

HONORING ROBERT LEDER

(Mr. TORRES of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, Robert Leder, as his name would suggest, was a natural leader, loved by the thousands of students whose lives he lifted.

I, for one, would not be here were it not for Robert Leder, who set me on a trajectory that led from public housing in the Bronx to the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C. My story is a mere footnote in the much larger legacy of public service that Robert Leder left behind after his passing in 2018.

Mr. Leder entered public education in the 1960s as a Spanish teacher. In the late 1970s, he rose to become the principal of Herbert H. Lehman High School in the Bronx, a position he held for nearly three decades, making him, at the time, the longest-serving educator in America's largest city. As principal, he knew the name of every student. He held everyone around him to the highest standards, but he held himself to the highest standard of all.

We, the alumni of Lehman High School, will always love you, Mr. Leder. We will never forget you.

I will not always be a Member of Congress, but I will always be the grateful student of the greatest educator I have ever known, Robert Leder. May he rest in peace.

□ 2000

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WEEK OF THE YOUNG CHILD

(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 to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Week of the Young Child. Sponsored by the National Association for the Education of Young Children, the Week of the Young Child focuses on celebrating early learning, young children, their teachers, families, and communities.

This year's celebration took place from April 10th to the 16th. The National Association for the Education of Young Children first established the Week of the Young Child in 1971, recognizing the early childhood years lay the foundation for children's success in school and later in life.

Children's earliest years are the most important when it comes to shaping their learning and development. High-quality early care and educational services directly correlate to the health and well-being of our communities.

Madam Speaker, with more than 400 childcare facilities in my district, and as a senior member of the Education and Labor Committee, I understand the importance of quality early care and

education experiences as well as access to high-quality care.

Madam Speaker, let's take a moment to recognize the vital work performed by early childcare and education professionals and express our gratitude.

RUSSIAN AGGRESSION AGAINST UKRAINE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Ukraine Caucus, I rise today with deep concern regarding the Kremlin's increased aggression toward our ally, Ukraine.

Currently, Russia is amassing troops in and close to Ukraine. Ukrainian officials estimate about 80,000 Russian troops are amassed on its border.

U.S. European Command General Tod Wolters said, the current Russian force mirrors the size of the infiltration of forces that occurred back in 2014 when Russia illegally invaded Ukrainian territory.

This aggression serves one purpose: Russia's hybrid warfare to threaten the security of the Transatlantic Alliance.

I am so grateful to President Biden for his exceptional leadership and support for Ukraine, and I agree completely that there must be serious consequences should Russia escalate further. I am also thankful for the administration's latest round of punitive sanctions on Russia given its malign behavior.

To strengthen Ukraine's deterrence capabilities, our caucus spearheaded efforts to increase Ukraine's defense assistance funding by \$25 million, up to \$275 million in fiscal year 2021, and to place mandatory sanctions on Nord Stream 2.

Our caucus stands ready to support NATO and the Transatlantic Alliance to ensure the protection of Ukraine's sovereignty.

ENDORSEMENT OF VIOLENCE IS UNCONSCIONABLE

(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, I rise out of great concern for the violence and looting that has taken over Minneapolis. Even more troubling is the seeming endorsement and, yes, incitement of it by Members of this body.

It is unconscionable that a Member of Congress sent to Washington to make the laws that govern our Nation would encourage Americans to disregard those laws. Yet one of our Democratic colleagues, only one day after 136 rioters were arrested, called for protesters to "stay on the street," "get more active," and "get more confrontational" against our law enforcement, urging this escalation by

asking protesters to ignore the city-wide curfew. Hours later, that inevitable escalation did occur, with National Guardsmen and police being fired upon.

These are very dangerous actions. Is this the standard by which we want this House to represent the people of this country, that incitement? I recall a lot of talk some months ago about a much lesser speech being inciteful, language must less geared toward that being inciteful, yet it happens here.

Strong action needs to be taken by Speaker PELOSI and this House against these types of words.

SECURITY ON THE SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss one of the most important problems facing our country, and that is security on our southern border.

