

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

CAPITOL SECURITY SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, it has been more than 200 days since the U.S. Capitol was attacked by mobs of anti-government insurrectionists. It was the darkest day for Congress in more than 200 years, since invading troops set this magnificent building on fire 200 years ago.

Americans in uniform that day stepped up to protect Congress. The officers of the Capitol Police and other law enforcement agencies literally put their lives on the line to protect Senators, Congressmen, and to protect our Constitution.

More than 25,000 members of the National Guard also came from across the country to secure Capitol Hill, including from my home State of Montana.

Words cannot express my thanks for what these men and women did on behalf of our Nation, and their service was not without sacrifice.

Police officers were assaulted by an angry mob, and we know that post-traumatic stress is a real problem for many who had been to hell and back. The citizen soldiers of the National Guard stood watch day and night.

Now, today, we find out that pay is running short for both Capitol Police and the members of the National Guard. The good news is that after weeks of Senate negotiations, we are on the verge of a bipartisan deal that ensures that the Capitol Police will have the money to pay its officers for the rest of the year.

And as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Committee, I have worked with Vice Chairman SHELBY on two critical funding items to be included in this bill.

First, we have agreed that the National Guard urgently needs \$521 million to pay them for securing this Capitol. This funding will allow the summer drill season to proceed without interruption. We need a prepared Guard.

Second, we have learned of the substantial costs of moving Afghans who helped our military get out of that country safely. We owe a debt to those brave Afghans, who risked their lives to support our American troops. That debt can never be fully repaid.

I would like to thank Chairman LEAHY and Vice Chairman SHELBY for working with me on this important bill. I hope we can seal the deal very soon and have this measure approved by the Senate today because it is our job to defend the brave officers who defended us on January 6 and who continue their tireless work to keep us safe today.

I yield the floor.

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. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent to be able to use a prop during my remarks.

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

NOMINATION OF TRACY STONE-MANNING

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to strongly oppose the nomination of Tracy Stone-Manning.

I want to focus my remarks now on the misleading and false statements that Tracy Stone-Manning has made to the Senate and how they just don't align with the facts.

On her committee questionnaire, which is a sworn affidavit that every nominee fills out, the committee clearly asks: Have you ever been investigated?

Tracy Stone-Manning said she had not.

On the same document, she also stated that she testified for a grand jury about an alleged tree spiking. Well, these statements are not true, and Ms. Stone-Manning knows it.

Tree spiking involves hammering a metal spike, like this one, into the trunk of a tree. Ecoterrorists use spikes like this. This is something they do to prevent loggers from harvesting trees. If a saw blade hits that spike, it destroys the saw, and metal shrapnel flies in every direction. The results can be catastrophic.

The trees in the Clearwater National Forest were spiked in 1989. Individuals were found guilty of this crime, and a local sawmill was damaged as a result of the spikes. Some of the trees standing today are still spiked and can still do damage to loggers and firefighters. These are serious dangers and damages that can occur to people still today.

If there is a forest fire in the Clearwater National Forest, a smoke jumper may need to cut down trees to slow the spread of the fire. If that person hits a spike with a chain saw, it could kill or maim the firefighter. Worse still, Tracy Stone-Manning knew who the ecoterrorists were, and she could have turned them in at the start.

In 1989, she edited, typed, and sent this vile, threatening letter to the men and women of the U.S. Forest Service. She did it on behalf of the tree spikers. The letter included lines like:

You bastards go in there anyway and a lot of people could get hurt.

She went on:

I would be more than willing to pay you a dollar for the sale, but you would have to find me first, and that could be your WORST nightmare.

Tracy Stone-Manning has said since the incident that she mailed this disturbing, threatening letter to warn people of the danger of the spiked trees. But she didn't go to the authorities. No, she did not. She did not go to the police. No, not at all. She took ex-

traordinary steps to ensure that she and the tree spikers would never get caught.

If she had gone to the police, the Forest Service would have been much better able to identify the spiked trees. Instead, she covered up for the criminals for years. All the while, these trees remain spiked and remain incredibly dangerous.

Ms. Stone-Manning told our committee that she was never investigated. Well, that was a lie. Following the tree spiking in 1989, she was subpoenaed by investigators to provide hair samples, fingerprints, writing samples, and other physical evidence.

