019, you can see the orange there, and that is actually pretty much the wealthy in our country.

Under the previous administration, you can see—and when I say “previous,” I am talking Obama—the wealthy got substantially wealthier than the poor, and it is because the lack of understanding of what creates economic vitality. This here is almost solely 2018 and 2019. The poor got wealthier; not the rich, the poor.

The working poor moved up dramatically faster than the rich.

Why?

Well, it turns out, tax reform moved lots of capital into making plants and equipment more efficient, meaning you pay people more.

You all remember your basic economics class. What are the two things that raises someone's wages?

Inflation—which means you paid more, but you didn't get anything more—and productivity.

When you raise a business's, the society's, the community's productivity, people get paid more. That is what was happening here. We made the working poor less poor through tax; regulatory; and immigration policy, which is something I will touch on at the end because it is very uncomfortable for a lot of people to talk about.

Immigration policy is complex from an economic standpoint, but if you love and care for those who are just struggling and trying to survive, they may not have had the opportunity to go to grad school or college. They may not have even graduated high school, but they are out there trying to provide for themselves and their families and the people they love and care for.

Why do we adopt policies like this that don't make their labor valuable, and then we choose to flood the market with similar skill sets to devalue the labor?

There is this weird duplicity that happens here, where we talk about helping those who need help, and then we engage in policies, whether it be immigration policy, regulatory policy, particularly tax and spending policy, that ends up crushing the very people we claim we are trying to help.

I know charts are annoying, but the math is the math. If you look at this one, you start to see the percentage of American households that were in poverty. We had substantially plateaued. We weren't getting better as a society. And then all of a sudden over here, you see we started doing what was necessary to expand, create opportunity. And, yes, it meant getting businesses to have to compete with each other by putting money into more efficient equipment and doing things that lifted Americans and created value for labor, even the very low-skilled labor.

You start to see in 2018 and 2019, America hitting its lowest poverty rates ever; income, food insecurity, the lowest ever. The working poor's labor became valuable. And if you actually want to go into the subsets—which I have chart after chart after chart—if you claim you care about African-American females or this subset or that subset, you see that some of those subsets have movement in the value of their talents and their labor, which was remarkable.

We had, I think, a quarter in early 2019, or it was late 2018, where African-American women had almost a double-digit rise in wages in an entire year. It was like a 7.3 percent rise in wages.

I know, as a Republican, we have this bad habit of sounding like accountants on steroids, but these numbers really do mean something. It is people. It is how they feed their family, how they save for retirement, how they have an opportunity. There were amazing things happening.

We talk a lot about income inequality, which I actually have a personal fixation on this. And if you actually look at the first time we had major movement in the drop of income inequality in this society, it was 2018 and 2019. And it wasn't because rich people got less rich. It was because the poor, the working poor got dramatically less poor.

We adopted policies that made their labor valuable. Then the pandemic hit and we had to rebuild.

But are we rebuilding in a way that makes their labor valuable?

I am going to make an argument that what we just did, we are going to get a nice little sugar high, but for a very short time.

And then the next day, what are their job prospects?

If you are someone who didn't finish high school, but you are willing to work your heart out, you are willing to learn, what opportunities did the last spending bill provide for that person? How many new jobs did it help create? How much economic expansion? How many capital expenditures to make their jobs more productive so they can be paid more?

Instead, what we did is we said: Here is some money, and, oh, by the way, we are going to raise taxes over here coming later this year and those things, so your job prospects—it is a technical economic term—you are screwed in the future.

Do we think more than just the next election cycle?

If we are going to make the poor less poor in this country, you need opportunity. We just spent \$1.9 trillion and not a dime of it creates opportunity, creates what the future should look like.

So we say we care. We both care. The problem is, I have the numbers that show what worked. The other side has decades of doing the same thing and income inequality and poverty didn't get better. They are blips. But those blips

were from direct cash, unless the plan is just, hey, we are going to do direct cash forever and ever and ever, and that is really going to be great for society and the psyche of our society.

Once again, I am sorry to do this, and I hate this term, but it is the only one the economists around here all use, which is "quartiles." Here is the lowest income quartile. Take a look at 2019, if you are willing to embrace math.

I always thought that would be the great Christmas gift around here, is to buy everyone a calculator. A family joke is: Daddy works in a math-free zone.

