

leases impacted by “stop movement” orders. However, the original bill unintentionally omitted the Coast Guard. The small but important change Andy initiated has had a positive impact on thousands of his fellow Coast Guard members and their families.

This is an exciting moment for Andy. Soon, he will assume command of the Coast Guard Cutter Mohawk in Key West, FL. I know the Mohawk and the Coast Guard will benefit from Andy’s steadfast spirit and determination.

I salute Andy’s service and leadership in our Nation’s armed services, and I thank him for all of his hard work. I have been blessed with many fellows. I rise to speak for fellows really only when they come for two tours in my office.

Andy’s presence on the Commerce Committee will be missed, but his colleagues and his country are grateful for his dedication and diligence. I know Kristen, Aidan, Karissa, and Alexander are proud of him also.

On behalf of the American people, I extend my deepest gratitude and wish Andy Pate the best of luck in his future endeavors.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, in all honesty, sometimes it is hard to figure out exactly what the policy goals are that the Biden administration is striving to achieve.

Take the so-called COVID-19 relief bill that was signed into law just last month. Despite the fact that every pandemic relief bill that became law last year received broad bipartisan support, this bill did not. In fact, not a single Republican voted for it.

The Biden administration is preparing to rinse and repeat this strategy with a new misleading label, calling it infrastructure. But the reason why Republicans didn’t vote for the COVID-19 relief bill, while we did for every single one last year, was because only about 10 percent of the bill was actually dedicated to the goal stated by the proponents. Only about 10 percent of the massive \$1.9 trillion bill was related to the pandemic, and less than 1 percent was related to our vaccination efforts.

As I said, now the administration is preparing a rinse-and-repeat strategy with a new misleading label: “infrastructure.”

If one of the surveyed questions on “Family Feud” was, “Name something that is considered infrastructure,” I would bet the top two answers would be roads and bridges. The other popular answers would probably include: airports, railroads, ports, tunnels, and waterways. But our Democratic col-

leagues are broadening that definition in ways that really are not accurate.

Just as they tried to brand things like environmental justice funding as “pandemic relief,” they are now getting very creative with the definition of “infrastructure.” In fact, the President’s infrastructure plan has a lot in common with his COVID-19 relief plan.

First of all is the pricetag. The non-partisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget estimates this plan would cost \$2.65 trillion. That is trillion with a “t.”

For reference, the last major infrastructure bill that became law in 2015 was widely described as the largest package in more than a decade. That overwhelmingly bipartisan legislation totaled just over \$300 billion, one-ninth of the cost of this new plan.

But there is another similarity between these two massive proposals, the long list of unrelated progressive or liberal policy priorities. Only about 5 percent of the spending in this colossal infrastructure plan is directed toward roads and bridges.

So where does the rest of the money go? For starters, this proposal would provide \$174 billion for electric vehicle chargers, far more money than would go toward the roads and bridges Americans drive on every day. There are roughly 280 million cars on the road, the vast majority of which are internal combustion engine driven. Yet rather than provide for the vast majority of travelers, this would favor \$174 billion for electric vehicle chargers.

This proposal includes a whopping \$400 billion to support caregiving for elderly and disabled Americans. There is no question about the importance of quality care for these individuals, but this is no definition of infrastructure. So this is really another Trojan horse: calling it one thing, making it look like one thing, and doing something entirely unrelated and different.

There is \$25 billion for government childcare programs; \$10 billion to create a Civilian Climate Corp—whatever that is. Then there is the massive funding for sustainable buildings and private homes.

This proposal would provide \$213 billion to build or retrofit more than 2 million affordable and sustainable places to live. This is really just the Green New Deal 2.0. And right on cue come the unrealistic targets to lower emissions.

Rather than research and development or innovation, this relies on taxation and regulation, an unrealistic goal. This infrastructure plan calls for 100 percent of electricity to come from renewable sources by 2035.

To be clear, we are nowhere close to that target now. And the effort to get there would have a devastating impact on States all across the country, including mine.

Last year, renewables accounted for only 20 percent of our total electricity generation. In Texas, we generate more electricity from wind turbines than

any other source in the country, but yet last year alone, renewables of all kinds—solar, wind, biomass, you name it—accounted for less than 20 percent. Natural gas accounts for more than double that.

