

spending policies of our government, and we need to get our fiscal house in order to prevent this in the future.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

□ 1215

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL SAMUEL LOMBARDO

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the life of Lieutenant Colonel Samuel Lombardo.

Sam and his family legally immigrated to the United States from Italy. He enlisted to serve in the Army National Guard's 28th Infantry Division just 1 month following the start of World War II.

After training, he was deployed to Europe where he would serve as platoon leader and executive officer of I Company, 394th Infantry Regiment, 99th Division, and he would always remind constituents in northwest Florida that he fought in the Battle of the Bulge.

During this time, Lieutenant Colonel Lombardo and his platoon created their own makeshift flag out of scraps of red and blue cloth. For the white, they used German surrender flags. They used this as their battle flag in victorious campaigns across the Rhine and Danube Rivers.

Following World War II, Lieutenant Colonel Lombardo continued his service to our country in Korea and Vietnam.

Throughout his service, Lieutenant Colonel Lombardo earned the Silver Star, the Bronze Star with "V" for Valor, as well as an Oak Leaf Cluster with Meritorious Achievement among 10 other medals.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the late Lieutenant Colonel Samuel Lombardo.

I asked Sam how he was able to be so healthy after more than 100 years living on the planet Earth. He said that his secret was red wine and almonds at night. I think I will have a little of both in his honor this evening.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

RECOGNIZING MUSCATINE HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a high school in my district that was recently recognized for their commitment to student success.

For over 15 years, Iowa has partnered with the ACT's college application campaign to increase the number of first-generation college students and students from low-income households in applying for and pursuing higher education.

I am proud to announce that, in 2020, 176 Iowa schools participated in the college application campaign, and all together, 504 students completed 1,578 college applications. Of the 176 schools that participated, Muscatine High School in my district was awarded the 2020 School of Excellence Award for Iowa from ACT. Muscatine was selected for this great award based on their commitment to student success and for serving as an exemplary model for Iowa's college application campaign.

Congratulations to the students and faculty at Muscatine for being leaders in academic achievement and for serving as a great role model for student success in Iowa and the entire Nation.

Mr. GOHMERT. It is wonderful to hear that about Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

NEW SPENDING INITIATIVES

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman GOHMERT for yielding to me.

For anyone who is not particularly familiar, we have sort of mechanisms. Last night, we were running late, and once we hit 10 o'clock, we were shut off. And trying to do 21 boards in 8 minutes, I apologize to those who have to try to take our words down.

But I wanted to just touch on a couple of things. One really quickly, we were just blessed to have Secretary Yellen in front of Ways and Means. I have tremendous respect for and have built a relationship with her when she was Federal Reserve Chair.

I want us all to pay attention to a promise that the Secretary and the President have made, and that is the new spending initiatives will be covered by the new taxes, the new revenues. I assume that is an honorable way to do it. We will fight over what the spending priorities are, and none of these games where we are going to do 15 years of tax hikes to cover 10 years of spending because, let's be honest, that is a complete fraud on the American people.

But the best math that is coming out from a number of groups right now is the tax hikes that are being proposed, the revenues, are only going to cover maybe, if you are being optimistic, Mr. Speaker, on the receipts, 50 percent of the new spending.

Yesterday, I think it is Penn Wharton that put out their model, I guess last week, that the capital gains tax itself loses \$33 billion over the first 10 years. So, it is not scored to 15 years; it is 10.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you do what is called the basis, which is how much is subject to the capital gains tax even though the perversity of it is that a huge portion of that is actually inflation we are going to tax, it would raise, in their model, \$133 billion. The administration, the Democrats, have said this will be 330. So, they are only hitting about one-third of the revenues that have been promised from the capital gains tax.

I really want to help the Democrats keep their promise that their new \$4 trillion proposed spending will be covered by their new receipts, their new revenues. They have a really interesting math problem. Either they are going to have to cut their spending substantially in half or dramatically raise taxes on the American people.

We asked Secretary Yellen: Should we expect a value-added tax? Is a VAT in our future?

The math is really ugly—we are going to talk about that in a second here—to cover all these new spending initiatives plus just the demographic curve that is already about to crush us, debtwise.

The answer was an interesting one. It is: Well, that is not part of our current proposal.

For everyone who is interested in tax policy—and I accept that maybe some of us are a little bit on the geek side—I am fascinated with the tax on Medicare financing. Keep an ear out because the only way I think the left is going to get these types of revenues is to actually go to completely new revenue-raising, new tax regimes.

Let's talk about what I consider is the greatest fragility of our Nation's future. It turns out it is not Republican or Democrat policy. It is demographics.