I don't think there is any question that most Americans agree that our immigration system is broken, but before we can fix it, we have to address the crisis at our southern border.

And let's be clear, what is happening at the border is a crisis. In fact, the President admitted as much recently. His commander of Public Health Service at the convention center in Dallas, when I went to visit there, maintained that they were in crisis management. You don't manage a crisis unless you are in a crisis, so it is a crisis. It is a humanitarian crisis.

The policies being put forward by this administration, basically absolutely opening the border are, in fact, inhumane. Smugglers, traffickers, foreign banks are profiting and enticing a hopeless people into sending their children or themselves to make this dangerous journey to unlawfully cross our southern border. These bad actors know how to manipulate our laws to their advantage. Putting forward policies that make it easier for them to do so is, in fact, wrong.

During the month of March record numbers of unaccompanied alien children were referred to the Office of Refugee Resettlement at the Department of Health and Human Services. The total number of people coming in without authorization is the highest it has been in 15 years. Customs and Border Protection encountered over 170,000 individuals along our southern border attempting to cross without authorization. Many of them were single adults.

Over the last month, Members from both sides of the aisle, both sides of the Capitol flocked to our southern border to see and assess the situation for

themselves. They held press conferences. They did television interviews and press releases. Yet the reaction from the White House was one of denial.

A little less than 30 days ago President Biden named Vice President HARRIS to be the point person for the administration to bring a resolution to the problems on our southern border. But the Vice President has not ventured to the southern border. She has not had a press conference about what is happening, and certainly we have seen no plan.

It was announced last week that she would be traveling to the Northern Triangle countries of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. This would be a great first step. But to fully understand what is happening, Madam Vice President, you need to visit our southern border.

Right now, hundreds of thousands of people come across our southern border from Mexico and from Central American countries through Mexico. And among these thousands are unaccompanied children, who are used as pawns to take advantage of the administration not enforcing our immigration laws. Now smugglers have no issue with using these children as pawns.

From the numbers, we know that America is one of the most generous countries in the world when it comes to accepting migrants. Through our Nation's legal immigration process, we welcome over a million immigrants into America each year. To be clear, these are immigrants who are going through the normal and correct process, waiting in line and following our laws. But how discouraging must it be for them to watch as others take full advantage of our laws not being enforced because of Washington putting forward poor policy. Despite the generosity of the American people, others remain intent on entering our country without the full benefit of the law behind them.

To better understand this problem, it is perhaps important to examine its roots. In 2018 it was important for me to visit Northern Triangle countries for myself to see the situation on the ground, to assess the situation, and determine how the United States can better help and better address the root causes of irregular migration.

The Energy and Commerce Committee, which I am a member of, does not oversee foreign policy, but it does have jurisdiction over the Department of Health and Human Services and subsequently the Office of Refugee Resettlement, which does take care of children who end up in the United States from one of those Northern Triangle countries.

I learned that there are different drivers for people to migrate from each of those countries. There is, unfortunately, corruption at the highest levels of government in that region. One common theme, however, is campaign rhetoric that places an "open for business" sign on our border.

The vast majority of people in the Northern Triangle countries do live below the poverty level and lack the job opportunities to escape these conditions.

In El Salvador there are problems with gangs, and the gangs are violent, medieval levels of violence and brutality. Many of the individuals serving in their government are holdovers from revolutionaries in the civil war which ended over 20 years ago.

Honduras is a country that is a through point for narcotics trafficking and, as a consequence, has many of the problems that you would imagine would be attendant with that type of activity. The current President ran for a second term. Although the law limited him to a single term the Supreme Court gave him a favorable decision. Unfortunately, he won with a very bare majority that only was determined many days after, some significant time after the election. Stop me if you have ever heard this before. But the Honduran President is now subject to extensive protests throughout his country that question the legitimacy of his Presidency.

I will say that the First Lady of Honduras, who has headed a task force aimed at addressing irregular migration, is performing a valuable service. The desire to make change is present, but some of the resources and capacity are lacking.

