



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2021

No. 185

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DELBENE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 21, 2021.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SUZAN K. DELBENE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

REMEMBERING GENERAL COLIN POWELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, this week, our country lost a great American, and I stand here today to remember a giant: General Colin Powell.

He was a statesman who loved his country fiercely. He was a trailblazer who served with love, integrity, and pride. He helped shape American foreign and military policy for years. He

believed public service was the most important job in the world.

His leadership, full of honesty and listening, inspired generations. He treated every person with dignity and respect. Until his dying day, he opposed the fear and the hatred dividing this country. He believed in America's promise, and he left that as his legacy. He stood on principle and believed in the good of life.

Today, we remember his steadfast leadership, his commitment to family, and his strong enduring presence.

Please join me in sending love and prayers to Alma and the Powell family in the difficult times ahead.

I close with some of the General's own wisdom: "The ties that bind us together are far stronger than the occasional stresses that separate us."

HONORING NATIONAL SPINA BIFIDA AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HERN. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in honor of National Spina Bifida Awareness Month.

Spina bifida is a rare condition that develops in the womb. It stems from a hole in the spinal cord, a condition known as a neural tube defect. As the spinal column fails to close properly, nearly every major organ system is impacted.

Children born with spina bifida typically undergo dozens of surgeries at a young age. For those who survive to adulthood, they live with complex physical, mental, and other health challenges.

There are precious few resources available for the 166,000 individuals living with spina bifida in the United States, including my sister and my niece. I have another sister who was born with spina bifida as well and passed away shortly after birth.

I am very familiar with the challenges faced by those who suffer from spina bifida. It has been a part of my life since childhood.

The medical community has taken many steps forward since my sisters were diagnosed with spina bifida several decades ago. Whereas spina bifida used to be a childhood death sentence, many individuals with spina bifida are living well into adulthood, a tremendous milestone. But there is more we can do.

Funding for spina bifida is low. There is only one entity in the Federal Government studying spina bifida. It is the Spina Bifida Program at the National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities at the CDC.

Americans living with spina bifida deserve the same respect and dignity in life as everyone else. Spina bifida research needs dedicated funding to ensure a better future for Americans with spina bifida.

REMEMBERING PAT CAMPBELL

Mr. HERN. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Pat Campbell, a friend not only to me but to many Oklahomans who listened to him on the radio every morning.

Pat passed away yesterday morning after a long fight with brain cancer. Everyone who knew Pat knows he was a fighter.

Pat got his start on radio largely on accident, because he would call in and debate a liberal radio host. The station was so impressed with his calls that they gave him his own show.

After that, he became a regular guest of Tucker Carlson's on MSNBC and would go on to be a guest commentator on shows like "The O'Reilly Factor" and "Fox and Friends."

Pat had an extraordinary impact on radio, not only in Tulsa but around the Nation. He was a passionate voice for conservative values and a truly great friend.

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5729

I will greatly miss Pat, and I offer my heartfelt condolences to his family and all those who loved him.

RECOGNIZING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH AND LATINA EQUAL PAY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. BOURDEAUX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BOURDEAUX. Madam Speaker, I rise today, October 21, to recognize Latina Equal Pay Day, the day when the pay for Latina women catches up to that of White men from the previous year. Latinas typically earn only 57 cents for every dollar earned by White men.

This disparity harms women, their families, and the communities that depend on their wages for survival. This inequity is why I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act, which would close loopholes in the Equal Pay Act in an effort to break the patterns of pay discrimination and strengthen workforce protections for women, especially women of color.

I would also like to take this time on Latina Equal Pay Day to acknowledge the recent conclusion of Hispanic Heritage Month and to recognize and celebrate the many contributions, diverse cultures, and extensive histories of the American Hispanic community and the over 60 million Americans who identify as Hispanic or Latino.

I am proud to represent one of the most diverse districts in the United States and the more than 170,000 Hispanic Americans who call Georgia's Seventh District home.

One of my most significant legislative accomplishments was borne out of conversations with Tony Rodriguez, CEO and president of the Aurora Theater in Lawrenceville. My conversations with him encouraged me to introduce the Paycheck Protection Program Extension Act, which extended the deadline to apply for forgivable PPP loans from March 31 to May 31 and gave small businesses more time to access this critical assistance.

I would also like to recognize Antonio Molina, chair of the board of Georgia's Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, for his hard work ensuring Hispanic small business owners have the resources they need to be successful.

I also recognize Santiago Marquez, the executive director of the Latin American Association, which provides a critical safety net service for so many in the Seventh District.

I would also like to thank two Hispanic members of the Cabinet: Secretary of Health and Human Services Xavier Becerra and SBA Administrator Isabel Guzman, who visited Georgia's Seventh District this year. It was an honor to host each of them and introduce them to the wonderful place we call home.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge my chief of staff, Estefania "Stefy"

Rodriguez, for her work leading my staff to serve the great people of the Seventh District.

As I host and attend events across my district, I am struck by the vibrancy of the Hispanic communities.

Recently, I visited with the Latino Lions Club of Norcross, the Latin American Association, the Hispanic Health Coalition of Georgia, and Latino Community Services to discuss how we can work together to address the issues that matter most to our community.

We all benefit from the contributions Hispanic Americans have made and will continue to make. The inclusion of their voices and values in our community make my district and the United States so much stronger.

They are the scientists, doctors, nurses, and essential workers who have helped us get through the COVID-19 pandemic; the teachers who educate the next generation of Americans; the artists who grace our television screens and our stages; the small business owners who drive our economy; and the many Hispanic elected officials, some who walk these very halls, who work every day to make a positive difference for our community.

I am a proud cosponsor of critical legislation, such as H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act, and H.R. 1603, the Farm Workforce Modernization Act, which extends the American Dream to millions of people who already call this great Nation home.

Today, on Latina Equal Pay Day, and following the conclusion of Hispanic Heritage Month, I reaffirm my commitment to always work to support and strengthen our vibrant Hispanic communities.

HORRIFIC EVENT ON SEPTA TRAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I am here today to talk about something that apparently the person whose representative serves in this Congress refuses to talk about, and that is the horrific events that occurred last Wednesday on a SEPTA train.

"SEPTA" stands for Southeast Public Transit Authority. It is the transit system that runs around Philadelphia.

Now, I don't know whether folks in the House know it, but for nearly 40 minutes, a woman on the train was harassed and groped before an illegal alien forcibly ripped off her clothes and raped her right there on the train, while up to 10 riders watched without intervening. They didn't even bother to call the police.

Imagine this. It actually gets worse. This hellacious experience continued as the train passed 20 train stations. Instead of taking action, other passengers watched and some actually are reported to have filmed the attack.

It actually gets worse. The perpetrator of this horrific crime is here in

our country illegally. Despite previous convictions of sexual abuse and drug crimes, he is another one that was released from immigration detention rather than being deported.

Now, the severe emotional and physical trauma experienced by the victim could and should have been prevented by our elected officials, who often advocate for open borders and defunding the police. They have failed her, they have failed us, and they have created an environment where she was victimized in front of others by a man who should have been deported years ago.

While the man should have been deported years ago, the man should not have been in our country in the first place. We have laws for these things, and we should enforce those laws so that this lady could live safely in her American city.

This horrific crime raises questions and concerns about where we are as a Nation and how we got here.

When my colleagues on the other side of the aisle decide they want to speak on this floor and attack law enforcement and denigrate our immigration officials, like the ones that were down at the border on horseback trying to enforce the laws that are passed in this very Chamber, and they actively seek to release dangerous criminals into society, I wish they would realize that there are real human victims of their reckless, irresponsible, and absolutely dangerous policies and rhetoric.

I hope the majority keeps this in mind as they continue to work on their \$3.5 trillion spending bill that promises amnesty to dangerous criminals and puts Americans citizens in danger. That is what it does; Amnesty, letting criminals stay here without consequence, without accountability.

But there is accountability for this poor lady, I guarantee you that.

Open borders, abolish ICE, no bail, and defund the police are not merely harmless catchphrases that Big-Government, socialist politicians can spew without consequence. That rhetoric results in horrific crimes against citizens that are someone's constituent, someone who took an oath to the Constitution to defend this country and the citizens of this country. They are someone's family member. This was someone's daughter, someone's little girl.

I want to commend the off-duty SEPTA employee for having the courage to step up and do the right thing, calling the police and ending the most horrific event of this young woman's life.

I also want to thank the SEPTA police officer—law enforcement. Yes, I want to thank law enforcement who intervened and brought this nightmare to an end.

But I do want to take a moment and ask my colleagues: How much more must we endure?

There are so many others, so many other victims, from this side of the country to the other side: Kate Stienle

in California, killed by an illegal alien; Derek Kichline in Pennsylvania, far from the border, killed by the head of the Latin Kings in town; Mollie Tibbetts, in the heartland of the country, killed by an illegal alien. Read the story about Nilsa Padilla, whose three little girls watched an illegal alien beat her to death, chop up her body, dispose of it, and then went on to kill their youngest sister, a little toddler. Then he left the country and was never brought to justice, as far as we know.

How much longer? How many more? We have seen record numbers this year alone at the border of illegal aliens coming into our country and imperiling and endangering our citizens. It is our job. We take an oath to defend them. I think you get the point, Madam Speaker.

□ 1015

HONORING THE SACRIFICES OF JOHN EADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a great American soldier, Staff Sergeant John Eade, a native son of Toledo, Ohio, of whom our citizenry is very proud and eternally grateful.

As our Nation approaches Veterans Day 2021, I enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the poignant story to honor John and his treasured colleagues for their superhuman valor. They are all heroes.

John, as a highly wounded Vietnam veteran, persevered and led a distinguished life as an architect and chief of the city of Boston's inspection division.

Our Nation must revere his lifelong valor in the face of overwhelming odds, terrible slaughter, and wounds endured from the deadliest single-day battle in the Vietnam war.

Sergeant Eade is held in the highest esteem by everyone who knows him. He is a trusted confidant, a faithful friend, a true patriot, and a very humble Purple Heart recipient. He would not seek that recognition for himself but would be thinking only of his comrades.

In November 1965, John was deployed to Vietnam as a fire team leader in the ill-fated 2nd Platoon, Alpha Company, 2nd Battalion, 7th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division.