What is the fastest growing demographic in the United States? It is getting old. We are graying very, very fast. It is baby boomers.

When you look at this chart—and we did this last night, but we did it sort of caffeinated, very fast—take the next 30 years. This is without all the new spending that has been proposed this year by the new administration. This is our baseline, \$101 trillion of debt in 30 years at today's dollars. This is inflation-adjusted dollars, 67 percent.

Functionally, \$68 trillion of debt is just Medicare. Only about \$3 trillion is the rest of government, so it is Medicare, then Social Security.

If you believe, Mr. Speaker, like I do, that we have an absolute moral obligation to keep our promises to those folks who have paid into Social Security and Medicare, then what are we going to do to keep that promise?

The reality of it is that this is what buries us as a country. It is our demographics and the promises that are dramatically unfunded. Remember, Mr. Speaker, it is only maybe 4 years or so that the Medicare trust fund—which is only part A, which is the hospital portion—that trust fund is gone.

Part B is actually seeing a doctor. Part C is managed care. That has its own little, in some ways, financial benefits. And D is drugs. Parts B and D are 100 percent out of the general fund. They don't have trust funds.

This is absolutely critical. This will drive all government policy. If you are someone who wants money for education, if you are someone who wants money for the environment or our military, then the fact of the matter is it is Medicare that consumes us.

One of my great frustrations is when you look at the math of how much is spending, Mr. Speaker, and then the financing of that spending, you get a sense that, as Republicans, we have this bad habit. We will go and say: Well, we will balance the budget through waste and fraud.

Democrats will go and say: Well, we are going to balance it by nationalizing healthcare, Medicare for All.

None of those are real. We are not telling the truth.

Let's walk through just a couple of things that are in my craw right now. This is just one portion of the left's bill called H.R. 3. From a conceptual standpoint, it is an honest debate of what are we going to do about prescription drug costs.

The methodology, though, Mr. Speaker, if you actually read the research, in a decade, it is killing people and costing more because we are on the cusp of a time of miracles.

This is really important to get our heads around. We have all heard about this concept of mRNA. We have talked about it for 20-plus years. Years ago, I used to come to this mike and talk about this concept of bio-foundry.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, we can take a snippet of your DNA and a snippet of your cancer, your disease, or your virus, and it would take weeks. And for the CAR-T therapy for cancer, it was \$350,000 just to get you your shot, but it was curing people. We just moved up 10 years in technology.

That is one of the amazing things Operation Warp Speed. It is actually one of the few positive things I can say that came out of this pandemic is it is here.

Look up Tesla and mRNA, Mr. Speaker. You find out that all sorts of very disruptive companies are investing in these little bio-foundries.

We are on the edge of curing HIV, sickle cell anemia. We now have a cure for hemophilia. And we are also going to cure all sorts of cancers. There are some amazing things happening. The problem is they are expensive, Mr. Speaker. But they cure you.

H.R. 3 does something that I think is fairly dark and fairly sinister, and we need our brothers and sisters on the Democrat side to be honest with constituents, and that is something called reference pricing. If a quality year is bought through a drug, but it costs more than, in this case, \$37,000 in Great Britain, Mr. Speaker, you don't get it.

H.R. 3 does this where they take a basket of some of these countries and say that we are going to use their cap. So, you are prepared to turn to your constituent and say: Oh, that drug is \$40,000. Yes, it gives you that quality year, but it is over our cap, so we are not going to provide you that pharmaceutical.

By doing that, we just destroyed small, disruptive bio-foundry pharma that is curing people. We are going to subject our population to say that the misery you have today is the misery

you are going to have tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, because we are going to shut down the disruption. We are going to protect—here is the sinister thing that healthcare economists talk about. The Democrats' H.R. 3 actually protects Big Pharma because the industry now becomes you just adjust your current patent, and that is how you make a living, Mr. Speaker.

But the ones that nip their heels that cure things, it is like the hepatitis C we cure now. Those cures don't come because we have just wiped out the income stream.

We need to rethink. If Republicans and Democrats have a common goal that we need to look at pharmaceutical costs, then destroying the pipeline that cures people and that ends the misery is really dark.

Mr. Speaker, we Republicans have our sins. How many of us will get behind a microphone and talk about price transparency? Price transparency is a really good thing, but it has almost no real effect on the price of healthcare. The best academic studies we have been able to find in our office is 0.1 to 0.7 percent.

My point is really simple here. The ACA, ObamaCare, was a financing bill. It was who got subsidized and who had to pay. Our Republican alternative was a financing bill. It was who had to pay and who got subsidized. Medicare for All is a financing bill.

When are we going to have the really tougher discussion of what we pay? Let's disrupt the price of healthcare through technology.