In Guatemala corruption is rampant at every level of government. There are only a couple of ministers who can be trusted. The corruption is, in this case, exacerbated by term limits because the President can only serve one term, and apparently there is a notion in the country that it is important for the President to prepare for the life after the Presidency while they are in office, so they do not have their focus on performing in the public good.

There is also a significant prejudice against some of the indigenous people in the western highlands of Guatemala. These individuals do make up the majority of migrants who are leaving Guatemala. Guatemala, unfortunately, has one of the highest rates of malnutrition in the world, and there is very little effort to combat this because of the lack of resolve of their central government.

In my travels to the Northern Triangle, I learned that there are people in those countries who do desire their children stay home. They understand the difficulty, the danger in exporting all of your young people. They do not want irregular migration. They do not want mass migration to happen. However, unfortunately, their governments have yet to eradicate the corruption from within.

For example, they do not prohibit financial institutions from contributing to the problem of these desperate populations. The financing of human trafficking from these countries is extremely profitable. Beyond the danger to the migrant, the journey from the

Northern Triangle to our southern border is not cheap. It varies what the estimates are, but families take out loans from \$1,000 to \$10,000 in order to smuggle someone to the United States.

Children that enter the United States will sometimes go to work to send remittances back to their homes so that their family is able to pay off the loan. In fact, it is estimated that as much as 20 percent of the GDP of Honduras comes in the form of remittances, so it is disturbing to learn that legitimate banks in Northern Triangle countries may be in this way aiding the human smuggling trade. It does seem like it is being fueled by cash from sources from which it should not come.

□ 2015

One clear solution to the corruption of these countries is to give more aid to the Bureau of International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement, a United Nations organization; non-governmental organizations and non-profits; the United States Agency for International Development, USAID; the International Organization for Migration; and other nongovernmental entities.

In addition, the United States Development Finance Corporation, previously known as the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, is facilitating needed investment in the region, and numerous nonprofits and NGOs have set up programs to help poverty-stricken and recent returnees.

One of my fears is what you hear discussed. Increasing the amount of aid to Central American countries will help with this problem. I would simply argue that the money not necessarily go to the governments that are not doing their jobs but to these non-governmental agencies, USAID, and the U.S. Development Finance Corporation, which will provide the economic benefit needed by the people who find it necessary to undergo that irregular migration because their economic circumstances are so dire.

In other words, the governments are not the ones that need the aid. The aid needs to be placed in the hands of those who can and will help the people. The answer to this humanitarian crisis is to not give more aid to the governments of the countries that are failing but to keep supporting the community-building organizations that are on the ground and working to serve their people.

In line with this solution, in September 2018, I introduced H. Res. 1092, expressing the sense of the House that the President should redirect foreign assistance given to El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras away from their central governments and toward the driving causes of illegal immigration into the United States and to those nongovernmental organizations. I have reintroduced this as H. Res. 17 in this Congress.

The inability of the central governments of those countries to deal with

and solve these issues has left over half of their populations living in poverty. In fact, millions of El Salvadorans, Guatemalans, and Hondurans face hunger at points each year.

This is why foreign assistance must be targeted toward the municipal and regional governments in these countries, as well as community-building organizations that have a direct impact on the lives of the people. Simply giving more aid to the central governments when it is not getting to where it is needed is unlikely to solve the problem.

The amount of foreign assistance could be determined by multiplying the number of unaccompanied alien children from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras and redirecting that amount for each country to these non-central government entities.

Focusing on where aid is directed is an essential part of the solution. That is why, in December 2018, I offered an amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act to redirect foreign aid to nongovernmental organizations in Northern Triangle countries and Mexico from being given to the central governments.

Instead, this funding would only be given to regional or municipal governments or educational institutions in these countries, private entities, or other nongovernmental organizations, or faith-based organizations operating in these countries.

To keep individuals, particularly unaccompanied alien children, from arriving at our southern border, the help necessary to make their homes safer and more prosperous is not through their central governments but for institution-building and other areas that can provide them the help they need to show that we are serious and to demonstrate to the central governments of the Northern Triangle countries that the United States cannot be constant caretakers for their children.