These are criminal investigators. Press articles at the time confirm this fact, as do the court documents obtained by the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. This is further verified by the letter that our committee received by the lead criminal investigator for the U.S. Forest Service, Mr. Michael Merkley. We received this letter after she had testified in front of the Senate committee a few months ago.

He wrote:

... the grand jury issued subpoenas for hair samples, handwriting exemplars, and fingerprints. These subpoenas were served on persons suspected of having knowledge of the incident, including Ms. Tracy Stone-Manning.

But don't take his word for it. Let's listen to the words of Tracy Stone-Manning herself. In a 1990 article about law enforcement's investigation at the University of Montana, she complained about how the investigation made her feel.

She said:

It was degrading. It changed my awareness of the power of the government.

Through this entire period, she did not tell the truth to the investigators. Remember, she knew who spiked the trees. She sent a threatening letter to them. She never went to the police, and she never identified the ecoterrorists. She also didn't cooperate.

The lead investigator says in his letter that the committee has received since the time she testified to the committee a few months ago—he said:

Through this initial investigation in 1989, Ms. Stone-Manning was extremely difficult to work with; in fact she was the nastiest of suspects. ... she was vulgar, antagonistic, and extremely anti-government.

He goes on to say she refused to comply with the investigation until she learned she would be arrested if she did not.

But the investigation of Tracy Stone-Manning did not end in 1989 with the subpoenas. In December of 1992, after years of her covering up for the ecoterrorists, she was identified as the one who sent the threatening letter. A woman connected with the group came forward and gave her name to investigators.

Mr. MERKLEY writes, again, in this letter we received since Stone-Manning

has testified in her committee hearing in the Senate—he writes:

[A]s a result of Ms. Lilburn's testimony, the grand jury sent Tracy Stone-Manning a target letter, which meant she was going to be indicted on criminal charges for her active participation in planning these crimes.

Her lawyer then negotiated an immunity deal. She would testify against the individuals who spiked the trees. And she knew she could have been charged.

In an interview published in a 1983 article in "The Missoulian," Stone-Manning said that she could have been charged with conspiracy if not for the immunity deal.

Remember, she told the Senate she had never been investigated. She was subpoenaed for physical evidence. She was investigated. She didn't cooperate with investigators. She complained to the press about being investigated, and she covered up for the ecoterrorists for years until she was caught. But that wasn't her only lie. On our committee's questionnaire for the record, I asked her:

Did you have personal knowledge of, participate in, or in any way directly or indirectly support activities associated with the spiking of trees in any forest during your lifetime?

In any forest during your lifetime?

She responded:

No.

Everyone knows that is a lie. She sent their letter. She knew who they were. She supported their activities. The lead investigator's letter makes clear she knew the plan to spike the trees in the Idaho forest in advance.

He wasn't the only one—this lead criminal investigator wasn't the only one to say she knew so in advance. One of the convicted tree spikers, one of the people who went to jail in this episode, he told E&E News—again, since the hearing and since the letter has come out, just in the last couple weeks, the convicted tree spiker says: "She knew about it far in advance, a couple of months before we headed out."

He continued: "She had agreed to mail the letter well in advance."

To be clear, after Tracy Stone-Manning had her confirmation hearing here in the Senate earlier this year, two people with direct knowledge came forward. One was the cop—the criminal investigator who investigated the crime. The other was the criminal who was convicted. Both the cop and the criminal say she lied.

Ms. Stone-Manning helped plan the tree spiking. She knew about it in advance. She sent a threatening letter to the Forest Service. She was investigated. She collaborated with ecoterrorists. She lied to the Senate.

Lying to the U.S. Senate has consequences. In this case, her actions and her lies should cost her this nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I want to thank my colleague, Senator

BARRASSO, for leading the effort to do what is the obvious thing to do on the U.S. Senate floor. Here, in a couple minutes, we are going to vote on one of the most extreme nominees I have ever seen to be nominated for anything requiring the confirmation of the U.S. Senate.

To be honest, I can't believe we are even really having this debate. I can't believe that the Senate is going to put forward and vote on an ecoterrorist. I can't believe the President of the United States, after maybe not recognizing who he put forward, didn't withdraw the nomination. And yet here we are.