On November 14, he and his team were sent as reinforcements to the Battle at Landing Zone X-Ray in the Ia Drang Valley made famous by the movie "We Were Soldiers."

On the morning of November 17, Sergeant Eade and his small team were marching to Landing Zone Albany. Only minutes after arriving, two much larger North Vietnamese regiments ambushed his unit.

As the North Vietnamese swarmed them through the trees, John's platoon was pinned down in ferocious hand-to-hand combat.

Sergeant Eade quickly rallied three of the only remaining soldiers able to fight: Wilbert Johnson, Barry Burnite, and Oscar Barker, Jr. Together, they fought valiantly to hold their position against the attacking Vietnamese.

Their plight was unfortunately short-lived. Burnite was struck in the chest by shrapnel, and Johnson pulled him to a position of cover to save him. The two men fought until Burnite died and Johnson was killed.

As the fighting continued, John was shot multiple times and sprayed with shrapnel. Barker tended to John's wounds. The rest of the platoon had already been killed. John urged Barker to leave him and retreat, but Barker refused. Moments later, Barker was killed.

Soon after, a napalm strike was dropped on John's position, leaving him severely burned. Weak, but still alive, John managed to roll in the dirt and extinguish the flames that had engulfed him, yet he continued his efforts to hold his position.

That afternoon, John was surprised by enemy soldiers, shot in the face, and knocked unconscious.

Despite the overwhelming odds and the horrific life-threatening wounds he had received, John refused to withdraw and continued exposing himself to the onslaught through the night, including throwing grenades with his remaining good arm. When dawn came, he was grievously wounded but remained alive.

Three days later, he was discovered by a recovery unit and awarded the Purple Heart for his massive sacrifice for our Nation. I believe to my core John and several of the men in his platoon have not been appropriately recognized for their valor.

It is for this reason I and my colleagues have nominated him for the Distinguished Service Cross.

John is now 78. He has lived with severe injuries sustained in battle that impacted him throughout his life and are impacting him now.

His reflections on life as a soldier and an American hero remain largely personal, but his valor endures. He is a soldier still, as he is now scaling another battle related to his wartime service.

He is handling this with such dignity, resolve, and even good humor. One can observe the raw courage that those of us who know him have witnessed through his life.

John, what a truly great soldier you are in the military and in life. America salutes you for your unyielding valor and for your deep patriotism.

No matter the challenge, you and your life are the very definition of courage. May God bless you and your fallen comrades, for surely you have blessed America.

RECOGNIZING FLETC PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY CEREMONY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers' Peace Officers Memorial Day Ceremony.

Each year, the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers engrave the names of graduates who made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty during the previous year.

This ceremony commemorates another year that has been distinguished by extraordinary law enforcement achievements but, unfortunately, has been marred by tragedy and personal loss.

We must always remember those who have made the ultimate sacrifice while protecting and serving our community.

Sadly, a total of 263 FLETC graduates have paid the ultimate sacrifice since 1970. Tragically, we have had to add another 22 names for last year alone.

Behind each and every one of these names there is a son, a daughter, a husband, a mother, or a relative who misses their loved one.

To all of our police officers and Federal law enforcement officials, thank you for your service to our communities and God bless you.

I hope that my colleagues will take some time to thank these courageous individuals who work to keep us all safe.

REMEMBERING AND HONORING ANN ERNST

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to remember and honor Ann Ernst of Savannah, Georgia, who sadly passed away on October 5 at the age of 93.

Ann attended Chatham County public schools and Armstrong Junior College and graduated from Valdosta State University with a degree in biology. Following graduation, she worked at a research lab studying malaria transmission and control.

Throughout her life, she was involved in teaching and inspiring the Savannah community. She served as curriculum director at Hancock Day School and taught children with learning disabilities at the Royce Learning Center.

Cherished by the Savannah community for her contagious laughter and love of life, Ann's immense impact was felt by everyone she knew.

I am thankful for Ann's lifetime of service, and I know her legacy will be forever treasured.

My thoughts and prayers are with her family, friends, and all who knew her during this most difficult time.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL PHARMACY WEEK

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize this week as National Pharmacy Week.

Today we honor pharmacists and technicians across the Nation. During

this week, I would like to recognize all pharmacists across the United States who ensure that Americans have access to important and often lifesaving medications.

Every day pharmacists are directly involved in patient care, and pharmacists are the most accessible healthcare professionals in the country. Ninety-five percent of Americans live within five miles of a pharmacy.

From administering flu shots to COVID-19 vaccines, pharmacists are a vital resource in our communities, and they will continue to play an active role in combating the virus. Because of their hard work, lives will be saved.

Madam Speaker, I encourage everyone to get to know their pharmacists and to thank them for the work that they do.

As a pharmacist currently serving in Congress, I thank all pharmacists around the world. We can look forward to a brighter future because of them.

REMEMBERING AND HONORING DR. JAMES POLK
"JAY" BRINSON, III

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor former Wayne County superintendent, principal, and coach, Dr. Jay Brinson, who sadly passed away at the age of 51.

Jay was proud to be a graduate of the Wayne County School System and was a devoted Yellow Jacket throughout his life.

After graduating from Wayne County High School in 1988, he would return to the school for a 29-year career. During this time, he was a coach, a teacher, and an administrator with a personal mission to give back to a community that he believed invested so much in him.

He retired as superintendent of Wayne County schools in March, leaving a lasting impact on his students.

Above all, Jay was a man of dignity who led by example.

I am thankful for Jay's service to Georgia's First Congressional District, and I know his legacy will remain.

My thoughts and prayers are with his family, friends, and all who knew him during this most difficult time.

CONGRATULATING CHIEF BRYAN REYES ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the career of Palm Springs Police Chief Bryan Reyes, who retired after nearly 30 years of service to our communities.

A veteran of the United States Marine Corps, Chief Reyes began his career in law enforcement as a reserve police officer for the Compton Police Department in 1991.

After transferring to the Palm Springs Police Department in 1993, he rose through the ranks, serving as an officer, detective, sergeant, lieutenant, and captain before ultimately becoming police chief.

Chief Reyes has had a lasting impact on the Palm Springs community and has led the department through difficult times.

On October 8, 2016, during the first year of his tenure as chief of police, Palm Springs Police Officers Lesley Zerebny and Gilbert Vega were tragically killed in the line of duty.

Chief Reyes recognized the devastating impact this would have on the department, community, and the officers' families. In this difficult time, he prioritized the mental health needs of those affected, and his guidance brought us all closer together.

I am honored to have collaborated with Chief Reyes in authoring legislation to commemorate the tremendous sacrifice made by Officers Zerebny and Vega that day. Named in their honor and inspired by our local police officers at the Palm Springs Police Department, the Heroes Lesley Zerebny and Gilbert Vega First Responders Survivors Support Act would get families of our fallen heroes the support they need and ensure they have every opportunity to succeed in life.

During his more than 6 years of leadership, Chief Reyes strengthened the department's community policing in neighborhoods and expanded engagement with residents and community organizations.

Further, he has received numerous accolades for his incredible leadership, including lifesaving medals, the officer of the year award, and the community heroes award.

Chief Reyes' 28 years of tireless and dedicated work for the Palm Springs community is a testament to his outstanding leadership, character, and commitment to the well-being of Palm Springs residents.

I have no doubt that changes brought about under his leadership will continue to improve the lives of Palm Springs police officers and the entire Palm Springs community.

On behalf of the great people of California's 36th Congressional District, thank you, Chief Bryan Reyes, for all you have done for our community. Congratulations on your well-deserved retirement.

EXTRADITION OF ALEX SAAB

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SALAZAR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, for those who enable murderous dictators, the United States system will find you in this life or the next, and this is the perfect example.

For Alex Saab, the plunderer of Venezuela, justice for his crimes against humanity will be swift and without mercy.

Why? Because over the weekend we learned that Saab will finally be extradited to the United States.

He tried to claim diplomatic immunity, but he is not a diplomat. He is not a politician. He is just another thug for the Venezuelan regime.

Saab was Maduro's leading front man and his number one money launderer. He is a drug trafficker who is responsible for flooding American streets with cocaine. He helped finance the worst crimes and the most appalling human rights abuses committed by the Maduro regime in Venezuela in the last 15 years.

So it is no surprise that Maduro, the dictator, has pulled out all the stops to try to prevent his extradition to the United States, but he could not.

In the meantime, earlier this week, six American executives, American executives in Venezuela, known as the Citgo 6, were sent back to a cruel political prison for no reason.

The regime arrested these men on bogus charges in 2020 with no justification. Now, with no explanation, Maduro has condemned these innocent American executives to rot in a Venezuelan prison.

Why? Just one reason: retaliation because Maduro doesn't like this picture.

This is a classic tactic of tyrants. If Maduro thinks that he can make a prisoner exchange, he needs to wake up and realize that the United States does not deal with dictators. So the Citgo 6, six American executives, need to be released now, unconditionally.

Unfortunately, Maduro right now is panicking because his top confidant will soon be facing trial in an American court of law, and he will say many things that Maduro doesn't want us to hear.

Today, the victims of the Maduro regime in Venezuela will finally have some justice, but we, as a Nation, cannot stop until Venezuela is free of this satanic nightmare called the Maduro regime.

□ 1030

RECOGNIZING LIBERTY UNIVERSITY'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of Liberty University in Lynchburg, Virginia.

Originally founded by Dr. Jerry Falwell, Sr. as Lynchburg Baptist College in 1971, its first classes were held that September for its 154 students.

Over the years, the college has grown and transformed in many ways, but has always remained a Christian academic community practicing the traditions of evangelical institutions of higher education.

The school was renamed Liberty Baptist College in 1975 and became Liberty University in 1985.

Now, Liberty University is one of the largest private nonprofit universities in the Nation and the largest university in Virginia, boasting more than 95,000 total undergraduate and postgraduate students, both in person and online.

As of 2021, Liberty has more than 250,000 alumni making an impact in their respective fields and in their communities.

I congratulate Liberty University and president Jerry Prevo on this milestone and wish the institution another 50 years of success in fulfilling its mission to develop Christ-centered men and women and instill in them the values, knowledge, and skills needed to impact the world.