How many of us went to Blockbuster Video last weekend? We don't because now we hit a button called Netflix and all sorts of other things. We allow disruption to happen in other parts of our healthcare, but we have built so many regulatory barriers and so many licensing barriers, crazy things that would disrupt healthcare.

One of my grand proposals—and this one needs to be Republicans and Democrats coming together—that \$68 trillion over the next 30 years in just Medicare spending, that is a substantial driver for U.S. sovereign debt. Thirty-one percent of it is just diabetes.

It turns out, Mr. Speaker, if you and I can have a revolution in ending the misery of diabetes, it is also the single biggest initiative you can have to U.S. sovereign debt.

It is time Republicans and Democrats come together and do an Operation Warp Speed on diabetes. Yes, there is really neat research that is on the cusp of almost curatives for type 1, the autoimmune pancreatic cells. But the political side is going to be really tough for all of us because we are going to have to talk about type 2, which has a substantial lifestyle component in it. It needs a discussion of what we do in nutrition support as a country and what we do in our farm bill as a country.

Mr. Speaker, if we care about people, if we really are going to come here and

give speeches about how minority communities and my Native American communities from Arizona had such horrible outcomes during COVID, are you willing to look at the comorbidities that were there before COVID? It is diabetes.

□ 1230

And it turns out, spending money on this management curative—and I really want curative—turns out to be one of the most powerful things you and I could ever do for U.S. sovereign debt going forward. It is 31 percent of just Medicare spending, and the numbers we are still working on for Medicaid and other things.

So part of my other proposal is there are things we could do almost overnight that have incredible impacts on the cost of healthcare in this country; and here is one that I beg of us to start getting in our lexicon.

Sixteen percent of the healthcare spending this year, over half a trillion dollars, just this year, will be people not taking their meds or taking them incorrectly. You have hypertension, you don't take your meds, you have a stroke. You have high cholesterol, you don't take your meds—and those things are cheap and inexpensive. Grandpa is forgetful, or we get busy in our lives.

And it turns out there are things where the pill top talks to your phone. It talks to you. There are other ones where it dispenses the pharmaceuticals to you.

It turns out the technology of getting people to take their pharmaceuticals properly, if we would understand its impact, that is 16 percent of U.S. healthcare spending is just not taking our pharmaceuticals properly. That is a half a trillion dollars.

Think about what you could do with a half a trillion dollars a year—not over 10, not over 15; a year—and how much less misery you would have in this country by people having strokes, getting sick.

This is not a revolution of trying to crush pharma or go after drug prices. It is actually taking a look and using this crazy thing we call, oh, yeah, math, and a calculator, and also technology.

And, yes, it doesn't work necessarily in our political lexicon. It is a little harder to campaign on, but it happens to be factual.

The other thing I am going to beg of us—and Congressman GOHMERT, I appreciate him yielding to me. So I promise I will only do one or two more boards.

I need us to think revolutionary. Before the pandemic, a Democratic colleague, MIKE THOMPSON, from California, a good guy, has worked with me on telemedicine. It was a piece of legislation that substantially was going to go nowhere because there were lots and lots and lots and lots of lobbyists who hated it because it disrupts the money.

But when the pandemic hit, our telemedicine bill became law. It expires

when they declare the pandemic over. The expansion of reimbursement and access to telemedicine goes away. We need to fix that.

But we also now need to understand what is telemedicine. Telemedicine is the thing you can wear on your wrist; the thing you can wear on your chest; the thing you blow into.

The technology is here to crash the price of healthcare. And all the skeptics who attacked telemedicine before the pandemic, oh Grandma's not going to be able to use; they don't know how to work FaceTime; no one is going to want to make a phone call to a doctor or a healthcare professional.

Turns out they were wrong. We have the last 18 months of proof. The satisfaction rates are off the chart. A, we need to continue it, but we need to expand the definition.

And then the other things the pandemic has brought us is things we never thought of.

How about a little home kit?

These are available today. Actually, you can get them sent to your house in a day. Blow into it. It tells you if you have COVID-19.

Well, if that exists for COVID, what would happen if I turned to you and said, turns out we have the technology today where you can have a medical lab in your medicine cabinet. You blow into it, it tells you if you even have cancer cells or a virus or bacteria. It exists today.

We, as a body, need to legalize the disruptive technologies that allow us to disrupt the price of healthcare if we are going to save Medicare, save the country from the crushing debt. And, yes, we are going to annoy a lot of incumbent investors and a lot of incumbent businesses, but it is the right and moral thing to do.

We have a society that has become a country of oligopolies, and Congress has become a protection racket. We protect incumbents; not incumbent elected officials, incumbent business models.