We know this administration supports far-left groups and certainly has nominated some far-left nominees for Senate confirmation to important positions in the Federal Government. But what hasn't happened yet is—they have knowingly put forward a far-left nominee who has clearly lied to the Senate, as Senator BARRASSO just showed clearly, who is not just a far-left extremist, she is a violent extremist.

So, normally, you would think in America that would disqualify you from a position that requires Senate confirmation—a position, by the way, that is one of the most important positions to my State, the great State of Alaska.

And yet here we are. Here we are. We are going to vote for her. And it looks like all my Senate Democrat colleagues are going to vote aye. Shocking. I hope America is watching because this is a bigger vote than just for the BLM Director. This is a symbol of how crazy and far left this administration has gone and, to be honest, how fearful some of my colleagues are of that.

So I was here on the Senate floor a little over 1 month ago, and I called on the President to withdraw his nomination to lead the Bureau of Land Management, Tracy Stone-Manning. It was the first time in my Senate career I have called on a nominee to be withdrawn before they had gone through their vote on the Senate floor and vote out of committee. I have never done that before.

Usually, the President certainly gets to put forward who he or she wants for positions to fill out his Cabinet and his Federal Government. That is normal.

I have never done this before, but I have a reason, just like Senator BARRASSO has been coming down on the Senate floor to talk about this, to actually call for this withdrawal, because we have not confronted someone with Tracy Stone-Manning's past, which involves being a member of part of an extreme, radical, violent group that performed violent acts in the name of getting attention, a violent group engaging in overt ecoterrorism.

Her past association with ecoterrorism is so heinous that even the Director of BLM from the Obama-Biden administration said that her actions should preclude her from consid-

eration, and her nomination should be withdrawn by the President.

You would think that would have been it. The last Democrat nominee for that job said she wasn't qualified because of her ecoterrorism past. That was Mr. Bob Abbey.

I want to talk about BLM for a minute and why I am on the floor again talking about this issue. This is an incredibly important and powerful Federal agency, particularly as it relates to my State.

The Alaska BLM manages more surface and subsurface acres in my State than in any other State in the country, by far. In fact, I haven't done the math completely, but I believe they manage more acreage in Alaska than they do in the rest of the lower 48 combined. That is how important this is.

Let me give you some of the numbers. This includes over 70 million surface acres of land and 220 million subsurface acres of land in Alaska. That is the land equivalent to about one-fifth of the entire lower 48 States. Most States can't even comprehend that size. That is why this is such an important nominee.

This, of course, is a huge amount of land, and it is a huge amount of power over my constituents for access to land for our economy, for our environment, for our Native culture. It is imperative the Director of this Agency—and I am not going to always agree with the Director of this Agency—but the Director of the BLM, with so much power and so much control over Alaska and its future and our working families, be someone who is, at minimum, trustworthy, honest, fair-minded, beyond reproach, and certainly—certainly—not involved with an organization whose mission was to perpetuate violence against their fellow Americans.

Is that so hard a standard?

This nominee is none of these things. As Senator BARRASSO so ably has presented, and as I mentioned, she was once a member of an ecoterrorist organization.

Now, maybe she can go work for President Biden in some other position, but to get Senate-confirmed, given what she has done, and have U.S. Senators look the other way—it is OK. She was part of a group that was perpetuating acts of violence against their fellow Americans to get attention, and we are OK with that? U.S. Senators are OK with that? My goodness, this is a low bar.

Tracy Stone-Manning was a member of Earth First!—a radical, far-left group who has engaged repeatedly in what is defined as ecoterrorism. She wasn't just a member of Earth First!; she was complicit, as Senator BARRASSO just mentioned, putting big metal spikes, thick ones, in trees that were meant to either threaten to hurt or actually gravely injure Americans, working families who were harvesting trees in our country legally and who were putting trees in sawmills legally. This was a common technique—tree

spiking, as it was called—deployed by such ecoterrorist groups in the late 1980s and early 1990s, and it is extremely dangerous.

Let me briefly talk about the group Tracy Stone-Manning was a member of. Again, we know that this administration is putting forth far-left nominees with affiliations with certain groups but not violent groups. That should be a redline that every Senator agrees with.

Earth First! began in 1980 by disaffected environmentalists who thought the movement wasn't radical enough. They thought the environmental movement in America wasn't getting enough attention, so they thought, hmmm, let's get more attention by perpetrating violence and destruction.