PROTECTING CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, as ranking member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, one of my top priorities is protecting the constitutional rights of our veterans.

Today, I want to raise awareness of a policy that strips law-abiding veterans of their Second Amendment rights; specifically, the policy that requires VA to report veterans who need help managing their VA benefits to the NICS program, thereby making it illegal for them to possess firearms.

To illustrate this practice, I would like to tell you a story about a hypothetical veteran named Joe.

Joe likes to go on hunting trips with his fellow veterans.

These trips are therapeutic for Joe. They give him stress relief and a fun hobby and an opportunity to connect with other veterans.

Unfortunately, Joe begins to suffer from headaches and memory loss, which he believes is linked to an in-service blast injury.

He files a claim for VA disability compensation benefits.

During the claims process, the VA learns that Joe struggles to pay his bills on time because of this traumatic brain injury.

This triggers the VA's requirement to determine if Joe is capable of managing his own VA benefits.

Ultimately, VA decides that Joe requires assistance handling his VA compensation payments.

The VA appoints a fiduciary to receive and manage Joe's VA benefits on his behalf.

As a result of the VA's appointment of a fiduciary, VA must—not by law, but by administrative rule—report Joe to the FBI NICS list.

And just like that, without evidence that Joe is a danger to himself or others, without involving a judge to ensure that Joe's legal rights are protected, without the opportunity for Joe to present his case in court on why he should be able to possess a firearm, Joe loses his Second Amendment rights.

That means that Joe can no longer go on hunting trips with his friends or family.

He can no longer own the hunting rifle his grandfather gave him.

And when Joe's friends learn about it and have learned what happened to

him, they decide that they would rather go without their VA benefits and services, instead of risking the same thing happening to them.

That story may be fictional, but some version of it happens across this United States all the time.

The truth is that some veterans forego seeking VA services out of concern that they would lose their constitutional rights; not because there are laws in place, but there is an administrative rule in place.

According to the VA's regulations, the purpose of the fiduciary program is to protect certain VA beneficiaries who cannot manage their VA benefits.

Clearly, the program was never intended to review someone's right to own a firearm.

A decision on a constitutional right should be left to a judicial authority, plain and simple.

Now, my bill, H.R. 1217, the Veterans 2nd Amendment Protection Act, would make sure that it is.

H.R. 1217 would prevent VA from reporting veterans to the NICS list, unless there is an order from a judge or magistrate that says the veteran may be a harm to himself or herself or others.

This bill allows VA to focus on its mission of caring for veterans, and leaves decisions about whether to strip a veteran of their constitutional rights to the judicial branch as it is supposed to be and it is for any other person who is not a veteran.

If a court finds that that veteran is a danger to themselves or others, then they should not be allowed to own a firearm.

However, it is time we end this policy that the VA has put in place, and we should make sure that we change this, we correct this problem for veterans that are discouraged from seeking help from the VA because of this rule.

We must make this change. If you want to ensure that veterans who need VA are willing to walk through VA's doors, that is how we do it. We make sure that they know their rights are protected.

I urge swift passage of H.R. 1217.

WASTEFUL SPENDING IS NOT WHAT THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY NEEDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, Democrats are determined to pass their massive socialist tax and spending bill that will turn the American Dream into a socialist nightmare.

Democrats are proposing the largest tax increase in most of our lifetimes. Their \$5.5 trillion plan—Senator BERNIE SANDERS' socialist spending plan—is the largest spending bill in our history and will take Americans out of the frying pan and into the fire.

We need targeted infrastructure improvements, but instead, this style of

cradle-to-grave Big Government gives Washington bureaucrats control over our personal and family decisions.

This spending bill promises to stretch the social safety net to every American household regardless of need. It promises extreme climate change proposals like \$3 billion for tree equity and \$12 billion for electric cars.

It promises subsidized government daycare, taxpayer-funded free college classes for illegal immigrants, universal pre-K, and new funding for gender identity issues and bias training.

The Biden administration is actively trying to gaslight the American people by claiming that this spending package will cost nothing.

Just this morning I heard the President emphasizing a single statement three times that the cost of this plan would be zero. This is an outright lie.

It will be America's middle-class families that foot the bill for Democrats' multitrillion-dollar giveaway through crippling tax increases. This massive package will not deliver opportunity or economic relief, instead it leaves rural America behind and will accelerate inflation, discourage work, and empower Washington bureaucrats.

More wasteful spending is not what our economy needs. It has already contributed to the harmful inflation that Americans across the board are experiencing. Today, inflation is more than 5 percent, the highest it has been in 30 years, more than half of my lifetime and more than the lifetimes of many Americans. Wholesale prices have risen at the fastest pace on record.

Americans do not want a government that defines them. Rather, Americans want to be able to define their own government.

We can meet our country's funding needs without jeopardizing our economic recovery and saddling future generations with more debt.

I ran for Congress because I am worried about the country that we are going to leave to my sons, Guy and Sam, and to the children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren of every American. I cannot in good conscience support a proposal that will mortgage their future, that will imperil their freedom and liberty.

But Democrats are bent on spending massively to enact their radical far-left socialist policies that will change our economy, change our Nation, and change our fiscal future for the worse.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY IS IN TROUBLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today because our economy is in trouble. We are headed in the wrong direction. We must reverse course.

My constituents are paying more today than they were a year ago for basic goods like milk, gas, and bread.

In fact, the national average price for a gallon of gas recently reached \$3.36, more than \$1 higher than it was a year ago and the highest price since October of 2014.

It was also recently announced that core inflation is at a 30-year high.

Inflation has gone up every month since President Biden has been in office.

Inflation is an invisible tax on all Americans, and it especially hurts seniors living on a fixed income.

Out-of-control government spending fuels inflation.

Some of my colleagues seem to believe more spending is the answer.

They have proposed a \$4.3 trillion spending plan coupled with a \$1.5 trillion infrastructure package, both of which are filled with pork, unfortunately.

For example, the spending bill contains billions for job training in climate careers to create a Civilian Climate Corps to promote the Green New Deal; to develop environmental justice initiatives; for housing grants to felons convicted of domestic violence or hate crimes; to benefit, again, 10 million illegal immigrants; and \$200 million for a park in San Francisco.

While I do believe we need to invest in traditional infrastructures such as roads, bridges, internet connectivity, and cybersecurity, only a very small percentage of the proposed infrastructure package funds these types of essential projects, which is wrong. We must spend more on traditional infrastructure and get rid of the perks.

These spending packages would raise taxes on every American, not just the rich.

They will kill American jobs and make us less competitive in the global marketplace.

In the end, it is more frivolous Washington spending, which is the absolute wrong approach, in my opinion, to fixing our economic woes.

It will only make matters worse, Madam Speaker.

Small business owners, who are the backbone of our economy, are having a very difficult time recovering from the pandemic, as you know. Not only are they dealing with the same inflationary pressures that all Americans are experiencing, but they are also facing labor and material shortages.

As we head into the holiday season, consumer demand will only continue to rise.

The supply chain bottlenecks must be resolved immediately to prevent further damage to our economy.

Instead of working together to find common ground and areas about which we can build consensus—that is how we govern—my colleagues on the left, though, seem determined to go it alone. That is the wrong approach, Madam Speaker.

They have spent weeks publicly arguing amongst themselves about how

many trillions of American taxpayer dollars they should spend without any concern to what this out-of-control spending will do to our already struggling economy.

Simply put, this is not how we grow the economy. This is how we grow inflation.

In order to restore our way of life and renew the American Dream, we must implement Trump-era economic policies that yielded unprecedented economic growth, the lowest unemployment levels for minorities in the history of the United States, energy independence—that is what we need—and the highest rise in middle-class wages in decades.

The destructive economic policies of those on the left must be defeated.

□ 1045

HONORING COACH DOUG SMITH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the leadership and perseverance of Appomattox County High School coach, Doug Smith.

Doug Smith has led the Appomattox Raiders football team since 2012. Under his leadership, the team has boasted a 32-game winning streak, and won State championship titles in 2015, 2016, and 2017. While Coach Smith's record is amazing, his leadership extends well beyond the field.

Coach Smith has truly united the community behind their team, as evidenced by the large groups on Friday nights. One cannot visit Appomattox County without seeing the impact Coach Smith has made on his students, his coworkers, and the community at large.

Modeling by example, he has taught his student athletes to be productive citizens, such as when the team famously came out in full force to help those affected by the devastating tornado that hit Appomattox in 2016.

However, Coach Smith is best known for his relationship with Jesus Christ, his eternal perspective, and his focus on those things that matter more than football. This has been most clearly displayed since the fall of 2020, as Coach Smith has faced a great personal challenge of his own with a diagnosis of multiple myeloma, a cancer of the plasma cells.

He has been a tremendous testimony through this journey. Thankfully, it appears that the Lord has him on the road to recovery. My continued prayers are with Coach Smith as he continues to fight this terrible disease.

I thank Coach Smith for his commitment to service and leadership. Coach Smith is an inspiration to us all about the importance of serving others, even through personal challenges.

COMMEMORATING SAILORS AND MARINES
ABOARD USS "FORRESTAL" ON JULY 29, 1967

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise to remember and express grat-

itude to the brave sailors and marines who were wounded or lost their lives fighting the catastrophic fire aboard the ship, the USS *Forrestal*.

July 29, 2021, marked the 54th anniversary of one of the most tragic fires in U.S. naval history. On July 29, 1967, the USS *Forrestal*, which was supporting combat operations off the coast of Vietnam, was impacted by an accidental rocket that ignited a fire and triggered several bomb explosions on the flight deck.

Sailors and marines on board, including several Virginians, bravely fought the fire for 18 hours. Despite the courageous efforts of the crew, 134 men died, 161 were wounded, and 21 aircraft were destroyed. Sadly, veterans wounded that day are still fighting their claims with the VA, such as my constituent, Mr. David Cephas Smith, of Vinton, Virginia. These heroes were not awarded the Purple Heart because their wounds did not occur during enemy combat, but their bravery still merits recognition.

We are forever grateful for the service of veterans, like Mr. Smith, who were wounded or sacrificed their lives battling this fire aboard the USS *Forrestal*.

PROTECTING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, in my home State of Pennsylvania, a woman was brutally raped by an illegal immigrant.