Yet the disruption of the technology that is here today crushes the misery of so many of our brothers and sisters out there who have chronic conditions, that get sick.

We can crash the price of healthcare. We can make us healthier as a society. We can take on, in that same breath, the crushing debt that is here. And it is demographic. It is coming. No matter how many speeches we give pretending we have a way around it, the only way around it is we have got to change the actual price of healthcare.

I beg of us, we need to think differently because this place, often our policy sets, sort of sounds like it is still the 1990s.

Mr. GOHMERT. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Oh, I would love to yield.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. SCHWEIKERT's ongoing analyses of the way we mismanage money

around Washington, D.C. And I was reading about proposals to go after the billionaires, the mega-rich, and I recall what Ronald Reagan's economist, economic adviser, Arthur Laffer, had said. Dr. Laffer said—he told a small group of us years ago—if you want to produce money—of course, I am asking you this because I have such great respect for your monetary analyses.

If you want to go after money, you want to produce tax revenue, the one place you will never get it is going after the super-rich because they are the only people in America who have the wherewithal to avoid whatever tax you put on them.

What is your thought about that analysis?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I have actually been blessed to spend lots of time with Professor Laffer and, actually, a couple of other folks who also have Nobel Prizes in economics. They tolerate me.

Gilder, I consider a personal friend, if you really want to geek out.

First off, you have a conceptual problem and the left doesn't—we have got to work with them to first admit we tax income. Property taxes are really the only things we tax wealth. We tax your real estate wealth.

So the leaked IRS data, which is a real problem if you want confidence in a tax system that, once again, the IRS is back to being weaponized. If you want to tax wealth, that is a different tax system, and there are all sorts of games you can play with that.

You could take your wealth and say, all right, here is what I am going to do. I am not going to take an income. I am going to borrow from it.

So how do you tax it?

You have to conceptualize very, very different.

We also—we actually have the math, even though it may not happen in the fiscal year you want it to. The ultrawealthy give away most of their wealth. That has been a tradition in this country, particularly for about a century and a half.

A tax system to work—and the gentleman and I have actually had a side conversation about this. You have to find what is the most—or the least disruptive tax that maximizes revenue, but also maximizes economic expansion. So we are already seeing some data that the Democrats' proposal on capital gains tax, actually, without changing the basis, actually raises substantially less revenues.

Now how is that possible?

It is because you stop engaging in those economic activities.

So somewhere there is a sweet spot that maximizes revenues, but also then maximizes economic activity. And I have an absolute fixation that 2018, 2019 were miracle years economically for the working poor in this country. It is 2 years where, actually, income inequality genuinely shrank; the broad based nature of the working poor getting dramatically less poor.

That shouldn't be a partisan fight. It should be the bipartisan goal.

And the rich got richer, but not as fast as the poor got less poor. And that is back to, in a weird way, a long answer to your question.

We need to have an honest debate of what maximizes revenues while minimizing economic damage. And right now, just throwing out numbers, and then throwing out fake—and I am being a little brutal on that—fake models from the administration saying we are going to raise \$4 trillion, we are going to cover all of our new spending, when all of the other models—and very soon joint tax will score it and we will see what the reality is.

But everyone it is scoring right now, the Dems are only getting about half the revenues. And we have already seen the first analysis of the corporate tax hike. It unemploys 1 million Americans in the first 24 months.

Mr. GOHMERT. That would be people who would pay income tax if they didn't lose their jobs.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. That didn't lose their jobs. And the harder part of the scoring is—and this was one of the miracles of 2018 and 2019—the Democrats repeatedly attacked the tax reforms from the end of 2017 and the regulatory reforms.

But there were so many people working, and there was such vitality in the economy that Medicare part A, the trust fund, grew in years. Social Security grew in years because there were so many people paying their payroll tax.

They didn't really pay income tax because they were part of the population that had been removed from having to pay income tax because we changed—but it turns out, if you actually, truly believe we have a societal obligation to keep our promises, to keep Social Security, to keep Medicare vibrant, it turns out you need an incredibly vibrant economy for people to be working. You can do that also by a rational tax policy instead of a punishing one.

Mr. GOHMERT. I know you would have—

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I am sorry; it is a long answer, but it actually has—

Mr. GOHMERT. No, no. I appreciate my friend from Arizona, Mr. SCHWEIKERT's excellent analysis, because we do want to have a vibrant economy. As the saying goes, it lifts all boats. And I really appreciate the analysis on where the Medicare spending is going. That is something we need to deal with.

I hear solutions of throwing money at the problem, but the real problem is we don't have the proper money to throw at it because the economy is not doing as it should.