To that end, I have introduced several times the Unaccompanied Alien Children Assistance Control Act to withhold aid from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras by the number of children in Federal custody due to their immigration status, multiplied by a multiplier, which is the estimated cost of caring for one unaccompanied alien child.

We should not be surprised that the reversal of the previous administration's immigration policies led to an influx of unlawful crossings at our southern borders. I would take issue with the fact that this is said to be a cyclical uptick. Yes, there are cyclical variations to the number of people who do cross our southern border, but this one is not a cyclical uptick. This influx is a direct result of a policy choice made by the Biden administration.

We faced a similar crisis in 2014, when President Biden was Vice President, and President Obama's administration instituted the dangerous catch and release policy that led to a flood of

unauthorized migrants and unaccompanied minors coming across our southern border. Instead of keeping those who made unauthorized crossings in custody, our immigration and enforcement agencies were required to release those individuals into our country.

People were given a court date, but few, if any, would actually appear. Beyond missing a court date, unauthorized migrants took advantage of our system. Unfortunately, the diversion of so many people coming across the border, the diversion of the attention of our law enforcement officials on the border, has allowed for the free importation of drugs like fentanyl and heroin across our border.

Due to those failures, it is understandable why the previous administration instituted a policy that required the enforcement of our laws. For 4 years, we listened to Members of Congress have these discussions on the border and in the Halls of Congress about the misfortune of those who crossed into our country without the benefit of citizenship.

But what exactly does it mean to put forward a zero-tolerance policy? It means enforcing the laws and giving needed support to our frontline border officials.

No one wants to see a child separated from their parents. This is a problem that Congress needs to fix. It is a problem that Congress can fix.

To understand why this has happened, we look back to the court case of *Reno v. Flores* in 1997, and we look at the asylum laws that were passed in late 2008.

The *Flores* settlement prohibited the detention of children from a noncontiguous country for more than 20 days. After those 20 days, they are placed in the care of the Office of Refugee Resettlement if they cannot be reunited with family.

Previously, when adults attempted to cross into the United States without authorization, they were placed in immigration detention to await an immigration hearing. But due to the backlog of immigration cases, these adults were being held longer than 20 days. If they entered with a child, the *Flores* settlement required that the child be released. Therefore, the adults were also being released with them, and very few ever showed up for their immigration proceedings.

It changed during the Trump administration. They held unauthorized adults rather than releasing them. And if they entered with children, those children were placed in the care of the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

People claimed this was inhumane. If enforcing our laws is inhumane, then we need to change the law. But it seems like what is inhumane is incentivizing an already desperate people to make the dangerous journey to our southern border. To do that in the first place seems inhumane.

We must realize that far too many children are being smuggled into our

country by adults who want to prey on the generosity of Americans. A significant number of adults with children are not even biological relatives to the child with whom they enter. Traffickers, cartels, and smugglers know how to take advantage of a humanitarian crisis.

Being a father and a grandfather, I truly mean it when I say that no one wants to separate a child from their parents. That is why, on September 25, during the Rules Committee hearing, I offered an amendment requiring a plan to promptly reunify children in the custody of the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

It is not inhumane to enforce laws. Putting forth policies that allow children to be used as pawns is itself inhumane. Trekking a child across multiple countries just to smuggle them illegally into another country, that is inhumane.

Stated another way, our laws are not inhumane; nonenforcement is leading to inhumane actions by desperate people. We need to help them at home, not here where the taxpayer is on the hook.

For anyone who turns on the news, you can see the terrible and disheartening situation at the border. So, today, the question is asked: Why would anyone object to enforcement of our laws?

There is significant proof that a zero-tolerance policy for violating our laws is a deterrent for people subjecting themselves to harm by taking a perilous trip to the American southern border.

For example, in early 2017, Department of Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly visited the southern border. It was virtually deserted. In June 2017, a Reuters journalist, Julia Edwards Ainsley, reported on the decreased number of border crossings. She wrote: "Last fall, during the waning months of the Obama administration, hundreds of immigrants crossed the river on rafts at this point each day, many willingly handing themselves over to immigration authorities in hopes of being released into the United States to await court proceedings that would decide their fate."