In Congress, one of our primary duties is to protect the American people. By allowing illegal immigrants who have committed crimes to remain within our borders signifies that we are failing. Allowing an illegal immigrant who has committed acts of sexual violence to remain in our country shows that we are failing.

Congress must move immediately to pass legislation ensuring that any immigrant who commits acts of violence is deported. What happened in Philadelphia this week was a failure of American leadership. It showed clearly that the Biden crime crisis is escalating.

Now, as apprehensions at our southern border hit record highs, President Biden is taking away the vital resources that our Border Patrol agents need to do their job. The answer to stopping our border crisis and our crime crisis is not to defund the police. The answer is not to be more lenient on illegal immigrants who have committed violent crimes against Americans.

We must put the safety of the American citizens first, and we must put the security of the American citizens first.

CELEBRATING CLARKE COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL INDIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the recent success of a high school football team in Iowa's Second District. For the first time in 31 years, the Clarke Community High School Indians are headed to the playoffs. The team finished the regular season with a 5-and-3 record, which is also a first in 31 years.

Although their season had plenty of ups and downs, the team persevered and worked hard to make their community proud. They will be traveling up to Williamsburg, Iowa, tomorrow, October 22, to take on the Raiders in the first round of the playoffs. I am confident that Clarke will make the Second District proud.

Congratulations to Coach Quinlan and his staff, and all the players, and the entire Clarke County community on their success, and good luck tomorrow night.

SAVE OUR SERVICEMEMBERS

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue that has become a national crisis and that must be immediately addressed. Serving in the Army for 24 years as both a nurse and a physician, from the Vietnam era to the first Gulf War, I have seen many of my fellow veterans suffer from anxiety, depression, survivor's guilt, and PTSD. Many veterans are still living with those scars, and without proper care and treatment, mental health crises can make everyday life a struggle or even life-threatening for them or their families.

Yesterday, I partnered with my fellow veterans, Congressman RUBEN GALLEGO, a corporal in the Marine Corps, Senator JONI ERNST, a fellow veteran and a fellow Army lieutenant colonel, and Senator MARK KELLY, a captain in the Navy, to introduce the Save Our Servicemembers Act.

This bipartisan and bicameral legislation would direct the Pentagon to evaluate the effectiveness of their suicide prevention efforts and to improve its data collection, reduce bureaucratic duplication, and strengthen collaboration between its offices.

I am heartbroken at the continued rise in suicides in the veteran community and our military communities. It is no secret that our servicemembers often face invisible challenges when they return to civilian life, and we need to do a better job addressing their needs and the needs of their families.

We need to look into all of our mental health and suicide prevention programs to better service our heroes, and I am proud to partner with an incredible group of veterans in Congress on this legislation.

To our servicemembers and our veterans, I want you to know that you are

not alone and there are people who care and are trained to help you in any mental health crisis you might face.

I encourage everyone to check in on your family and your friends because sometimes the deepest wounds are the ones that we cannot see.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF STATE TROOPER TED BENDA

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tragic loss of one of Iowa's heroes.

Yesterday, October 20, Iowa State Trooper Ted Benda passed away from injuries sustained during a crash while responding to a call for help to detain a wanted suspect in Clayton County.

Over his 16-year public safety career, Trooper Benda served with honor and courage each and every day. Trooper Benda began his public safety career with the Iowa Division of Criminal Investigation in 2005. He later moved to the Special Enforcement Operations Bureau, and finally, to the Iowa State Patrol, admirably serving communities in Northeast Iowa.

It is days like this when we are reminded of the sacrifices so many of our law enforcement officers make every day. I am proud to say that I was always ready to support them and do whatever I could in Congress to ensure that they are properly funded, trained, and equipped. Trooper Benda was a hero, not just in his community, but to all of Iowa. His years of dedication and service will never be forgotten.

My thoughts and prayers are with Trooper Benda's wife, Holly, their four young children, all of his loved ones, and the entire Iowa State Patrol family.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Lord, our God, bless this day. Give favor to our labor and consecrate our whole selves to Your gracious plan. Be pleased to use us as instruments of Your will.

Use our hands, that they would reach out at the impulse of Your love; our feet that they would be swift and sure to follow Your direction.

Use our voices that we would magnify Your message of mercy and our

words that they would bear the fruit of love, joy, peace, forbearance, kindness, goodness, and faithfulness.

Take our wills and our hearts and make them Yours. May we not hold back the spiritual gifts with which You have graced us that You would reveal Yourself through our efforts.

All that we are, all that we aim to do, all that we hope to be, we owe to You. We give You our moments, our days, our very lives, in gratitude and in faithfulness to You. And may we prove worthy of Your faith in us.

In Your gracious name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BROWNLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF DICK GRIFFIN

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Dick Griffin, a towering figure in Buffalo's legal community and one of our leading citizens.

Dick worked to make Buffalo a more just place as a champion of the civil rights movement in the courtroom and as a trusted adviser to national and local civil rights leaders.

An attorney for 64 years, he was admired and respected widely for his talent, capability, and legal mind, so much so that later in his career, he was called upon to arbitrate some of the toughest regional legal issues, including that of compensation for the victims of the tragedy of Flight 3407.

He cared deeply about his community and played an active role in civic and philanthropic efforts to improve parks, public spaces, and whole neighborhoods.

We mourn the loss of Dick Griffin today and extend our condolences to his wife and my friend, Dr. Jane Griffin, and their children Mary, Anne, Thomas, and Richard.

HOLDING PRESIDENT BIDEN ACCOUNTABLE FOR RISING PRICES

(Mr. EMMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a crisis hurting every household in America: skyrocketing prices.

If you listen to the Biden administration, they will tell you that this is a “high-class problem.” This is a lie propagated by those who have never had to do the mental math at the grocery store to make sure the amount in their cart does not exceed the cash in their wallet.

For Democrat leaders, paying 42 percent more at the pump isn’t a problem. I suppose the price of gas isn’t a concern if you are riding government-funded high-speed rail in Silicon Valley.

More than 90 percent of my constituents reported that rising prices are impacting their household budgets. Inflation is destroying Americans’ ability to save for retirement, buy a home, or build wealth. This isn’t a tax on the rich. It is an enormous burden for working Americans.

It is not too late to change course. I have introduced legislation to increase the transparency in government spending so that lawmakers will be forced to answer for reckless spending sprees. Moreover, my Retirement Inflation Protection Act will protect Americans from inflation-driven tax burdens right when they enter retirement.

This crisis is already hitting home for millions of Americans. We must act before it financially cripples generations of Americans to come.

WHEN WOMEN SUCCEED, AMERICA SUCCEEDS

(Ms. BROWNLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY. Mr. Speaker, we all know that we do not have economic policies that set women up for success.

The pandemic has put a cruel spotlight on these challenges. In fact, one out of four women has been pushed out of the workforce because the care economy collapsed.

We have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to change this paradigm, while supporting a tenuous economic recovery, by making transformative investments in America’s working women.

The Build Back Better agenda invests in childcare, paid family leave, home-based care, universal pre-K, and the child tax credit.

There is no doubt that the Build Back Better agenda sets up women and their families for short-term and long-term success.

And we all know that when women and their families succeed, America succeeds.

STAND UP FOR SCIENCE

(Mr. VALADAO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, this month the current administration made the reckless and undeniably partisan decision to begin reconsultation of the 2019 biological opinions.

In its place, the proposed interim operations plan represents a huge step backward in California’s effort to protect, restore, and enhance the delta ecosystem and provide reliable water supplies.

The 2019 BiOps were built on years of research, comprehensive peer reviews, and the best available science. They advise the most efficient use of water resources while continuing to protect at-risk species.

These BiOps also allow for greater water availability for the Central Valley farmers that feed the world. Questioning these expert findings is antiscience.

I led the entire Republican California delegation in expressing our grave concern to the Secretaries of the Interior and Commerce.

As the California drought worsens, communities in my district face water shortages and farmers are unable to maintain their crops.

I implore my colleagues and this administration to stand up for these suffering families and farmers, stand up for science, and reject this outrageous decision.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize National Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Sadly, domestic violence has plagued our families and communities in the Nation for far too long.

Each year, one in three women and one in four men in the United States experience domestic violence.

My hometown of Fresno has, sadly, one of the highest rates in California of verified domestic violence calls to the police department.

We cannot ignore these staggering statistics, and we must do more to address this crisis. This year, Congress passed the Violence Against Women Act and the Victims of Crime Act, or VOCA, fix, to prevent violence and expand victim services to our communities.

These bills would help organizations working tirelessly to uplift survivors, including the Marjaree Mason Center, the Centro La Familia, and the Valley Crisis Center in my district.

This week, the House also will be voting on the Family Violence Prevention and Services Improvement Act of 2021, of which I am a cosponsor. This

bill aims to improve services for victims of domestic, dating, and family violence, and we need to invest more.

I urge my colleagues to join me in advancing these efforts to end domestic violence. As chair and cofounder of the Congressional Crime Survivors and Justice Caucus, it ought to be our priority to benefit those survivors and provide them the resources they deserve.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TOM CAVANAGH

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Tom Cavanagh of Springfield, Illinois, who passed away this past weekend.

Tom had decades-long service to Springfield and to Sangamon County. Tom was known as a loyal friend and a consistent advocate for taxpayers. Tom spent three decades in public service, serving four terms as Sangamon County treasurer and also county auditor, as Capital Township supervisor of assessments, and on the Springfield Park District board of trustees.

Tom’s years of dedicated service in support of Springfield and Sangamon County culminated in his recognition as the Illinois County Official of the Year in 2018, when he was serving as treasurer.

Everyone who had the pleasure of knowing Tom knew him for his great sense of humor and commitment to the community he served. Tom always had a knack for finding a way to provide better services at a lower cost for Sangamon and Springfield residents.

Tom will be missed by our Springfield community, but his legacy will carry on through the work he did to better Sangamon County.

As central Illinois continues to mourn Tom’s loss, my thoughts and prayers remain with his family and loved ones.

FORD IS COMING TO WEST TENNESSEE

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, Ford Motor Company recently announced it is going to place a facility to construct electric trucks at the Memphis megasite in west Tennessee. This site is 50 miles from Memphis and has been developed for the purpose of industrial opportunities for people in west Tennessee who need it well, and it affects Memphis.