And then I still hear our friends talk about the need to stop climate change. Unfortunately, the climate has been changing since the Earth ever appeared. And I have got a lot of friends out there. And I say friends facetiously. People on the left—I am beginning to understand that sarcasm is a tool that is appreciated by the intelligent. So the left, the alt-left, they don't get it.

But this is an article from Ethan Hunt back in August of 2019. It says: NASA admits that climate change occurs because of changes in Earth's solar orbit; not because of SUVs and fossil fuel.

Well, it really can be a combination of things. But having found out from the former NASA Director that the Moon's orbit is slightly changing and the Earth's orbit is slightly changing and, as the term was, it is becoming more squashed, well, that would mean there are times when we are closer to the Sun and we are further away from the Sun.

And I know there are some leftists at NASA that said: Oh, no, changing Earth's orbit doesn't affect our climate at all.

And I would humbly submit that you don't have to be a rocket scientist to understand that if you get closer to the Sun, or if you get further away from the Sun, it is absolutely going to affect your climate; just as more solar activity, more solar flares, they are going to affect our climate. And there is not a lot that we can do about more solar flares, solar activities, solar hot spots.

And I would sarcastically ask a question regarding the Bureau of Land Management and National Forest Service, since they were going to be spending so much time on climate change, and we had heard the Earth's orbit was changing slightly and the Moon's orbit was changing slightly.

Could they do anything about that?

□ 1245

For those who thought I was really challenging BLM, the Bureau of Land Management and the National Forest Service, like they were going to do something about the Earth's orbit, the National Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management, they are not going to do anything about the Earth's orbit because they can't. That is not their job.

Although there is some professor that thinks we might could adjust our orbit, I think that is still yet to be arrived at scientifically. It is an interesting concept, but I had no belief that it was about to happen by the Bureau of Land Management and National Forest Service.

It is interesting to look back. I missed this article back in 2019. It goes into much more detail about not only the changing orbit but the changing tilt from time to time.

Then if you do more digging, you find out that actually, going back millions—some say 56 million; some say billions—that the planet was much hotter, and the planet's orbit was closer to the Sun. It has moved back some, according to some, over the millions or billions, whatever you believe, number of years.

I also want to mention this article from The Washington Times, June 16, 2021, Stephen Dinan, about "Smartphone smugglers: How social media is reshaping border crime." It is

really intriguing. The author does an amazing job of pulling these things together.

It is interesting. The drug cartels south of our border, apparently, we are informed, have workers in every city in America. Of course, we have heard before that the Border Patrol, ICE, the U.S. Government is considered to be the logistics for the multibillion-dollar drug cartels in Mexico because the drug cartels get them across illegally into the United States. And I have seen people in the middle of the night, as they are being processed by the Border Patrol, long lines of people. I have watched them comparing addresses and sometimes switching addresses.

They are the addresses that the drug cartels have given them as to where the drug cartels want them to go work in order to earn enough money, either drug trafficking, sex trafficking, or human trafficking, to pay off the rest of their debt to the drug cartels for getting them into the United States illegally. Many times, it is the U.S. Government, which means U.S. taxpayers, that end up paying to send the drug cartels' employees, or indentured servants, to the cities where the drug cartels want them.

It is incredible that we, as a U.S. Government, are helping the drug cartels in Mexico make the tens of billions of dollars that they use to keep different levels of government corrupt in Mexico, that keep the Mexican people from having the economy that would allow them to have across-the-board wonderful homes, have wonderful jobs, and be one of the top economies in the world. The corruption of the drug cartels keeps Mexico from having their true place in the top economies in the world.

They have some of the hardest-working people in the world. They have incredible natural resources, a fantastic location—actually, better than the U.S. because they are between North and South America, and they are between the Pacific and the Atlantic. Incredible location, hardworking people, great natural resources, good ports, but the corruption that the American people are funding through their U.S. Government and through the purchase of drugs that are massively coming into this country—if somebody truly has compassion for the people of Mexico and Central America, they would demand that our southern border be secured, that we continue to provide visas in greater numbers than any country in the world, but we secure the border so that we cut the tens of billions of dollars from flowing to the drug cartels that then corrupt and destroy lives, kill Americans with fentanyl and other drugs that are pouring into our country. And the Mexican people would come to the United States on vacation to spend the significant, wonderful money they had earned without fear of the drug cartels and what they will do to them if they are not subservient.

There was a time in Mexico when people who were wealthy knew the drug cartels would normally leave them alone. There was a time in Mexico when the drug cartels basically had a wink-and-nod agreement: Look, we won't have attacks in tourist attractions because we know how important that money is.