The group's slogan is this: "No Compromise in Defense of Mother Earth." In their view, "no compromise" meant destroying property, putting steel spikes in trees that could kill someone trying to harvest a tree, and they even celebrated and encouraged such actions. The group put out a manual—yes, a manual—on their ecoterrorist tactics detailing tree spiking and instructions on how to cause other sabotage: Cut down power lines. Flatten tires of vehicles for timber harvesters. Burn machinery. Again, these are all American citizens who were trying to do something legally.

We harvest trees legally in Alaska. We have loggers who have been doing this for generations from hard-working American families. So many other States in this Senate—represented here in the Senate. I certainly hope a Senator from one of those States is not going to vote yes in a couple of minutes here on this vote.

David Foreman was the founder of Earth First! He talked about these activities, and he said: "This is where the ecoteur can have fun." That is a quote from the founder of Earth First! This is what he called fun.

This is how an article in the Washington Post from this time described such an incident of tree spiking that severely hurt one of our fellow American citizens, and I am going to quote from this article:

George Alexander, a third-generation mill worker, was just starting his shift at the Louisiana-Pacific lumber mill in Cloverdale, Calif., when the log that would alter his life rolled down his conveyor belt toward a high-speed saw he was working on.

Now, we have these saws and these mills in Alaska. These saws are huge, the size of people. They spin at incredibly fast speeds with huge teeth. They are dangerous to work on normally, but when you think about hitting a tree going through a mill with a spike in it, you can imagine, it is an explosion.

Let me continue this article:

It was May 1987, and [George] Alexander was 23 [years old]. His job was to split logs. He was nearly three feet away when the log [he was working on] hit his saw and the saw

[this giant saw] exploded. One half of the blade stuck in the log. The other half hit Alexander in the head [again, these are giant saws] tearing through his safety helmet and [tearing through his] face shield. His face was slashed from eye to chin. His teeth were smashed and his jaw was cut in half.

Good job, Earth First! Good job trying to kill a fellow American. This is what Earth First! did.

I was up on the Yukon River over the Fourth of July at our fish camp cleaning brush, trees, working a chain saw, and I honestly was thinking about this. I was thinking, man, I have this saw, a little saw, not one of these huge things. Think about if you hit a spike.

But these were the kind of tactics that Tracy Stone-Manning, the Biden administration's choice to lead the BLM, once conspired in. Does that disturb you, America? Does that disturb you, national media? Does that disturb you, my fellow Senators? It sure the heck disturbs me. Every U.S. Senator on the floor here should be very, very disturbed about this.

So what did she specifically do? Again, Senator BARRASSO has highlighted this. She hasn't been truthful to the Senate, by the way. That is a crime in and of itself. Here is what she did. In 1989, she did a fellow friend, an Earth First! friend—really a comrade; it is more of a socialist Communist organization—a fellow comrade a favor. She rewrote word-for-word a profane, anonymous letter—you saw it here from Senator BARRASSO a couple of minutes ago—from this Earth First! member about the 500 pounds of tree spikes that they had hammered into trees in an Idaho forest—by Earth First!, 500 pounds. That is a lot.

She rewrote the letter on a rented typewriter because, she later told a reporter, "her fingerprints were all over it," so she didn't want to get caught. So she knew she was obviously doing something criminal. She didn't just handwrite it; she typed it and then sent the letter to the FBI. And you saw it is a very disturbing, profane letter where she threatens people who are going to get hurt. So she is all in. She is all in.

She kept quiet on this for years, and that was 1989, until she came forward in 1993, received immunity, obviously had been investigated—lied about that—for her part in this tree spiking in Idaho.

She has since then portrayed herself as a victim. But a former criminal investigator for USDA Forest Service—again, Senator BARRASSO laid this out—wrote a letter to the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and here is what he said:

Ms. Stone-Manning was not an innocent bystander, nor was she a victim in this case. . . . Ms. Stone-Manning was not only a member of Earth First!, but she played an active role in the Earth First! hierarchy.

He described her as vulgar, antagonistic, and extremely anti-government. He said she was uncooperative and refused to provide hair, handwriting samples, and fingerprints as ordered by the

Federal grand jury. Come on, U.S. Senate, really? You are going to confirm her?