We are happy and proud that Ford picked this site for these jobs and for this important environmental effort to have electric batteries for vehicles and electric trucks. We think Ford will be a great representative in Memphis. They have been a good representative in Louisville.

As the Speaker well knows, Louisville shouldn't get everything. Memphis deserves something, too. I appreciate Ford coming to Memphis.

RACE TO GREEN IS TAX ON WORKING FAMILIES

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the cost of everything is spiking, from gas to groceries.

One of the main reasons for these spikes is that energy costs are soaring. Affordable, reliable energy fuels our economy and our daily lives.

But some of my colleagues don't like the affordable, reliable energy that has built our economy and lifted billions of men, women, and children around the world out of poverty. Why? Because this energy has been provided by fossil fuels and nuclear power, energy sources vilified by many wealthy elites and the activist class, those least impacted by these high prices.

Make no mistake, when pipelines are blocked, new leasing on Federal lands is stopped, and mines are forced to close, working families pay the price.

This rush to green is a tax on working families, the middle class, because a larger part of their paychecks is consumed by these increasing prices on items necessary for daily life.

The American people should know, this race to green is not really about carbon. It is about control.

GOD BLESS U.S. BORDER PATROL

(Ms. HERRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HERRELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to rise in support of the brave men and women of the U.S. Border Patrol. I believe our agents need to know how grateful we are for their service to the United States of America.

No doubt they have rewarding careers, but these days it has become a thankless job. Sadly, the media often ignores the role our agents play in humanitarian efforts along our borders. They save lives and rescue women and children who are being trafficked and abused.

U.S. Border Patrol agents are some of the most amazing people I have ever met. Every day they risk their lives during confrontations with cartels, coyotes, drug runners, and criminal gangs, all to keep you and me and the sovereignty of our Nation safe.

It is time we stand in support of these fine men and women, encourage them with prayer, and support them with policies and procedures they need to keep America safe.

God bless each one of our U.S. Customs and Border Patrol agents.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING LEVI LINDEMUTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very special individual from Brockway, Pennsylvania, Levi Lindemuth.

Earlier this year, Levi was watching "Home Alone 2" when he was inspired to do something to help children who are in the hospital. Combining his love of gardening and passion to help others, Levi started Levi's Hope Blossoms.

Levi started selling flowers in his hand-painted pots and cans for a \$5 donation. All the proceeds from Hope Blossoms go to St. Jude hospitals, and so far Levi has made over 100 hope blossoms, raising nearly \$1,000.

Levi's efforts to help St. Jude's stem from a serious complication that required surgery when he was 5 days old. Now a happy and healthy 7-year-old boy, Levi is committed to giving back to children who were once in his position.

Levi sells these colorful planters and can take personal design requests via his Facebook page, Levi's Hope Blossoms.

When asked why he started Hope Blossoms, Levi's answer was simple: "I don't think kids should have to pay to be healthy."

Mr. Speaker, Levi is an inspiration to all of us.

AMERICANS SHOULD NOT EXPECT LESS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, James Freeman of the Wall Street Journal on October 19 wrote an editorial on how Americans should not be complacent living with less, as jobs are destroyed while inflation accelerates:

"Selling the Joe Biden-Bernie Sanders era of scarcity won't be easy. And it's going to get much harder if the President and his legislative coauthor enact their massive new plan to discourage productive labor."

Examining the House version of the plan, economist Casey Mulligan estimates that by reducing the incentives to work, the bill's planned expansions of Federal benefits will cost nine million jobs.

Already, the COVID-era combination of astronomical government spending and money creation has resulted in too many dollars chasing too few goods.

Generations of them, American consumers, built the largest economy in the world and various online commenters have suggested a slogan for Democrats running in 2022: Expect Less.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, who successfully protected America for 20 years, as the global war on terrorism continues moving from Afghanistan to America.

RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

(Mr. PALAZZO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend remarks.)

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce legislation, along with 100 other Members, to recognize the centennial anniversary of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cemetery.

This Sunday, October 24, 2021, marks the 100-year anniversary since the body of one unidentified member of the Armed Forces who died during World War I was selected as the first Unknown Soldier.

Since that date, an unidentified member of the Armed Forces from World War II, the Korean war, and the Vietnam war have been interred into the tomb.

This resolution recognizes the ultimate sacrifice of the unknown soldiers interred at Arlington Cemetery and shows our gratitude and appreciation for all the members of the Armed Forces.

Since the creation of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, members of the 3rd U.S. Infantry Regiment, known as "The Old Guard," have protected this sacred site 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

100 years after the burial of the Unknown Soldier from World War I, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier continues to be a powerful symbol of service and sacrifice, mourning, and memory.

I am proud to introduce a resolution that pays respect to our Armed Forces and honors the 100-year anniversary of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

HONORING DONALD SNYDER

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, in the words of Saint Teresa, "Death is nothing else but going home to God, the bond of love will be unbroken for all eternity."

I rise today with great honor to recognize the extraordinary life of Attorney Donald Snyder of West Winfield, New York, who passed away last month.

Don was a gem of a man and a wonderful servant to our community. Don was also admired by his peers.

I remember Don being a very close friend of my father, the late Honorable Justice John R. Tenney, who always spoke so highly of Don as a person to model your career and your gift of service on.

Don served our Nation in the Army, and he returned home to start a country law practice in little West Winfield, New York, in Herkimer County.

Don was a wonderful servant who served on the board of Herkimer College for over 22 years and the chair for 12.

Don was involved with so many organizations and schools and church organizations, but he was also a very dedicated husband to his wife, Mary Theresa Higgins, and a dedicated father of four and grandfather of 12.

Nine people in Don's family are attorneys. They were all sworn in on the very same day by the U.S. Supreme Court, which made the front page news in our little town. Don was very proud of this.

Don was a man who devoted his life to service, to happiness, and he couldn't have been a kinder person to me and a better friend and mentor for me as an attorney when I first started out many years ago.

I can't express enough my deepest condolences to his family, his friends, and our community. This is truly the loss of a great man. I wish them all the best, and it was an honor to call Don Snyder my friend.

RECOGNIZING THE ASSISTANCE TO FIREFIGHTERS GRANTS PROGRAM ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. MCHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that there are inefficiencies and waste in the Federal Government. Well, I am here to recognize the most efficient grant writing program in the Federal Government: The Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, marking its 20th anniversary.

The AFG program, along with its sister programs SAFER and Fire Prevention Grants, help deliver training, manpower, and desperately needed equipment straight to where they are most needed. Communities across America have benefited from these programs over the past 20 years; all of this with hardly any overhead costs.

It is a well-run program. Why? Well, because it is largely run by the fire service.

Throughout my time in Congress, it has been a true honor to have visited well over 100 fire departments in my district. These are some of my favorite visits. And you see the best of America in these everyday heroes.

On a final note, I thank Chief Jeff Cash, Jason Wofford, and Ryan Cole for teaching my AFG grant classes throughout the years.

I would encourage my colleagues to do likewise to ensure their fire services are well taken care of with the best training and equipment they deserve.

Thank you to the AFG program and to the fire service.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 21, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 21, 2021, at 11:36 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2899.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

RELATING TO THE CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE REPORT 117-152 AND AN ACCOMPANYING RESOLUTION

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 727 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 727

Resolved, That if House Report 117-152 is called up by direction of the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol: (a) all points of order against the report are waived and the report shall be considered as read; and (b)(1) an accompanying resolution offered by direction of the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to a point of order; and (2) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on such resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by Representative Thompson of Mississippi, Representative Cheney of Wyoming, and an opponent, or their respective designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 727. The rule provides for consideration of the resolution accompanying House Report 117-152 under a closed rule if the report is called up by direction of the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol. It provides 1 hour of de-

bate equally divided among and controlled by Chair THOMPSON, Vice Chair CHENEY, and an opponent.

Mr. Speaker, today, we face a fundamental choice: Whether we are going to get to the truth about the violent January 6 attack, the worst assault on the Capitol since the War of 1812 and the worst domestic assault on American democracy since the Civil War, or whether we are going to allow lawful subpoenas to be ignored and the investigation being conducted by the select committee to be obstructed to puff up the ego of the former President, who has launched another frivolous lawsuit, this time against the select committee.

I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I still remember January 6 like it was yesterday. I was standing right where you are now, Mr. Speaker. Our democracy was in peril; the lives of Members of Congress, our staffs, and all the workers here were endangered. And Capitol Police officers were beaten or worse.

Getting to the truth of what happened or placating the ego of a former President, that shouldn't be a tough call. In any ordinary time, it wouldn't be. This measure would probably have passed on suspension.

Because as a Member of Congress, we have fewer more important and solemn duties than what is at the heart of the measure before us today, and that is protecting our democracy and preventing future attempts to overturn the results of an election.

This is about country, not about party.

Now, many witnesses are already doing their patriotic duty and cooperating voluntarily with the select committee.

In fact, 10 of the 11 witnesses required to produce records to the select committee by the required deadline are engaging with the committee.

Only one person, Mr. Speaker, is refusing. One. Stephen K. Bannon.

Instead of doing the right thing, the legal thing, the patriotic thing, Mr. Bannon is hiding behind the former President's false claims of executive privilege to try to run out the clock on this investigation.

Now, maybe he has something to hide. I don't know. But the law isn't on his side. It is not on Donald Trump's side either.

Executive privilege is not absolute, and President Biden has declined to invoke that privilege.

There is a long history of the White House making accommodations to investigative requests from Congress. That is especially true when the public interest outweighs other interests, as it does here.

But apparently facts and the law don't matter to some. Apparently, Steve Bannon thinks he is above the law. Maybe it is because he was pardoned by the former occupant of the White House.

But ultimately, in the United States of America, no one should be above the law.

That shouldn't be a controversial idea. But we live in an age where apparently some put fidelity to Donald Trump over fidelity to the Constitution. And I find that disgusting.

I get it. The former President is in Mar-a-Lago somewhere seething about our efforts to get to the truth about January 6.

But is he so feared, Mr. Speaker, that my Republican colleagues are going to keep denying what happened that day? And keep trying to sweep it under the rug as if it never happened? Oh, it was no big deal.