We experienced what happens when these unrealistic, pie-in-the-sky goals are set. We had a 120-year weather event, the so-called polar vortex in Texas. It is a long, sustained period of subzero freezing that may be more common in Massachusetts than it is in Texas. As a matter of fact, like I said, it is a 120-year weather event. What we found out was the severe weather affected wind turbines, which effectively froze up snow- and ice-covered solar panels, and even natural gas went offline because the electric pumps that compress the natural gas to put it into the pipelines failed as well. About the only reliable fuel source during that period of time was nuclear power, which represents a fraction of our total energy needs.

I am a proud supporter of renewable energy sources as well as a broader effort to reduce emissions. There is no question about this. Just last week, I joined folks from the North American Development Bank and their public and private partners to announce a new solar farm in Webb County, Laredo, TX. But there is a big difference between supporting renewables and what the Biden administration is trying to do with this unrealistic and pie-in-the-sky target.

At the start of the pandemic, we got a small taste of the real-world impact of a shift from oil and gas and what that would look like. When the pandemic hit, the need for Texas’s greatest natural resource plummeted. Demand dropped precipitously as people stayed home and quit driving. With fewer cars and planes on the road and in the sky, oil and gas producers were left with a high supply and low demand. And that is when the layoffs began.

Last fall, a report by Deloitte found that between March and August of 2020, about 107,000 oil and gas workers were laid off. To be clear, this doesn’t include the countless workers who had their pay cut or were temporarily furloughed.

If the Biden administration enacts aggressive deadlines to eradicate our most prevalent and abundant energy sources, and the jobs they create, a lot of Texas energy workers and their families would be left high and dry.

But the bad news doesn’t stop there. The list of unrelated and downright damaging provisions in this bill is a long one. The big question with any legislation, especially something of this size, is, How are you going to pay for it?

In the past, the vast majority of infrastructure funding has come from the highway trust fund, but for years it has faced serious shortfalls. To a serious degree, Texans have footed the bill for those shortfalls. In fact, we are one of the few States that receives less than

it contributes to the highway trust fund, a so-called donor State.

But rather than address the solvency of the trust fund and the inequitable burden put on donor States before the authorization expires at the end of September, the administration has completely ignored the issue altogether.

The President's infrastructure plan doesn't even draw on the highway trust fund. So in order to pay for the sweeping liberal wish list, President Biden has proposed the largest set of tax hikes in more than half a century. By increasing the business tax rate from 21 to 28 percent, we would see an increase in revenue in the short term but serious long-term economic harm.

The tax burden on American companies would be greater than that of our biggest trading partner, as well as our competitors, and would have far-reaching consequences on our competitiveness and our economy and jobs for hard-working American families.

After all, we know the cost of these tax hikes won't be reflected in lower earnings for CEOs. The brunt would be borne by consumers who pay higher prices, workers who earn lower wages, and, let's not forget, those whose jobs would disappear entirely.

A study by the National Association of Manufacturers found this proposal would put 1 million people out of work in the United States in the next 2 years—a million people out of work. Just as we are beginning to come out of the pandemic, having been vaccinated and taking care for both our health and the health of others and now opening up our economy, this would be the reward for the American people: 1 million Americans out of work as a result of this misguided policy.

This legislation is not about improving America's roads and bridges; it is another partisan wish list under the guise of something that has traditionally enjoyed bipartisan support. Despite what some people think, the American people, I believe, are smart enough to see through this bill for what it is, an unaffordable, unwanted liberal wish list.

The Federal deficit is at its highest since World War II. This is not a time to go on another spending spree, using borrowed money from future generations. This is the time to craft smart policies that achieve the needs of our country without driving the next generation deeper and deeper into debt.

There is no question that America's roads and bridges—our real infrastructure—need an investment from the Federal Government, but we can update that infrastructure for far less than \$2.65 trillion.

Last Congress, the Environment and Public Works Committee developed a truly bipartisan example of an infrastructure bill. It included provisions for rebuilding our crumbling roads and bridges to improve road safety, protect the environment, and grow the economy.

The bill was so popular, in fact, that it passed the committee unanimously. And what was the pricetag on that bill? Just over 10 percent of the cost of the President's current proposal. It would have authorized \$287 billion over 5 years. That is \$100 billion less than what Democrats proposed spending on caregiving alone.