It was a remarkable change in the value of those workers and what they were paid, and it is because their talent, their labor that they had to offer became more valuable.

Look at what happened in 2019. That is what changes a society, because the idea is, you build a base, and then the next year you build on it, and then the next year you build on it, and the next year you build on it. That is one way to remove lots of your society out of poverty.

The other is to do what the Democrats are doing right now and saying: We are going to send you a check.

Okay. What happens the day the check is gone? Did you make society more prosperous? Did you take the working poor of our country and make it so the value of their labor that they offer is more valuable the next day, and the next day, and the next day?

You didn't. The only way you basically have to backfill is you have got to send another check. It is just societal suicide and lunacy.

I understand pandering and politics, but at some point you wish you had a quiet room with some economists to say: How do we have a revolution in our society that we have dramatically less poor and the working poor are dramatically less poor? And how do we get there? And how do we do this over the next decade?

Because I will make you the argument that what was happening particularly in 2018 and 2019 were remarkable numbers. So let's go to the next quartile up. It turns out the same thing was happening.

And when you actually look at the stratification of these quartiles—I am sorry, it is geeky—the lowest quartile, a traditionally very, very low skill set. Second quartile, up some skill set. And you actually see remarkable—I mean, a \$2,600 increase in the value of their labor for the second quartile, which is still poverty. It is working poor, but this quartile, if you look at that, that is remarkable.

This is actually accounting for earning of tax credit and transfer payments, working through what was economic, and it was the value of their labor.

□ 1345

Once again, for all of us that keep coming behind these microphones—

and, you know, particularly the darkness of this body right now, we see so much of the debate being about the pigment of someone's skin instead of the economic circumstances, the class, as Dr. Wright would often refer to, and what we do to create opportunity.

And this chart here basically is just pure salary. What happened to the mean weekly, real earnings? Now, remember, these are inflationary adjusted. So I do my best to make sure the math is as honest as possible. And when you actually start to see the quartiles of African-American wages taking a huge spike up in 2018 and 2019—Anglos, Hispanics—really the growth rate in their wages was remarkable. And there are some other charts, which are really hard to read, that are a little geeky, that say, okay, here is the level of skill set, educational attainment, those things.

It turns out, we had such a robust economy that those who are often at the tail end of educational attainment actually had the fastest growth in wages.

So you go back to the earlier chart, saying, turns out the working poor got substantially less poor, the rich got richer, but nothing at the same percentages. And that is why the economic inequality shrank. That is the honest math. Yet, you don't hear it in the rhetoric here, because the rhetorical divide of our society is so much more powerful and desired, because it is about winning the next election than actually doing what is important to make society great.

So right now—and this is a hard one to talk about, because we have so politicized it that trying to look at it through an economic lens is really hard. I will get folks—whenever I start to walk through these numbers, folks will send me crazy stuff. And I am trying to say this isn't about ethnicity; this is—I am doing labor economics.

Janet Yellen is supposed to be a brilliant labor economist, yet when you hear her speeches recently—or now that she is Treasury Secretary—it rips your heart out, saying, at least take a breath and compliment what happened in the previous couple of years, but that would mean saying something nice to free market economics.

Right now, we estimate—and this is the best number I can get my hands on—that about 4½ percent of the labor force is undocumented.

In a society right now where, if you actually really dive into labor force participation numbers, unemployment is probably double the number we post. You know, people who should be in the labor pool aren't there, the folks who were the miracle of, particularly, 2018 and 2019, the number of folks who came back into the labor force—remember, we actually had some quarters there with some weird numbers where unemployment actually sort of flatlined, but the number of workers in the United States exploded. How does that happen?

It means you have such a robust economy that you are drawing people back in.

The crisis we live in today is so many Americans, particularly female workers, are now out of the labor force, with almost no intention of coming back in. What is devastating about that is we just passed legislation here that will reinforce the incentive not to come back in. Because, instead of designing the Democrat's \$1.9 trillion spending bill saying, We are going to incentivize; we are going to help you; you can keep some of this money; and we are going to incentivize an employer to hire you, building that type of economy. It is, Here is something; you can have it if you work; you can have it if you just choose to stay home. There is no incentive there to come back into the labor market.

And why is this so darn important? Why do I fixate on this?