This is our democracy that we are talking about here. This is about the oath we took and the freedoms we cherish, freedoms that Americans have fought and died for, Mr. Speaker.

And some on the other side, are they really willing to throw away all of that to placate the whims of one man? Really?

This has to stop.

The legal scholar James Landis once said: "To deny Congress power to acquaint itself with facts is equivalent to requiring it to prescribe remedies in darkness."

We need to see the facts in the cold light of day and follow them wherever they lead.

That means not only holding those who attack this building itself accountable, as the legal system is currently doing, it also means holding people accountable when they attack what this building stands for: Democracy and rule of law.

□ 1230

We will not tolerate being left in the dark, and certainly not when something so fundamental is at stake.

Now, this doesn't have to be a partisan fight. And just yesterday in the Committee on Rules, we debated the underlying measure at length. And, yes, we heard from the usual Members who rushed to the former President's defense, who deflected and wanted to talk about anything other than the events of January 6. But we also saw something more remarkable.

Chairman THOMPSON, a Democrat, sat side-by-side with Vice Chair CHENEY, a Republican, two people who probably have never voted for the same Presidential candidates in their lives; two people who disagree on virtually every issue. But they agreed on this: On defending the Constitution and rule of law. Let's follow their example.

Mr. Speaker, I sat across the dais from Congresswoman CHENEY for years on the Committee on Rules when the Republicans were in charge. We were polar opposites. But yesterday, I couldn't have agreed with her more, not as a Democrat but as an American.

Now I don't give a damn if you are a Democrat or a Republican, and I don't care if you like Donald Trump or not. Matters like this are about something more than petty partisanship.

So I urge my colleagues, let's put our country before our party. Let's put de-

fending our democracy before defending Donald Trump. Let's support this rule and the underlying measure, not as Democrats or Republicans, but as public servants, as Members of Congress dedicated to preserving American democracy and the rule of law. That is what is at stake here and nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to ignore the feeling that this is one more example of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle trying to distract from the real issues that concern Americans. We have an administration that can't stop the flood of illegal immigrants at our southern border, can't unlock the supply bottlenecks at our ports.

What are the Democrats doing about inflation?

What are the Democrats doing about the border issues?

What are the Democrats doing about supply chain issues?

And what are the Democrats doing about the worker shortage?

And I could go on. Instead, we are here going back and forth arguing if we should continue down a path of yet another partisan investigation of questionable motives and purpose. No wonder the public thinks we can't do our job.

That said, there are several questions that need to be resolved before we can continue with this vote. The Supreme Court has found that the power rests with Congress for subpoenas if they serve a legitimate legislative purpose, and be "related to, and in furtherance of, a legitimate task of the Congress."

A legitimate legislative purpose would be issuing subpoenas to the leaders of the D.C. National Guard and Sergeant at Arms so that we can find out what gaps in communications and authorities that need to be filled and find solutions to ensure that this doesn't happen again. But have those been issued? No.

Instead, House Democrats are continuing their witch hunt into President Trump and their political opponents that voted against the certification of the election in some States, something that they, themselves, did just 4 years ago.

What information is intended to be gathered that would be useful for a legitimate legislative purpose? Much of the discussion in the Rules Committee centered around criminal action, not around legislation. These concerns would have been raised by Republicans if Speaker PELOSI had not rejected the minority leader's nominees. But instead, she hand-picked Members that would fit her and the Democrats' narrative.

It seems the story line has already been decided. We need to ensure that it

is, as stated, intended to investigate and report upon the facts, circumstances, and causes relating to January 6. Unfortunately, Speaker PELOSI and the Democrats made it clear early on that this committee and its investigation outcome was predetermined when it tilted representation in favor of Democrats and, again, rejected the two Republican Members selected to serve on the Commission by the minority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the precedent being set here today as the majority, yet again, embarks on another investigation in search of a crime.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Minnesota said we wouldn't be in this position if we had done what the Republicans had asked us to do. We did.

And I include in the RECORD the letter that the minority leader, KEVIN MCCARTHY, sent to Speaker PELOSI requesting a number of items.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 22, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: We are in agreement that the best path forward for bipartisan legislation is to create an impartial and bipartisan Commission.

In keeping with the suggestions from the Co-Chairs of the 9/11 Commission, the legislation the House puts forward should mirror the precedents that fairly and successfully governed that Commission. Simply put, House Republicans are asking for no more and no less than what Congress came together and agreed upon in the past. Specifically, those precedents include:

An equal 5-5 ratio in appointments by Democrats and Republicans

Co-Equal Subpoena Power for the Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission

No inclusion of findings or other predetermined conclusions which ultimately should be rendered by the Commission itself

As the Co-Chairs of the Commission stated, a "bipartisan independent investigation will earn credibility with the American public." I am confident that following their procedures and precedents can do just that, in a way that an overtly partisan commission will not be able to.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing your response.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House Republican Leader.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, those items include: an equal 5:5 ratio on a committee; coequal subpoena power; no inclusion of findings of other predetermined conclusions which ultimately should be rendered by the Commission itself.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Homeland Security agreed to every one of them—every single one of them. And what did the Republicans do? They said, Well, we didn't think you would agree to everything, but we still don't want the Commission. So they voted

against it. And then they blocked it in the United States Senate.

So don't talk to me about partisanship or bipartisanship when it was very clear early on that my friends on the other side had no intention of wanting to work with us to get to the truth, because they couldn't take yes for an answer.

Mr. Speaker, let me also point out that today, President Trump issued a statement—he had to issue a statement because he can't tweet anymore because of mistruths and embrace of violence. Anyway, he issued a statement today. This is what he said:

The statement says, "The insurrection took place on November 3, election day. January 6 was the protest!"

Let me just say that one more time.

Trump said today in a statement, "The insurrection took place on November 3, election day. January 6 was a protest!"

And by the way, he didn't mention that it was a violent protest on January 6.

Mr. Speaker, are any of my Republican colleagues, aside from Congresswoman CHENEY and Representative KINZINGER, who have shown courage and patriotism, are any of them willing to come to the floor and say unequivocally that the election on November 3 was not an insurrection, as the former President has now said?

It was a free and fair election held by one of the oldest democracies in the world. And that used to mean something to my Republican friends. Please, please. The former occupant of the White House is trying to tear this country apart. And unfortunately, too many on the other side are going along with him. Enough.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, with all respect to my colleague from Massachusetts, the fact still remains that when the minority leader did try to participate in this Commission, the Speaker rejected the two nominees that the minority leader had offered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER).

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and fellow Rules Committee member, Representative FISCHBACH, for allowing me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I really believe that the issue before us today comes down to a very simple question, and that is, what is the legislative purpose of the Select Committee subpoena on a private citizen. This is a very narrow legal issue.

And what the courts have held is that Congress has the power to secure information "in order to legislate." So in other words, Congress's subpoena authority is valid only if it relates to the furtherance of a legitimate task of Congress.

Now, according to the Select Committee's own press release, the committee is attempting to tell a story and

to find out what happened that day. But the courts have already determined that that is not a valid legislative purpose.

In the 1957 decision, *Watkins v. The United States*, the Court held that Congress has "no general authority to expose the private affairs of individuals without justification in terms of the functions of Congress." Additionally, the quote went on in that case to say Congress cannot investigate private citizens for "the sake of exposure."

So then what is the legislative purpose before us today? What is the legislative purpose of a subpoena on a private citizen, including 11 individuals who merely filed and were granted permits to exercise their First Amendment rights to assemble and to petition the government? This cannot be perceived as an investigation and still fit within the framework of case law.

Again, let's be clear, the law is crystal clear here. If Congress does not have a legitimate legislative function, they simply cannot subpoena a private individual.

Now, the Constitution gives those powers to the executive and the judiciary branch. They don't give that power to Congress. So I can, therefore, only conclude that the purpose of the resolution before us today is to fulfill a partisan agenda.

If the Select Committee was actually serious about conducting a legitimate oversight, they would subpoena the former House Sergeant at Arms and the former head of the D.C. National Guard. That would be an investigation within the clear purpose of Congress and within the delegated power that we have in the Constitution.

Instead, we are here voting on a resolution with absolutely no legislative purpose. We are also setting a dangerous precedent that will have a chilling effect on the rights of private citizens in the future.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that someone on the other side would respond to former President Trump's statement today, which I find stunning and shocking, but apparently they don't want to talk about that. They want to talk about legislative purpose. When we get to the bill, I will let the committee members respond to that.

I do want to say one thing again; that Speaker PELOSI was committed to a truly bipartisan commission, and we did a bipartisan commission—a truly bipartisan commission. My friends on the other side of the aisle tried to undercut it and get their friends over in the Senate to tank it. That is what happened. They basically destroyed what could have been a bipartisan commission that, quite frankly, was the way we all wanted to go.

But then they said, well, she wouldn't let us put who we wanted on this current commission. Well, the minority leader suggested Mr. JORDAN to be the lead Republican, and he very

well may be a material witness in this investigation. You would put him on to oversee an investigation of, what, himself and others?

Give me a break. What is going on here? At least be honest enough with the American people to say what is going on here; and that is, you don't want to get to the truth about what happened on January 6. You never did; notwithstanding the violence that occurred right here in this Chamber, in this sacred building.

So, please, let's not get into this, Oh, we wanted to cooperate but somehow you wouldn't let us. We gave you everything you wanted, and you could not take yes for an answer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for truth and accountability. That is why we are here. We are dealing with common criminals. You see a guy running down the street in this city with a television on his back strapped to it, you start to wonder. We have had enough of those incidents to indicate to us that is what we are dealing with.

The gravest attack ever on the U.S. democracy came 288 days ago. It was born of lies. Steve Bannon spread those poisonous lies, and Bannon was guided by the dictator. We must pursue the truth. We go only where the facts take us. Refusing a subpoena is obstructing justice. We don't allow the plaintiff to prosecute or to decide. We decide it through the courts. If you can't take the Constitution, go to Russia. It shows you have something to hide. What are you hiding?

This is a vote of conscience.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, refusing a subpoena is obstructing justice. This is a vote of conscience.

Do you agree with the rioting terrorists or our democracy? Are we a country of laws or a country of men?