Well, all of those days are gone. If we were really a compassionate neighbor, we would secure our border. We would stop drawing off people with the potential to be the best citizens that Guatemala, Mexico, other countries have, drawing them up here because of the corruption below our border that we in the U.S. Government are helping fund.

It really needs to stop. But it is getting worse, much, much worse, as we are seeing numbers that no one has seen in many, many years.

There has been so much appropriate concern about January 6 and what happened that day. Unfortunately, we don't know all that happened that day. There are some major questions that need to be answered.

We know that the former chief of the Capitol Police testified that they got no intelligence from the FBI about potential violence on January 6. There were lots of stories about people who were here at the Capitol on January 6 that may have carried a Confederate flag, may have had red on and MAGA or Trump.

But the Capitol Police had told me the day before: Hey, we have heard there are going to be people who hate Trump that are going to be trying to blend in, and there is going to be violence, and we are concerned about it.

But the chief of the Capitol Police said they got no intel like that from the FBI.

An article a few days ago from *Revolver* says: "Unindicted Co-Conspirators in the January 6 Cases Raise Disturbing Questions of Federal Foreknowledge." That is June 14. I saw my friend Tucker Carlson covered this last night.

But this is really disturbing, and this is something that I know from my time here in Congress has disturbed Democrats and Republicans alike across the aisle because we don't like to see government agents stirring up trouble or find that there are criminal acts that would not likely have occurred had not the Federal Government been participating, whether they were actual agents or undercover agents or informants that were working for the Federal Government.

But this is scary stuff. This is kind of third-world stuff. This is not only third-world stuff, but this is like Putin kind of activity.

If there were Federal agents that were involved on January 6, we really need to know what the FBI knew and when they knew it. Not only that, we need to know how much participation did any of our Federal friends, either at DOJ, FBI, or any of the intel community, what kind of role were they playing.

There is information that came out about the effort to kidnap the Michigan Governor, and it has been said that there were Federal agents that were involved in that. It would seem, if you have 14 people that are involved in a conspiracy to commit a crime, and over a third of them, including people in leadership, are Federal agents, undercover agents, or people that are working for a Federal entity, that we have got some serious problems, and we have not done adequate oversight.

It disturbs me greatly that there was not more information forthcoming from our Federal law enforcement intelligence, DOJ, than was received here on Capitol Hill because, surely, if they had known the level of planning by a small group to actually commit violence and break into our U.S. Capitol, they would have been better prepared.

I know some of us have had extreme differences with the Speaker, but I just feel sure if she had known the level of violence that was being talked about and planned and monitored by DOJ and FBI, surely she would not have allowed the Sergeant at Arms to turn down National Guard support on January 6.

This article pulls from documents, legal documents, that have been filed by the Federal Government in some of these different cases. This article says: "To address the matter directly in the following three questions: In the year leading up to January 6 and during January 6 itself, to what extent were the three primary militia groups—the Oath Keepers, the Proud Boys, and the Three Percenters—that the FBI, DOJ, Pentagon, and network news have labeled most responsible for planning and executing a Capitol attack on January 6 infiltrated by agencies of the Federal Government, or informants of said agencies?"

Question 2: "Exactly how many Federal undercover agents or confidential informants were present at the Capitol or in the Capitol during the infamous 'siege,' and what roles did they play—merely passive informants or active instigators?"

And, third: "Finally, of all of the unindicted co-conspirators referenced in the charging documents," the official Federal pleadings, "of those indicted for crimes on January 6, how many worked as a confidential informant or as an undercover operative for the Federal Government—FBI, Army Counterintelligence, et cetera?"

□ 1300

"If the narrative about January 6 does not conform to the questions above, the American people will never learn the most important truth about what January 6 is, and what kind of country they're really living in.

"If it turns out the Federal Government did in fact have undercover agents or confidential informants embedded within the so-called militia groups indicted for conspiring to obstruct the Senate certification on January 6, the implications would be nothing

short of seismic. Especially if such agents or informants enjoyed extremely senior-level positions within such groups."

And the thing is, like I said, they have got documentation, the Federal pleadings that the United States Government has filed in some of these cases, that really raised serious issues. Yeah, there is no question, there were radical groups there, and those three seem to be the most prominent. But from the pleadings from the Department of Justice itself, it appears that they had significant presence and participation in what went on.

We do need to see the 14,000 hours of security video, seeing Ashli Babbitt killed by an officer standing off to the side. There were officers in front of the window, but then there were officers on the other side where Ashli was; and it appeared it was John Sullivan, a Trump hater, that told them if they will move out of the way they won't get hurt, and the officers appeared. Well, they moved out of the way, and these guys broke through the glass.