"Now, the agents look out on an empty landscape. Footpaths up from the water have started to disappear under growing brush, with only the stray baby shoe or toothbrush serving as reminders of that migrant flood."

"The reason for the change, the agents say, is a perception in Mexico and Central America that President Trump has ended the practice known as catch and release, in which immigrants caught in the United States without proper documents were released to live free, often for years, as their cases ran through the court system."

"Now, would-be violators know 'they will be detained and turned right back around,' said one of the two agents, Marlene Castro. 'It is not worth it anymore.'"

So said Julia Edwards Ainsley in June 2017.

What happened between the Obama years and the first years of the Trump administration? When people believe that they will encounter a border wall, or that they will be turned away at the border, they simply do not come.

Our laws are only effective if they are enforced. If Congress truly wants to repair our immigration system, we, the Members of Congress, are obligated to act.

We know this is not the first time in American history that an administration has used a zero-tolerance policy. Over 40 years ago, during the Carter administration, between April 15 and October 31, 1980, there was a mass emigration of Cubans. They left from Cuba's Mariel Harbor to travel to the United States. We remember this as the Mariel boatlift. Because of this emigration, Fidel Castro decided to open his prisons and mental health facilities, sending those Cubans through the Straits of Florida to the United States. President Carter's administration was left grappling with a Cuban refugee crisis.

In a 1997 interview, former Deputy Secretary of State John Bushnell recalled a meeting with President Carter in which he and other key advisers discussed solutions to the Cuban refugee problem:

I remember sitting in that windowless conference room of the National Security Council with the Secretary of State, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Director of the CIA, the head of the Coast Guard, the head of INS, and several other senior officials, debating how to stop this flow of Cubans. National Security Advisor Brzezinski chaired until Carter came in toward the end of the meeting.

There was a long discussion on how the Coast Guard and Navy ships might physically stop the Cuban boats either from leaving the United States or returning back with the Cubans in the Mariel Boatlift. The Navy and Coast Guard, represented at this meeting by admirals, were concerned.

"How can we do this?" they said, and it was suggested that the boats simply could be stopped, physically prevented from entering the United States, without any major loss of life of the passengers. But they did suggest ways of maneuvering the boats to block their passage, which struck me as sort of wild. It sounded to me like they had in mind a picket line of Coast Guard and Navy boats going across the Straits of Florida to stop the movement of these small boats with refugees. This naval discussion went on for a long time but eventually was inconclusive.

Perhaps wisely so.

But from this interview, we understand that President Carter's administration was contemplating how to physically stop Cuban boats from coming to the United States.

Then, moving forward to the early 1990s, rafts of immigrants from Haiti bound for the United States were intercepted at sea, as authorized by policy enacted by President Bush's administration.

□ 2030

A young governor from Arkansas used divisive campaign rhetoric as he

ran against George H.W. Bush for President. Then-Governor Clinton time and again spoke of his disagreement with President Bush's zero-tolerance immigration policy.

During his campaign, Governor Clinton often maligned President Bush for being cruel in the treatment of Haitian refugees traveling to America via boat. Some feared that he was creating an unrealistic expectation for the Haitian people, who were suffering from significant unrest in their country.

In the New York Times, an article entitled, "Clinton Inspires Hope and Fear in Haiti," a writer, Douglas Farah, wrote: "It was Mr. Clinton who helped create the expectation of an exodus from Haiti when he condemned the Bush administration for a 'cruel policy of returning Haitian refugees to a brutal dictatorship without an asylum hearing.'"

We all know from our history in November of 1992, Governor Clinton won the Presidential election. Because of President-elect Clinton's promises, the people of Haiti anticipated being welcomed into the United States with open arms. The problem is, after securing the White House, President Clinton changed his mind after learning that perhaps the true toll such an exodus would take as people took to the waters in unseaworthy boats.

In a Voice of America address on January 14, 1993—a mere week before he took the oath of office—President-elect Clinton walked back his promise. Let me just read some of President-elect Clinton's remarks that he spoke directly to the people of Haiti over the Voice of America.