We must hold all involved accountable; this includes those who attacked the police and those organizers who spread the lies, and the President who organized it.

This is America, not Russia.

□ 1245

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, Republicans will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for the additional consideration of H.R. 5586, the Prohibiting IRS Financial Surveillance Act, authored by Representative FERGUSON.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with the extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, requiring banks and Federal credit unions to disclose personal details about their customers' accounts is an extreme invasion of privacy, and it would have terrible implications for community banks and credit unions in my district and across the country.

I suppose I really shouldn't be surprised about this egregious attempt on behalf of the Democrats. They clearly want as much government involvement as possible in every possible part of American citizens' lives. I may not be surprised anymore, but I continue to be disappointed that they refuse to listen to the American citizens who time and time again say they want Big Government out of their lives and their wallets.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question. There is absolutely no denying that the Democrats want to control every part of your life by allowing the IRS to snoop into your bank accounts.

This is wrong. And for what? It is really truly all about control. This unlawful surveillance is their latest gambit.

The Democrats' snooping scheme would include hiring 87,000 new IRS agents at a cost of almost \$80 billion. That is almost enough IRS agents to fill up Sanford Stadium at the University of Georgia for a Saturday football game. Now, I will take a college football stadium full of SEC fans cheering on the Dawgs, but not one full of IRS agents.

The proposal that the Democrats have put out claims to only go after wealthy tax cheats, but at its core, this is going to target every single farmer, every single family, every single gig worker, every single small business owner, and just about anyone who pays rent or pays a mortgage.

Their bogus attempts to scale it back are meaningless. At any number, this is wrong. Think about how long it would take, paying \$200 a month out of your bank account, or \$200 a week out of your bank account, to get to the \$10,000 number that they have proposed.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, the Democrats' IRS surveillance plan is flat out wrong. It is an outright violation of the Fourth Amendment of every American. Government has no business sifting through our personal information. This is a foundational principle that this country was built on.

I will say it again. Whether the amount is \$1, \$600, \$10,000, or \$1 million,

giving the IRS this kind of unfettered and unchecked power is wrong. The threshold is irrelevant. Americans know that this is wrong. We know it is wrong, and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that it is wrong.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so desperate to find revenue to fund their Big Government socialist programs that they are willing to violate the constitutional rights of our fellow Americans. This is wrong. It is egregious on every front. Once again, we know it; they know it; the American people know it; and that is why we are pushing back.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can restore some reason and sanity and put an end to this absurd proposal for the IRS to snoop on Americans' bank accounts.

Defeat the previous question so we can vote to prohibit IRS financial surveillance of Americans' bank accounts.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to waste my time debating this information. What my friend is talking about is a false government takeover. What about the people who tried to take over our democracy on January 6? What about what happened here on January 6?

Why is there no interest in getting to the truth? They come with this instead. Again, I am still waiting for somebody to respond to President Trump's statement that insurrection day took place on November 3. Do you really believe that? Is that what we have come to, that my friends on the other side would embrace such a shocking and such an offensive statement?

We had a free and fair election, and this is what the former President—who my friends are all so afraid of—says.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. Speaker, there are moments in our country's history when we are presented with stark choices, choices between right and wrong. And the violence of January 6 has made it clear that we are at such a moment. January 6 was a shocking assault on our government.

On the orders of the former President, thousands of rioters destroyed public property, gravely injured police officers, terrorized lawmakers, and invaded the Capitol to halt the certification of the electoral college required by the Constitution. That day cannot be minimized or swept under the carpet because the forces that inspired that attack are still stoking the fires of chaos and conspiracy.

Congress has tasked a bipartisan select committee with investigating the January 6 attack, and that committee has outlined why it needs Steve Bannon's testimony to fully under-

stand the events leading up to that attack.

However, when subpoenaed to testify, Mr. Bannon told the select committee to pound sand. Mr. Bannon is a private citizen; he is not above the law and cannot refuse to obey a subpoena any more than you or I or any American can. Neither Mr. Bannon nor the former President has made any credible legal arguments to shield his testimony.

Patriotism demands that anyone with knowledge of that dark day come forward, and the rule of law and our Constitution demand that everyone in this Congress support this investigation.

I am incredibly disappointed that Republican leadership and so many of their colleagues continue to oppose any attempt to investigate the January 6 attack. They opposed legislation to create a bipartisan commission. They opposed the creation of the select committee. And they are now trying to prevent the committee from carrying out its work.

This is not a time for games or delays, all of which have allowed the former President and his allies, like Mr. Bannon, to escape accountability thus far. This is a time for courage, the courage to protect our Constitution and our national integrity.

I am grateful to the members of the select committee for having the courage to put loyalty to country over partisan politics.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this rule.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. HINSON).

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding to me today.

Mr. Speaker, President Biden and Speaker PELOSI are moving full steam ahead with their Big Government, big spending vision for this country. One of the most egregious proposals in their multitrillion-dollar reconciliation package would give the IRS access to nearly every single American's bank account by requiring financial institutions, like your local bank or your credit union, to report every account with more than \$10,000 of transactions annually to the IRS.

This proposal would give the IRS unprecedented access to sensitive personal information and unprecedented power to target working families across Iowa and across America. This government snooping is a complete invasion of privacy and a massive overreach into our lives and our livelihoods.

This spying scheme is a lose, lose, lose. It will increase the existing backlog at the IRS exponentially. It will jeopardize the privacy of millions of Americans. It will destroy our community financial institutions. And it will hurt rural communities and working families hardest of all.

Democrats claim this is about tax evasion. Everyone should pay the taxes

that they owe. That is not the argument here. But this misguided proposal isn't about tracking down missing revenue; it is about expanded government control, plain and simple.

This proposal, by design, will hit normal working families' bank accounts. A total of \$10,000 in transactions in a year, that is a year's rent or a series of farm equipment bills, for example. The IRS should be focused on being more efficient at its current job, not emboldened and certainly not unleashed on hardworking Americans.

We do not need to be throwing more money at the IRS to put Americans' daily transactions under a microscope. Iowans have been very clear with me. They do not want the IRS snooping around in their bank accounts at that granular level.

I have also heard very serious concerns from our community financial institutions. These are the folks that are helping our farmers, our families, and our small businesses access credit. They told me this proposal could force them to shut down for good, leaving Iowans without access to credit and capital that they need to help keep our rural economy going to fuel and feed the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to put a stop to this madness and stand up for our constituents by voting "no" on the previous question, keeping the government out of Americans' bank accounts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just remind everybody that democracy doesn't defend itself; people have to defend democracy. It would be nice to see a little courage on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman and chair of the Rules Committee for yielding and for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the House is a separate and coequal branch of government. We are the institution that is closest to the people. The House has a sacred obligation under the Constitution to defend our democracy, and we should be doing that in a bipartisan way, but something has happened to the modern-day Republican Party.

The party of Abraham Lincoln is gone. The party of Ronald Reagan is gone. The party of John McCain is gone. A cult of personality has risen up to take its place.

Is that why my colleagues refuse to denounce the former President's lie uttered today, that the real insurrection was on November 3?

Take back your party. You can start today. You can start right here. You can start by holding Steve Bannon accountable for his blanket defiance of a congressional subpoena.

What is wrong with Steve Bannon? There is no cult exception to the United States Constitution. There is a

legitimate, bipartisan congressional investigation that is underway into the violent insurrection and attack on the Capitol on January 6. It was an assault on the Congress, the Constitution, and the country.

A lawful subpoena has been issued that Steve Bannon should comply with. We must hold Steve Bannon accountable for his blanket defiance of a congressional subpoena, for undermining the rule of law, and for obstructing a congressional investigation because, in America, no one, no one, no one is above the law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 5586.

This bill would kill a Biden administration proposal that would allow IRS agents to comb through the bank accounts of any American who spends more than \$10,000 a year.

To put that in perspective, \$10,000 a year equates to just \$28 a day, \$850 a month, or half of the average Minnesota mortgage payment. In other words, the Biden administration wants the IRS to be able to spy on tens of millions of Americans.

Don't be mistaken. This proposal does not just target the 1 percent, as the President sometimes likes to claim. Instead, it is pointed directly at working American families.

Today, I led a letter, with more than 200 of my colleagues, urging Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen to scrap this proposal to spy on American citizens.

This is not China. We must protect Americans' right to privacy and stop this proposed intrusive, unnecessary Biden financial reporting requirement.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say, not only will my Republican friends not condemn the President's outrageous and unacceptable and unconscionable statement today, but they won't even talk about what we are here for.

That is what fear looks like, and it is really unbelievably sad.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by saying that this is not just about Mr. Bannon. This is about our rule of law, our democracy, and protecting it for future generations.

On January 6, a mob, incited by the lies of a political leader, descended on the Capitol. Nooses, vandalism, death threats to elected officials, Americans remember the violence that took place here.

□ 1300

Beltway chatter often focuses on the winners and losers of that day. But on that day, we all lost. Americans lost their lives, and we nearly lost our democracy. That is why we created a bipartisan January 6 commission. We know that unless we do our jobs, the ultimate losers will be future generations who will wonder what happened to our Nation.

The commission's work is serious and has no time for the games of Mr. Bannon or anyone else who would disregard the rule of law. Our Constitution and our courts have made it clear that Congress has the power to investigate. This power is vital to the protection of our democracy, and it must be respected.

I think a lot about our late, dear colleague, Elijah Cummings, and his words still sit with me. He said that when we are dancing with the angels, the question will be asked: What did we do to ensure we kept our democracy intact?

I stand before you, Mr. Speaker, with that quote on my heart, thinking of my own four grandchildren and when they learn of January 6, they will see a time when America descended into violence, destruction, and desecration; when Americans attacked Americans and threatened our democracy.

And what did I do?

What did we all do to protect our democracy?

So I lend my voice to hold Mr. Bannon in contempt and support the bipartisan select committee for their work in keeping our democracy and our future intact.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), who is the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as my good friend from Georgia explained, if we defeat the previous question, we will immediately move to bring up H.R. 5586. This bill is critically important to ensure there will be no expansion of Internal Revenue Service requirements for financial institutions to report the ins and outs of bank accounts.