And yet with all of the people that the FBI has sought information on and put up pictures—and it appears they were probably wearing masks, but there is another 14,000 hours of video. These guys were around in the Capitol, around the Capitol. They didn't have their masks up at all times. But it doesn't appear that the FBI has asked for assistance in identifying those people that broke through the glass or that were right there, at least when Ashli was shot in the neck and killed.

And that normally means if they are not asking for help in identifying somebody that they know who they are—and maybe they are person 1, person 2, person 3, person 15—that are referred to in the pleadings of people that were working with the FBI or Federal authorities of some kind.

But this is very unsettling stuff. It was bad enough to have our Capitol attacked. As a former felony judge, I would have no problem sending people to prison that broke into this Capitol, that literally broke in or that did damage or that stole things here. There is no place for that, and they do need to be severely punished.

But were some of those people doing those things working for the FBI? Were they egged on by Federal authorities? Because it sure looks like from some of these legal documents they filed and the masking of names and referring to them as something other than their real names that we have a serious problem with some of the people that were involved that day that it appears were either working for Federal authorities or were informants for Federal authorities and had leadership positions in those groups and quite possibly, in some cases probably, helped to egg them on.

This article says in many cases the unindicted co-conspirators appear to be much more aggressive and egregious participants in the very so-called con-

spiracy, serving as the basis for charging those indicted. The question immediately arises as to why this is the case and forces us to consider whether certain individuals are being protected from indictment because they were involved in January 6 as undercover operatives or confidential informants for a Federal agency.

So another place further on in the article it points out: "This would be far worse than the already bad situation of the government knowing about the possibility of violence and doing nothing. Instead, this would imply that elements of the federal government were active instigators in the most egregious and spectacular aspects of January 6, amounting to a monumental entrapment scheme used as a pretext to imprison otherwise harmless protesters at the Capitol—and in a much larger sense used to frame the entire MAGA movement as potential domestic terrorists."

There is so much more. Let's see, further on, I guess this is page 8/26. "In one of the plot's climactic scenes, in the main van driving up to look at Governor Whitmer's vacation home"—and that is of course the plot to kidnap the Governor—"three out of the five people in the van—60 percent of the plot's senior leaders—were Federal agents and informants."

"FBI infiltrators comprised, at the very least"—talking about overall in that plot—"26 percent of the plotters. That is, at least five FBI operatives have been disclosed, against just 14 suspects indicted."

So looking at some of the pleadings by the DOJ themselves, but just to give an idea of what we are dealing with, it says, "On December 30, 2020, Watkins and Caldwell exchanged the following text messages:

"Watkins: Looks like we are green light to come to D.C. on the 6th. The rally point still at your place?"

"Caldwell: Not that I am aware. Have been contacted by no one. Typical (Person one). Here's the rub: (Person two) and I will be in a hotel within striking distance of the city starting on the 4th, so we won't even be here. There will be some stuff going on during the 5th, and we want to be a part of that whenever it shakes out."

Person one and person two were apparently working for the Federal authorities, some Federal agency.

Another place it references person two, person three, person one, and they seem to be significant leaders in what is going on.

Another place: Person three—emailed person three several maps along with the message. These maps will get you from the hotel into D.C.

I mean, person 10 checked into the Hilton Garden Inn in Vienna.

Person three, another reference.

Person 15 and person 20 are referenced.

These are people that they are covering up their names because they are working for the Federal authorities.

If you look at some of the video on January 6, there were a lot of people walking around. They had no business being in the Capitol. But it is quite concerning that people that were extremely active at all should have been or were working for Federal entities such that they have to cover up their names because of their complicity with the Federal authorities during that day.

So that is United States versus Caldwell, Crowl, and then there is one Government's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration of Detention.

They are holding some of these people still. Some with 23 hours, 24 hours a day in solitary. Some were just walking around, they did no damage. They should not have come into the Capitol, but it remains to be seen why the government has their stinger out so much for people no matter how mild their participation on January 6.

And yet the biggest damage done to the United States in protests was last summer, and those folks aren't being treated the same way that others are.

So there are some very serious questions that need to be answered. We do need the answers. We need to know how many Federal agents; how many informants had given information to Federal agencies and why in the world all of that information was not provided to people that needed to protect Capitol Hill.

So we need an investigation. We don't need one that has an entire Democrat staff. It needs to be truly bipartisan to get to the bottom of just what happened that day and who caused it to happen.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

SERVICE BEFORE SELF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

(Ms. SLOTKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about service by recognizing individuals and organizations who have stepped up when their fellow citizens needed them most. Through their actions, they have shown what it means to put others before self.

DR. SATURNINO RODRIGUEZ

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I begin by rising today to honor Dr. Saturnino Rodriguez, a good friend and devoted servant of the Latino community in Lansing.