"For Haitians who do seek to leave Haiti, boat departure is a terrible and dangerous choice. I've been deeply concerned by reports that many of you are preparing to travel by boat to the United States. And, I fear that boat departures in the near future would result in further tragic losses of life.

"For this reason, the practice of returning those who flee Haiti by boat will continue for the time being after I become President. Those who do leave Haiti for the United States by boat will be stopped and directly returned by the United States Coast Guard.

"To avoid the human tragedy of a boat exodus, I wanted to convey this message directly to the Haitian people: Leaving by boat is not the route to freedom."

Well, as you can imagine, this dramatic change did not go without notice. January 17, 1993, the Chicago Tribune columnist Stephen Chapman wrote: "The President-elect has a terrible time making up his mind and keeping it made up. A lot of Haitians are disappointed to find he's something less than a man of his word. They're not the only ones."

So just from these historical moments, we can understand that border security is not a new debate; it is not an easy debate. President Carter, President Clinton, President Obama,

all learned the same lesson. It is, in fact, inhumane to encourage anyone to attempt a treacherous journey in order to reach America's borders without the proper authorization to enter.

There are things we must prioritize to move forward. First, having the understanding that enforcing our laws is, in fact, a humanitarian response.

The next step would be security along the southern border. To put it plain and simple: We can finish the wall, which includes having not just the wall, but additional technologies to solve the problem.

In order to solve problems within our broken immigration system, the bleeding needs to stop. You can't put a Band-Aid on an arterial wound. You need to stop the bleeding. Congress first needs to address the humanitarian crisis at our southern border.

So it was encouraging to hear Secretary Mayorkas announce a reconsideration of filling the gaps in the construction on the southern border wall. I recently took a trip down to McAllen. Between McAllen and Laredo, you can see areas where the wall was being built. The construction had stopped. The construction equipment was literally abandoned at the side, but I was grateful that Secretary Mayorkas did say that he was reconsidering filling in the gaps in the construction in the southern border wall. The problem is the smugglers know where those gaps are. They know how to use them to their advantage.

Again, let me say, when it comes to immigration, America is the most generous country in the world. But is it okay for us to allow over 100,000 people a month to enter our country without authorization? Is it all right for us to subject innocent children to a dangerous journey?

Sovereign countries must define and defend their borders. I believe that America is a country worth defending. It is heartbreaking that after achieving operational control of the border after many years, it was abandoned. It was abandoned through a series of executive orders that was signed early in this President's administration. And what has happened in its place, operational control of the border is no longer determined by the United States of America. Operational control of the border is now determined and dictated by cartels.

This week, we are considering two immigration bills: the NO BAN Act and the Access to Counsel Act. The first will prevent the President from banning anyone from entering the United States. The second essentially provides a lawyer to anyone entering our country unlawfully, thus prolonging the wait times for those who are trying to enter our country through the normal legal process. And that all will be done at the taxpayer's expense.

Clearly, these are the wrong solutions at this time. Our priority should be to ensure that every President has the necessary tools to put forward lawful priorities and not prevent them

from doing so. We should be focused on policies that will encourage legal immigration rather than just reacting to illegal immigration.

It is important that we reinstate the “Remain in Mexico Policy,” also known as the Migrant Protection Protocols. We know this program helped limit fraudulent asylum claims from those who thought they would be able to just walk into the United States, and instead had to wait their turn for a hearing while remaining in Mexico. It is not a good idea to allow lawbreakers to jump in front of those who are here lawfully.

We are still in the middle of a pandemic. Now, thankfully, the Biden administration has kept the Trump administration’s CDC Title 42 authority in place—oh, except for people younger than 17 years of age. We are on the verge of ending the pandemic, but we must ensure that we are doing everything we can to prevent additional spread of this coronavirus. Something that would aid in doing that is requiring a negative coronavirus test before someone is released into this country.

What happened when, under an executive order, the Title 42 restrictions were lifted for those under 17? A lot more people under age 17 started coming through, started coming across. The problem is, each of those individuals will eventually be placed with a family, and by not testing for coronavirus, we are risking placing individuals who are infected with the virus with families throughout the country.