It was only after she knew that she might get in trouble that she began to cooperate. "Let me be clear," Special Agent Michael Merkley wrote very recently. "Ms. Stone-Manning only came forward after her attorney struck the immunity deal, and not before she was caught."

In testimony submitted to the Senate, she claimed that the tree spiking was "alleged" but never investigated. That is untrue. None of this is true.

But here is what is true: She was a member of an ecoterrorist group who had as its goal to threaten or actually hurt Americans. Americans were hurt by this, hard-working Americans doing something legally. She is clearly dishonest, and she has no business heading up the BLM, a Federal Agency with enormous power, especially over my State.

So this is a really important issue for me, which is why I have been on the floor talking about it. As I said, the President should have withdrawn her nomination, and I certainly hope my Senate colleagues will not vote to confirm her. I don't think any Republican is going to. But any of my fellow Democrats who live in places where men and women harvest logs, hard-working American families, it is going to be really interesting to see how you write those families after you vote yes, if you do.

So I hope we defeat her vote here today, but I think there is something else to talk about. As I mentioned, it is one thing to put forward far-left individuals for these Senate-confirmed jobs. It is quite another to put forward someone who is far left and violent, with a record of trying to hurt your fellow Americans.

I think this is a symbol. We know the Biden administration has a lot of allies in some of these groups, but the fact that the President of the United States, with all this evidence that has come out—maybe they overlooked it, but now it is all out—lying, violence. He is still standing behind her, and it looks like all my colleagues are going to vote for her. This is a travesty.

I hope all Americans watching ask the proper question. Dishonest, lying ecoterrorist took action to hurt people, who is now going to have one of the most important positions of power in America over my constituents. We need to do better here, folks. If she passes, this is going to show just how far left the Biden administration is.

Again, I try to be bipartisan here. I have a lot of friends on both sides of the aisle. But how compliant or scared my Senate Democratic colleagues are of these radical groups.

Do the right thing, vote no on this nominee, and get the President to put forward someone else without a violent past who has been honest. We might disagree with them. But to my Senate Democratic colleagues today, do the

right thing. You know what the right thing is. Do the right thing. Vote to reject this very radical, unqualified, dishonest nominee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, because of the increase in hospitalizations because of the Delta variant of the virus, we are told that the CDC will soon be requiring, in about half the counties of the country, masks and other restrictions to prevent the spread of the virus.

They say they are doing it because of the science. We are told they will not show us the data. The very essence of science is peer review, and pity anybody who wants to analyze it. In America, the public's business ought to be public.

If we can't get this data, what the taxpayers are paying for and public policy is being made on, it seems to me that principle—that the public's business is not really public. And when people are able to cover up things and make policy decisions that are not public and transparent, it obviously brings about less accountability.

So let's have that data. We want to know why you are requiring masks again.

REMEMBERING MIKE ENZI

Madam President, today, I join my colleagues to mourn the passing of my friend, former Senator Mike Enzi.

Just a few months ago, Mike stood here in this very Chamber, on December 22, to say farewell to this institution and his colleagues. After 24 years, the people of his beloved State—serving them—he returned home to Wyoming.

To the good people of Wyoming, I thank you for sharing Mike with us for a couple of dozen years. He was a guiding light here in the U.S. Senate. He worked effectively to find common ground and bridge partisan divide for the public good.

Mike practiced, by word and by deed, the mission statement that he created for his office: Do what is right; do our best; and treat others as they wish to be treated.

In his farewell speech here on the Senate floor, he told us about the 80-percent tool as an effective way to govern. Mike was a pragmatist. He understood good laws aren't made with a sledgehammer. It takes craftsmanship, consensus, and common sense. As Mike said, focus on the 80 percent of an issue where we can find agreement and then discard the other 20 percent.

Today, as Congress seeks to reach consensus on a host of important issues, we would do well to follow Mike's advice. We need more of that bipartisan buy-in that Mike brought from his State of Wyoming to Washington, DC, and the Halls of Congress. I was honored to partner on so many bread-and-butter issues that had a direct impact on hard-working families,

farmers, breadwinners, and small businesses.

