

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.

The Director of the National Institutes of Health, Dr. Francis Collins, has also been silent on what, if any, oversight was done on the grants to the Wuhan Institute of Virology. Dr. Fauci has been silent on what, if any, oversight he did.

This is a simple and very important question for the government to answer. In other words, as you heard me say a few minutes ago, the public's business ought to be public. And without that sort of transparency, we don't have accountability, and we are entitled to have accountability on this kind of money.

The more that they deny the U.S. Congress an answer, the more it looks like these bureaucrats don't give a lick about the American people: the people they work for, the people who pay their salary.

Dr. Fauci is all over television and radio. You name it, he is on it. But, apparently, he and his counterparts can't find enough time to answer this very simple question: Did you do any oversight of the taxpayers' money you sent to EcoHealth, money that you knew was going to the communist Chinese Government? If so, please explain; if not, why not?

This should not be a difficult question to answer. Either you did or you didn't, and, either way, the American people deserve an explanation. And if they didn't do any oversight, then how can they confidently say the money wasn't used for gain-of-function research or other bad conduct?

We have lost over 600,000 Americans, and this body has spent trillions of dollars to support our economy and fight the virus. Congress and the American people have an absolute right to know what Dr. Fauci and Dr. Collins did to oversee this money. Enough with the games. Just answer the question.

I understand that the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General is doing an audit of what, if any, oversight was done. They are supposed to be taking a deep dive on the grants, the cooperative arrangements, and other relationships the government had with EcoHealth Alliance.

The audit isn't just focused on what the National Institutes of Health did or didn't do to monitor the grants. The scope also includes what EcoHealth did or didn't do to manage the funds in accordance with Federal requirements. And the scope of that review, at least right now, is from 2014 to 2021.

I expect the inspector general to be aggressive and unrelenting in getting the records, the emails, and the memos; run the transcribed interviews and question everyone up the leadership chain; leave no stone unturned; and make as much as possible public.

If punches are pulled, then this IG audit will be a waste of everybody's time and taxpayers' money. The inspector general has a tremendous responsibility to get this job done right.

DOMESTIC TERRORISM

Madam President, my last point that I want to make, fourth and last point,

I should say, is on a major issue facing our Nation, the issue of domestic terrorism and the threat it brings to our cities and communities across the country.

On June 15 of this year, the National Security Council issued a national strategy for countering domestic terrorism. Although the strategic objectives were very similar to the National Security Council strategy under the Trump administration, I was very concerned to see that the policy took a partisan tone. For example, aside from the commonsense measures to combat crime, such as promoting cooperation between law enforcement agencies, there was an emphasis on promoting gun control and critical race theory in schools.

The Biden administration seems to make these recommendations at every turn. What the report was missing, I found shocking. The report was lacking any strategy to combat anarchist extremism. Specifically, there was no mention of the 500 domestic terrorism investigations that were open throughout the 2020 riots. Those 500 cases amount to about 25 percent of the FBI's current domestic terrorism investigations.

How could the cause of 25 percent of the current FBI caseload not be mentioned?

It is a grave mistake to make an issue like domestic terrorism partisan, even in the slightest. Judging by the report, I am afraid that is exactly what the administration is doing.

It is of critical importance to keep in mind the great bipartisan work that can and should be done to address domestic terrorism of all types—rightwing and leftwing, including an anarchist extremism. We have to work together on diving deeper into serious, apolitical solutions to this issue. It is pretty simple. The American people deserve it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to use a prop during my remarks.

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

NOMINATION OF TRACY STONE-MANNING

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, I rise today to join my colleagues in opposing the motion to discharge President Biden's nominee to lead the Bureau of Land Management, Tracy Stone-Manning.

Since Ms. Stone-Manning's first hearing in the beginning of June, members of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee have gathered copious amounts of information regarding a number of controversies that disqualify her for this important role within our Federal Government.

As has been highlighted today, Ms. Stone-Manning was involved in a tree-spiking plot as a member of the ecoterrorist group Earth First!—a tree-spiking plot.

I have to tell you, I didn't know what tree spiking was until a couple of weeks ago.

Could you imagine taking this nail and driving it into a tree with the hopes it would deter that tree from ever being cut down?

And the concern is, someone that would take a chain saw, cutting through that tree, when they would hit this spike, what would happen?

I, unfortunately, had to take care of more than one chain saw situation in the emergency room. Let me tell you about a chain saw accident. The chain doesn't cut the flesh; it tears the flesh apart. It tears the skin apart, the muscles apart. It grabs the tendon and literally wraps them around the chain saw, usually permanently maiming people.

So could you imagine, if a chain saw hit this spike, what would happen?

Again, I have ran a chain saw before, and I know, as you are running the chain saw and you hit something solid, something hard—a knot—sometimes that chain saw bounces. It bounces back into your body. And that is where most of the accidents occur.

So could you imagine, if that chain saw hit this spike, the chain saw is going to bounce back, going to recoil into the person's body, and turns this spike into a piece of shrapnel?

This Earth First! Ms. Stone was a member of is a radical organization that spanned the late 1980s and early 1990s, during the peak years of what is often referred to as "the wilderness wars." As described by the Wall Street Journal, Earth First! had, at the time, "defined itself"—and I should quote here, "defined itself as the tip of the fanatical spear," and Ms. Stone-Manning was referred to as "an Earth First! spokesperson."

Debuting in 1985, the group engaged in a number of protests over the expansion of certain campgrounds and street theater asking people to take oaths to protect the Earth. However, they graduated into violence and ecoterrorist activities, including arson, equipment destruction, and the dangerous practice of tree spiking, which mangles saws and can easily result in the death of loggers.

In 1989, Ms. Stone-Manning was involved in an incident of tree spiking herself. Despite her denial, she was aware of the act being carried out, aided those who were involved, and helped cover it up. She obstructed the investigation and, finally, traded testimony for immunity.

At a time when the Biden administration has declared domestic extremism as one of the biggest threats the United States faces today, how can the President nominate someone with a record like this to lead the Agency that governs one-eighth of the country's landmass? How can this body bring her confirmation vote to the floor?

It is reckless and dripping with hypocrisy.