So during consideration of the reconciliation bill, the one that was supposed to crush the coronavirus, I offered a motion to instruct at the Budget Committee and an amendment at the Committee on Rules to provide for COVID testing for all arriving at our southern border. This was rejected in the Budget Committee, and the Committee on Rules would not make it in order to have a floor vote on that amendment.

And once migrants are in our Federal custody, we do have responsibility that they receive appropriate and compassionate care. Under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health, we have conducted oversight on the Department of Health and Human Services and the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

Since 2014, I have made multiple trips to the border and multiple trips to ORR facilities. In the last few weeks, I visited Office of Refugee Resettlement shelters in Carrizo Springs, in McAllen and the convention center in downtown Dallas. Since my visit to the Carrizo Springs facility, it has been doubled in size. There are so few beds at ORR shelters along the border, there has been a need to expand further, which is why I visited the Kay Bailey Hutchison Convention Center in Dallas.

It was startling to see those 2,400 cots lined up each to allow a 13- to 17-year-

old boy to sleep at night. They were so close together, any restaurant that tried to open right now with tables placed that close together would be shut down by the public health authorities. And yet, here we were, in fact not just condoning it, we were facilitating it.

Look, the bottom line is, this is not a capacity problem, it is a commitment problem. And we are, unfortunately, on a path to repeat history. Many of us here know the work done by the Committee on Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health in 2014. That work led to the unaccompanied minors receiving better health screenings, and better healthcare.

When I visited shelters in 2014, the children did not have access to a doctor. They were not receiving any type of health screening. Today, they have access to a full range of medical and mental health resources and children are being screened for communicable diseases, children are being given vaccinations for the usual childhood diseases prior to their release to sponsors in this country. It makes sense to do that. This protects American communities; this protects American schools, where these children will eventually be enrolled.

Today, when a child is released from an ORR facility, they have a phone number to contact the Department of Health and Human Services after they leave their shelter. And they will also receive a wellness check 30 days after their release to a sponsor.

In 2014, it wasn’t that way, children were not given any means of contact after they left Federal custody, and no follow up was conducted. And unfortunately, you know what is going to happen in that situation. Some children will not be placed with a competent caregiver, and they can fall victim to trafficking or abuse.

Now, because of Members of the subcommittee and Members of the full Committee on Energy and Commerce, if children need help once they leave the shelter, they do have a lifeline. These are helpful resources for those who are entrusted to Federal care. My primary goal is to secure the border and to prevent unaccompanied minors from crossing the United States without benefit of citizenship in the first place. But while it is happening, we must do our best to ensure that they are safe after they arrive.

I understand the care of children is a huge balancing act. Once they are in our care, it becomes our responsibility, and we must ensure that those traveling with them are not using them to game our immigration system. It is simply wrong and potentially harmful to the child, not to check that the adult with which they are traveling is, in fact, related or their legal guardian.

Ultimately, we will have to put an end to this crisis. From our experiences, both recent and throughout history, we know that our rhetoric matters. The message must be clear: Do

not cross the border unlawfully. For years, Presidents, Senators, Representatives, have promised to end “catch-and-release” and restore order on the southern border.

The human traffickers, the coyotes in Central America, use our words spoken in Washington, D.C. They use our words to prey on the disadvantaged in Central American countries to entice families into putting their children on the top of a freight train to travel through the Mexican desert. And they do that by putting a price on the head of each child. They use our words to subject children to the violence of cartels, or worse, children who may not arrive in the United States after beginning that journey.

□ 2045

When we say, or even suggest, that children could receive amnesty at the border, we put innocent lives at risk. Our words turn these children into literal game pieces. We can be compassionate and we can provide a secure border at the same time. These two concepts are not mutually exclusive.

In 1980, as former Deputy Secretary of State Bushnell recalled, Congress appropriated over \$400 million to assist holding and settling Cuban refugees in the United States.