Over the years, Dr. Rodriguez, or Nino as he is known around town, has had many titles. In each role, he has left a profound impact on the students, faculty, parents, and community residents that call greater Lansing home.

Dr. Rodriguez has spent his entire professional life working in schools—

first in Peru, then in Grand Rapids, and then Lansing, where he has worked tirelessly for the past 50 years to improve the lives of children through education. His career has taken him from being a counselor at C.W. Otto Junior High, an assistant principal at Gardner Junior High and Eastern High School, principal at Pattengill Middle School, and finally as deputy superintendent of the entire school district.

He was an innovator in the classroom, developing a clustered teaching approach that is still being used today. In addition, he led the adoption of guidelines proposed by the Youth Violence Prevention Coalition, which brought about significant positive changes in student and community relations.

Since 2009, he has been an elected member of the Lansing District Board of Education, a role that he carries out with joy because it allows him to continue his service to Lansing students.

Dr. Rodriguez' passions extend beyond education. He is an officer with the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce and a member of the Ingham County Health Department's Board of Health. But to really know Dr. Rodriguez, you only need to read his monthly magazine *Adelante Forward*.

Published in both English and Spanish, *Adelante Forward* has been an instrumental source of information for the Lansing community, advertising new businesses and spreading word about resources from Head Start classes to COVID vaccine clinics. It has been a key way to reach Latino and Hispanic residents, bridging the language gap in order to improve community relations. And, as I am sure Dr. Rodriguez is proud to know, it is even being used by some Spanish language teachers as part of their lesson plans.

The publication wouldn't be possible without the special partners that work to put it together: Danny Layne, Allena Tapia, Patricia Briones, and Dr. George Mansour. In addition, no tribute to Dr. Rodriguez would be complete without mention of his wife of 30 years, Margarita, as well as their two daughters and two grandchildren.

It is my privilege to represent Dr. Rodriguez in Washington. I am grateful for his willingness to always speak to me about Lansing's needs. Every time we are able to connect, it is a pleasure to hear about the good work being done to improve the lives of others. I am appreciative of his commitment to serving others, and it is my honor to recognize him today in the permanent RECORD of the people's House.

□ 1315

HONORING LISA BRINKER

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Lisa Brinker, a resident of Lake Orion, who has been there for her community when it needed her most.

Ms. Brinker has faced adversity in her life. Three years ago, her husband passed away from brain cancer. Out of

that pain, she found purpose. Over the course of the last year, she has devoted her time to the New Day Foundation for Families, a local nonprofit that supports those fighting cancer and their loved ones.

The financial cost of a cancer diagnosis goes beyond just medical care, as I know well. Beyond the loss of income, the increase in expenses, and emotional distress, it is a diagnosis that can consume us entirely. And that is where the New Day Foundation for Families comes in. With an army of local volunteers like Ms. Brinker, they provide resources to give cancer patients hope through financial assistance and emotional support.

When her husband was in the hospital, Ms. Brinker was surrounded by family, friends, and churchgoers who helped lighten the load. For her, she wouldn't have known what to do without that help. And it is why she works so hard to make someone else's load a little lighter. During the pandemic, when family members of immunocompromised patients saw a trip to the grocery store as a fraught experience, Ms. Brinker was there to provide for their essential needs.

Since the program began last spring, volunteers like Lisa made more than 300 deliveries helping 125 families in total. They were a godsend during COVID, and not just for their food deliveries. By demonstrating that service doesn't stop, not even during a once-in-a-generation pandemic, Ms. Brinker was a source of inspiration and strength. With an infectious attitude that brightens the days of all she serves, we are lucky to have her in our community.

Ms. Brinker has persevered through adversity and loss, and it has magnified her service. With the powerful perspective that comes with experience, she has used it to better her Lake Orion community. As a humble spirit, she prefers that any recognition focus on making a difference. An article in the local paper ended with her asking readers to get themselves involved. And true to form, for this recognition, she indicated that credit should go to the good people of the New Day Foundation for Families.

It is a rare soul who can reduce pain and hardship in others, especially when they themselves have been in that position. For her work to honor the loving memory of her husband and her tireless service to community, it is my privilege to recognize Lisa Brinker on the House floor today.

HONORING LISA KOCAB

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize another Lisa, the ultimate champion and advocate for the disability community in Brighton, Michigan, Ms. Lisa Kocab.

Put simply, Lisa is a powerhouse. As a teacher and a mother of five, including an incredible 10-year-old boy, PJ, who has Down syndrome, she has built and created an incredible circle of support since moving back to Michigan in 2016.