As many of you know, I help on our family farm in New Hartford, IA. Mike started and ran a family-owned shoe store in Gillette, his home there in Wyoming. Meeting payroll, paying bills, and making ends meet informed in each of us a philosophy about government spending and conservative management of the taxpayers' money. As disciples of fiscal discipline, we evangelized, caucused, and fought together to hold the line on reckless spending.

Too many people in Washington forget that taxpayers' dollars don't grow on trees. It is the people's money. Mike knew how to crunch numbers and watch over the Federal purse better than all of us. He was an accountant and put his expertise to work as chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. He held the Federal bureaucracy to account and kept Congress accountable to the American people.

Relected by wide margins, Mike relished retail politics and fought for small businesses and retailers at the policymaking tables. Barbara and I traveled to Gillette once to attend a political event with Mike and his wife Diana. The feeling in the crowd was insightful; the Enzis are beloved in Wyoming.

Mike kept in touch with the grass-roots, traveling Wyoming as extensively as I travel to every corner of Iowa. However, he always made time to foster relationships with friends, former staff, and, of course, his family.

I don't often socialize in Washington, but I made an exception for my friend Mike Enzi. I joined the Enzis' weekly Tortilla Coast dinner when I could. My wife Barbara joined every chance she had, and she did it much more often than I did.

On each Senator's birthday, Mike would write a long, heartfelt birthday note with a personal P.S. I looked forward to reading his birthday wish every year and the advice—very good advice—that he included in it. There was always a piece of advice or a challenge for the year ahead.

Mike was humble. Mike was approachable. Mike was respected by all. He was a true friend of this Senate. I recall those parting words from the gentle giant of Gillette, WY: I like being a Senator, not for the title, not for the recognition, and certainly not for the publicity. I like solving Federal problems for Wyoming people. I like doing legislation.

And, of course, Mike did just that. Barbara and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to Diana and his children as well. May God bless Mike, a faithful servant of the Lord. And we saw that faithfulness to the Lord as he led the Wednesday morning Senate prayer meeting on a very regular basis. And may He bring you and your family peace and comfort, today and always.

CORONAVIRUS

Madam President, on another note, on June 8 of this year, I sent a letter—

I came to the floor, I should say instead, to speak about my oversight activities with respect to the origins of the coronavirus. As part of that oversight, on March 8 and May 26 of this year, I wrote to the Department of Health and Human Services about its oversight of grants sent to EcoHealth Alliance.

The Department sent millions of dollars to EcoHealth. That group then subawarded hundreds of thousands of dollars of that taxpayer money to the Wuhan Institute of Virology. Reports have indicated that \$600,000 to \$826,000 was sent to the Wuhan Institute of Virology.

So, folks, what we have here is taxpayer money that was sent to the communist Chinese Government. That is a pretty scary proposition. When we send taxpayers' money to the Chinese Government, if there is no oversight done on that money, then we really don't have any idea how it is used. Just look at the news about China kicking the French out of the Wuhan laboratory.

China can't be trusted, period. But I am not sure bureaucrats share that same view. I am talking about bureaucrats of our government. To illustrate, Dr. Anthony Fauci has said that Chinese scientists are trustworthy; that "we [really] always trust the grantee to do what they say."

As a threshold matter, if a government worker doesn't show at least a little bit of skepticism about how a grant recipient is using the taxpayers' money, they aren't doing their job. That skepticism is healthy, and it is basic good government to question the recipient to make sure that they are doing what they are supposed to do with our money.

Dr. Fauci has also stated that the National Institutes of Health "has not ever and does not now fund gain-of-function research in the Wuhan Institute of Virology." That is a pretty confident statement.

When my colleague Senator PAUL questioned Dr. Fauci on his position with respect to gain-of-function research, that same Dr. Fauci called my colleague a liar. Well, the way I see it, the only way that Dr. Fauci and the government can be so confident that no gain-of-function research was done is if they performed the proper oversight of the American taxpayers' money sent to China.

In both my letters to the Department of Health and Human Services, I asked that very question. So far, the Department of Health and Human Services has failed to answer the question.

On June 10 of this year at the Senate Finance Committee hearing, I asked Secretary Becerra what, if any, oversight was done. He didn't give me an answer. I asked again in a followup question for the record—still no response, even though all these people that come before a committee for nomination approval always say: We will answer your letters; we will answer the phone; we will testify. But no answer to that question yet.