A bipartisan bill to rebuild our crumbling roads and bridges is possible. We have done it before, and we can do it again. But our Democratic colleagues are going to have trouble getting not only Republicans but many Members of their own party on board if they continue to push this sort of unrealistic, economy-harming sort of plan.

I am sure it comes as no surprise that putting Americans out of work while driving up the deficit and hurting our global competitiveness are wildly unpopular. Even smoke and mirrors can't conceal the impact of this so-called infrastructure bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Iowa.

HONORING STATE PATROL SERGEANT JIM SMITH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, a short tribute and then maybe about an 8- or 9-minute speech that I have.

Today, I want to pay tribute to Iowa State Patrol Sergeant Jim Smith, who courageously gave his life in the line of duty this past Friday.

Sergeant Smith, a 27-year Iowa State Patrol veteran and a tactical team leader, put himself in harm's way on behalf of his fellow Iowans last week, and it cost him everything.

Sergeant Smith is being remembered as a dedicated father, a loyal public servant, a man of God who left a positive impression on everybody he encountered.

I mourn for his family, fellow troopers, friends, and the entire Independence, IA, community at this tragic loss.

#### OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. President, I pose the following question to my fellow Senators, something I doubt there is much disagreement on, but time is moving on. We need to take some action shortly. So this question, if a deadly poison were killing thousands of Americans each year, what would you do? Would you work to find the solution to prevent these deaths, or would you choose to be complacent, reactive, and allow fellow citizens to die? If all levels of law enforcement were pleading for action to prevent future fatalities, would you heed their warning—the last question—or would you roll the dice with the lives that are on the line?

I know I would seek to be very proactive. I am here today to call attention to the dire need for Congress to schedule fentanyl-related substances before it is too late.

Without hyperbole or theatrics, such action could save the lives of thousands of Americans. Fentanyl is a synthetic opioid that is about 30 times more potent than heroin.

While dangerous and deadly, fentanyl also has some medically recognized qualities, often for pain management. However, fentanyl abuse has become more common and more dangerous in recent years because of the increase in fentanyl analogs. These analogs are chemically similar to fentanyl, but many are much more powerful and, of course, deadly.

Much of the illicitly manufactured fentanyl that is responsible for American overdoses and the deaths connected with them has originated in China. Unfortunately, these deadly drugs are not permanently controlled in the United States. As such, fentanyl analogs aren't on the same footing as other dangerous drugs like heroin, LSD, ecstasy, or cocaine. The sad part is, the drug dealers know all of this. They can skirt the law by easily manipulating the structure of fentanyl so that it isn't technically covered by existing law. But that doesn't make it any less potent and dangerous. We all know the results are lethal. How lethal? Well, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention states that more than 36,000 people died from overdoses involving synthetic opioids like fentanyl in 2019. Nearly 50,000 overdose deaths are projected for 2020.

As is, the law can't keep up with the rapidly evolving drug trends when the chemists work on these drugs and change them just a little bit to get around the law. The Attorney General can outlaw new variations of a drug on an ad hoc basis, but do you know what? This process can take years. By the time an analog is added to the schedule, do you know what? The drug traffickers are already out with one or more other variations that don't violate that law. Simply put, the law can't keep up with the rapid pace of illicit drug producers and traffickers. This is particularly problematic for fentanyl analog enforcement.

How can we address this seemingly endless cycle? How can we ensure that those suffering from substance use disorders aren't killed at the hands of greedy drug dealers? The answer is to stop fentanyl analogs from being available in the very first place. We must keep it out of our country and, hence, then being peddled by criminals.

On February 6, 2018, the Drug Enforcement Administration published a temporary order that scheduled and placed all fentanyl-related substances in schedule I. Congress subsequently extended this authority until May 6 of this year, which is just around the corner. So we have 23 days until this authority expires. Congress must act to extend this scheduling order. If we do not, we will face a surge of rapidly emerging fentanyl drugs, wherein the chemists and the criminals will be ahead of anything that the Justice Department does.

The Justice Department then has made clear that this classwide scheduling order has made a big difference in Chinese fentanyl entering our country.