And reflecting on that time, later, former Deputy Secretary Bushnell said, “I used this appropriation as a key example of why foreign aid through the Caribbean Group was a good investment. It was much better to help our neighbors build a good economic future for themselves at home than to have a flood of desperate refugees, which would cost more money to settle.”

I think, today, it would be wise to consider Secretary Bushnell’s reasoning. Perhaps Congress could heed my recommendation to address how we send foreign aid to countries such as El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Mexico.

Should it be tied to the care that their children receive?

Here is the deal: Why should we reward countries whose children are fleeing for their safety to our country?

Certainly, it is something worth consideration.

It is simply irresponsible and it is inhumane for the American Government to incentivize anyone to subject themselves or their children to that perilous journey on our border. It was a lesson that President Clinton learned. It was a lesson that President Carter learned. It was a lesson that President Obama learned. And I do fear that it is a lesson that President Biden will learn.

We know the solution. We do know what works. Simply put, enforcement of Title 42 protections for all age groups, not accepting those younger than 17. Accept enforcement of Title 42, the CDC requirement that, during a pandemic, we restrict travel across the border.

Reinstitution of the Asylum Cooperative Agreements with Central American countries. At great negotiation

skill, these cooperative agreements were established, but, unfortunately, they have recently been abandoned. They could be reconsidered. They could be reestablished. We are going to have to have agreements with the countries of origin around asylum if we are going to be able to solve the problem.

The Migrant Protection Protocol, “Remain in Mexico,” was successful. It did help in the assessment of the Asylum Cooperative Agreements. This could be reinstated, and it is probably time that it was.

In fact, it is past time to end a broken and inhumane pattern. It is past time to stop demonizing those who we ask to enforce our laws. It is past time to understand that nonenforcement of our laws does lead to inhumane actions.

It is up to Congress. We are the legislative branch. We are the ones under the Constitution who are responsible for providing this security at our border. What is so critically important is that we must do it sooner rather than later.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker, on Friday, April 16, 2021, announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 164.—An Act to educate health care providers and the public on biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes.

S. 415.—An Act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the scope of new chemical exclusivity.

S. 578.—An Act to improve the health and safety of Americans living with food allergies and related disorders, including potentially life-threatening anaphylaxis, food protein-induced enterocolitis syndrome, and eosinophilic gastrointestinal diseases, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 20, 2021, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1392, the Protection of Saudi Dissidents Act of 2021, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YAR-

MUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 2630, the Extending Temporary Emergency Scheduling of Fentanyl Analogues Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-839. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting results of the financial statement audits of the Department of Defense, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 240a(b); Public Law 115-91, Sec. 1002(b)(1); (131 Stat. 1538); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-840. A letter from the Senior Legislative Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's Consumer Response Annual Report for 2020, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5493(b)(3)(C); Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1013(b)(3)(C); (124 Stat. 1969); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-841. A letter from the Senior Legislative Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's 2020 Annual Report of the Office of Minority and Women Inclusion, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5452(e); Public Law 111-203, Sec. 342(e); (124 Stat. 1543); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-842. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Superfund Five-Year Review Report to Congress for FY 2020; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-843. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Columbia, Missouri) [MB Docket No.: 20-428](RM-11870) received March 26, 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-844. A letter from the Associate Chief, Mobility Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Facilitating Shared Use in the 3100-3550 MHz Band [WT Docket No. 19-348] received March 26, 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-845. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 on April 12, 2010, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-846. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-847. A letter from the Director, Office of Diversity and Inclusion, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board'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-848. A letter from the Senior Legislative Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau'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-849. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting 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.

EC-850. A letter from the Director, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency'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-851. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation'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-852. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of a final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation: Federal Acquisition Circular 2021-05; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR-2021-0051, Sequence No.: 2] received March 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-853. A letter from the Director, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration'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-854. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting the Foundation'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-855. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting recommendations adopted by the Assembly of the Administrative Conference of the United States at its 73rd Plenary Session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-856. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Office of General Counsel, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inmate Discipline Program: New Prohibited Act Code for Pressuring Inmates for Legal Documents [Docket No.: BOP-1172-F] (RIN: 1120-AB72) received February 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-857. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31349;