Post-tax reform, if you actually looked at the changes in revenues—remember, we had the second and third highest, adjusted for inflation, tax receipts in U.S. history post-tax reform, post the lower rates. It is because the economy, the pie, got so much bigger. But what was so special about that is the trust funds that so many of us had worked on, that—we were really worried how fast the Medicare trust fund was collapsing, the Social Security trust fund was collapsing. The actuarial life of them popped, it got longer. It is because we had so many more workers who were paying into it.

Remember, we have a pay-as-you-go system. When you hear the words “trust fund,” there is really very little cash in those trust funds.

If you care about protecting Social Security, if you care about protecting Medicare, if you care about society and these promises we have made, you would think the economics, the policy we are adopting here, are about maximizing opportunity employment, not trying to patch over pain that we are suffering right now in a way that makes the next day painful again.

So the last thing—and it actually does tie in. I am going to personalize this a little bit. I am blessed to live in a community where my school is open.

The greatest gift that has ever been given to me in my life, and my wife, is we have a little girl. Many know we struggled for years, and we were able to adopt a little girl. She is the greatest joy you can imagine.

She is in higher education now. She is in kindergarten. And this summer, for her first month—this is back in August—she had to sit at home behind a little laptop doing Zoom class, as a kindergartner. At that time she was $\frac{3}{4}$. She tested in early.

And she was miserable. I had a little girl—I didn't know this could happen, that a child that young could be depressed. She was miserable.

“Daddy, can I go to Washington with you?”

“Daddy, can I go to work with you?”

“Daddy, don't make me sit behind the computer.”

“Daddy, I don't like this.”

And then after about $3\frac{1}{2}$ weeks, the school district actually followed the science. Not the politics; they followed the science. Not the teachers' union; they followed the science. They started letting the little people into school. They took the proper precautions, and my little girl wears a mask and they sterilize their hands. They follow rational precautions.

Within just days, it is like I had a different little girl. She was joyful. She was happy. She announced she had a boyfriend. Daddy is not happy about that.

If that is my personal experience, what have we done to our society? What have we done to the next generation?

I came here last week and did a series of presentations of what we have done to individual future earning power, particularly the categories we just talked about, the working poor, their future earnings, their future income. We have crushed them, because today's success builds on the next. What happens when you take an entire year away from so many people's career paths, from building their base?

Now, this is international, but we came across this; it is a sense of well-being of young people and older people from around the world.

We all saw that article from about a month ago about Las Vegas County and the number of suicides of children. And this one, when you look at it, it is our kids. We have devastated our kids.

My fear is we are going to spend decades making up for the schools being closed, the access to nutrition, the access to counseling, and the access to just human relationships. Why would we ever allow our public policy to do this sort of violence to the health and well-being and psyche of the children that we claim we care about, because the teachers' union has a different agenda?

I hope we, as Members, and I hope America remembers what happened here. I also hope the next time the left comes with a massive spending bill, they understand how much that money needs to go into repairing the damage we have done to our children, to the next generation, and being willing to recognize that we didn't follow the science; we followed the politics.

Madam Speaker, I wish us all a fine time at home. I hope now that the world is getting healthier, we can spend time with our constituents. Maybe when we come back in a couple weeks, we can still be partisan, we can still duke it out, but we actually make policy by rational math instead of the wedge of politics.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolu-

tion 188, the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. on Tuesday, March 23, 2021.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 23, 2021, at 11 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-658. A letter from the General Counsel, U.S. Government Accountability Office, transmitting Impoundment Control Act of 1974—Release of Withheld Amounts Due to Withdrawal of Rescission Proposals (H. Doc. No. 117—24); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EC-659. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Admiral Philip S. Davidson, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-660. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Robert B. Abrams, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-661. A letter from the Supervisory Workforce Analyst, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Strengthening Wage Protections for the Temporary and Permanent Employment of Certain Immigrants and Non-Immigrants in the United States; Delay of Effective Date [Docket No.: ETA-2020-0006] (RIN: 1205-AC00) received March 17, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC-662. A letter from the Board Secretary, Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting the Board's report on postal officers and employees who received total compensation in calendar year 2020, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3686(c); Public Law 109-435, Sec. 506; (120 Stat. 3236); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-663. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination and a 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-664. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of a vacancy and designation of acting officer, 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-665. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of a 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-666. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public