Members may remember this issue during the debate on ObamaCare when the Democrats tried to require anyone who received a payment of more than \$600 to be given a 1099. People were rightly outraged by this provision, and it was repealed before it ever went into effect. Now, with their new reconciliation bill, the Democratic majority is again looking for payfors and are willing to sacrifice the privacy of all Americans in that quest. Every threshold being discussed for inclusion will give the IRS full access to what is in the bank account of every American.

And what is the justification for that, Mr. Speaker?

It is to help the IRS to identify tax cheats. Well, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the Democratic proposal will make

everyone who pays rent or a mortgage a target and won't do anything to help the IRS close the tax gap.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic plan is an astonishing breach of privacy. Giving the IRS the power to snoop around financial accounts, even with no accusation of wrongdoing, violates every protection against government overreach. Americans have a reasonable expectation of privacy in their homes and in their personal lives, including their financial lives. Yet, if the majority has their way, the IRS will be empowered to go digging around in the bank accounts of everyday Americans in search of wrongdoing. That is simply beyond the pale.

We have seen what can happen when the IRS abuses its power. It was only a few short years ago that the IRS was targeting political and religious organizations for their beliefs, an astonishing violation of their First Amendment rights.

What the IRS needs, Mr. Speaker, is oversight and accountability, and that is why we need to bring up and pass H.R. 5586 today. Only this will ensure that the IRS is not granted unprecedented power to intervene in the lives of and invade the privacy of ordinary Americans.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution ought to be supported, and the underlying action that the rule provides for ought to be supported by every Member of this House who believes that this House has a constitutional responsibility of oversight, of protecting the Constitution and the democracy in which we all are privileged to live, and the integrity of this House.

Oversight is not possible for this House if, in fact, it cannot request and, indeed, demand the testimony of those who have information which this House, the people's House and the protector of our democracy and our Constitution, needs to protect our democracy. This rule and the underlying action for which it provides is essential.

Mr. Speaker, if I were trying a case, I would offer as Exhibit A a statement by the man who would be dictator, Donald Trump, who absurdly and, of course, incorrectly says the insurrection took place on November 3, election day. January 6 was the protest.

My view is that man, Donald J. Trump, protests too much, because I believe that he recruited, incited, and deployed an insurrectionist mob to threaten this institution, its Members, its constitutional responsibility in the electoral process of the Presidency of the United States, and democracy itself.

Mr. Speaker, the events of January 6 exposed threats to our democracy that must be fully understood and ad-

ressed. It is a weighty responsibility that falls to the House Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol, a bipartisan committee.

I want to thank Chairman THOMPSON, Vice Chair CHENEY, and all of those serving on this committee for their commitment to seeking the truth, defending our democracy, and to giving sufficient information to our public and our constituents, our people, that they know this to be a stark and dangerous lie.

The committee is doing a diligent job at finding the truth. This task should not have fallen to the members of a select committee, this subpoena for contempt. We should have been able to come together, Democrats and Republicans, to create a bipartisan commission in the style of the 9/11 Commission, recognizing that such consequential and transformative attacks require us to come together as one nation indivisible to seek answers and identify solutions to make our country safer.

Sadly, however, we have come to a place where one party is so focused on defending the indefensible that this institution cannot act as Americans but, rather, are relegated to acting simply as partisans.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I am heartened to see Democrats and some courageous Republicans working together to uncover the truth of what happened that day. These Republican Members are exhibiting what President Kennedy would call profiles in courage.

In order for this committee to perform its work in full—indeed any committee of the Congress to perform its work in full—ultimately it has to be able to get the information that it needs from those who know the information it needs. It must hear testimony from all those who may have information regarding the events of January 6 in this particular case. That is why we provided the committee with subpoena authority.

Steve Bannon's refusal to appear, even when subpoenaed is, A, a demonstration of his contempt, not only for Congress but his contempt of the Constitution and his contempt for the law. It is unacceptable and obstructive to this process of uncovering the full story of that day's attack on the Capitol. He must be found in contempt, not as a Democrat and not as a Republican, but on behalf of this institution and the people whom we represent.

Withholding information on the events of that day from the committee is no less than an act of betrayal of the American people and of our constitutional democracy.

The American people need to understand what led to the violent insurrection that sought to overturn our election and led to the deaths of multiple police officers and others; although, as I said, Exhibit A, the former President's comments, should be the proof in and of itself the American people need to understand what led to the

deaths of those police officers and the placing at risk the democratic process of electing a President of the United States.

We need to understand, Mr. Speaker, how this could have happened, why it happened, and what ought to be done to hold the perpetrators accountable and prevent the events of the day from being repeated.

That appears to be the fear on the floor of this House today: accountability, responsibility, and consequences.

In refusing to appear before the commission, Mr. Bannon has made it clear where his loyalties lie. He has chosen Trump first and America last, not America first. Trump first, America last. Trump first, our Constitution last. Trump first, our democracy last. Trump first, the House of the people, this House of Representatives last. And he will have to answer for that to us.

This is a moment of reckoning for our country, reckoning with hard truths and painful memories, a reckoning that, above all, requires truth and understanding.

Can't we, Mr. Speaker, in a bipartisan way summon the courage to look the truth in the eye and vote the truth?

We cannot allow anyone to shirk their responsibility to share that truth and help the American people understand.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to vote "yes" on this resolution and to vote "yes" on the citation for contempt so that Chairman THOMPSON, Vice Chairwoman CHENEY, and the members of the select committee can make it clear to Mr. Bannon and to all others summoned to testify they will seek the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth as they determine what we must do to protect our beloved country, our beloved Constitution, and our beloved democracy.

□ 1315

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE).

Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, as explained prior, if we defeat the previous question, we will immediately move to bring up H.R. 5586. This bill prohibits the expansion of the Internal Revenue Service's requirements for financial institutions to report bank account transactions.

The Biden administration is searching for ways to pay for their partisan \$5.5 trillion social policy bill, and one of the Democrats' proposed solutions is to spy on taxpayers' bank accounts.

Their proposal would require financial institutions and service providers to report data on accounts that deposit or withdraw more than \$600 or maybe \$10,000 to the Internal Revenue Service to help ensure that Americans are paying their fair share in taxes.

Democrats claim that this regulatory expansion would only impact wealthy Americans and businesses. But in reality, it targets virtually all working-class people in our Nation.

This government overreach would be an enormous violation of privacy, jeopardize the financial security of all Americans, and impose significant compliance costs on financial institutions.

Through this proposal, the Democrats are looking to weaponize the IRS by creating a new surveillance program, which would allow them to monitor every single bank account without permission or limit. In order to conduct this surveillance on Americans, the provision includes \$80 billion to double the number of IRS agents, which would be six times the size of the IRS' annual budget.

This plan was initially included in the massive budget reconciliation bill and has now since been removed after pushback from financial institutions and customers. But it is still being considered for passage.

Regardless, my House Republican colleagues and I are doing what we can to protect the financial security and privacy of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma.

Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma. I have recently written a letter to Speaker PELOSI, Chairman NEAL, Secretary Yellen, and Commissioner Rettig to express my concerns of overburdening the data collection system, exposing millions of Americans to potential cyberattacks, and how distrust in banks negatively impacts our economy.

Additionally, I signed on to a letter and cosponsored two bills that directly address this pressing issue. The letter to Secretary Yellen expressed the concern of more Americans unbanking due to privacy concerns and distrust in banks and how applying extra reporting requirements for financial institutions would be incredibly burdensome.

The U.S. Government should not have the authority to spy on bank accounts of American taxpayers. The Biden administration's proposal would significantly impact the working class, invade privacy, pose financial security threats for Americans and businesses, and further burden institutions. House Republicans are working tirelessly to put a stop to this government overreach and protect the American people's security, privacy, and trust in this great Nation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman updating us on the bills that she has cosponsored and her opinions about the IRS, which have nothing to do with the underlying bill that we are debating here today. But it is stunning to me that neither she nor any of my friends on the other side of the aisle will respond to what the former occupant of the White House said today in a statement, that the insurrection took place on November 3; that our

election, our lawful election in one of the oldest democracies in the world, was somehow an insurrection; and that January 6 was merely a protest.

I am stunned by this. I challenge the next speaker, please, can you say that you disassociate yourself with this statement? Can you make it clear to the American people that you want no part of this? I get it. You endorsed this man. He campaigned for you. You are afraid of his base. You are afraid every time he says anything. But the bottom line is, this statement needs to be condemned, and the unwillingness of anybody on the other side to condemn this statement is unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, they won't question Trump's statement that the insurrection was November 3 because that is the day each and every one of them and each and every one of us was elected. It was a free and fair election when it came to electing Congresspeople, but for President, they think it was an insurrection. Horse manure.

Bannon, who was thumbing his nose at the Constitution and this Congress by not responding to his subpoena, said that it would be different than on election day, on January 6. It wouldn't go as expected, because he was part of plotting what was an overthrow of our government.

He was pardoned by President Trump for ripping off Trump supporters. He got them to give money to an effort to build the wall, and he took over \$1 million for his own personal expenses. Fraud. But Trump didn't care that he ripped off Trump people for a Trump wall. He pardoned him. The whole thing is a con game, and we need to end it before democracy goes out the window.

I urge you to support the rule and the underlying resolution. Protect America and protect democracy.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Minnesota for yielding and Mr. FERGUSON for leading this effort.

If the previous question is defeated, we will amend the rule and immediately consider H.R. 5586, the Prohibiting IRS Financial Surveillance Act.

This legislation would prohibit the Treasury Department and the IRS from implementing any new financial account surveillance regimes. This is a direct response to this administration's invasive proposal that would require financial institutions to report transaction data on every American's bank account that meets their proposed threshold.

I am deeply skeptical of the need for this dangerous expansion of IRS oversight and believe it to be a significant risk to individual privacy. The Democrats are leading the American people

to believe that this is needed to target wealthy tax cheats and to help close the tax gap. Unfortunately, this proposal, even with a \$10,000 threshold, would subject Americans at every rung of the economic ladder to these onerous reporting requirements. This includes middle-class families, small business owners, and farmers.

Even with proposed carve-outs, this proposal would turn local banks into IRS reporting units, which is not only incredibly burdensome but also costly. I have already been hearing from local bankers in Morton and Liberty, Illinois, and throughout my district who are deeply concerned about how this proposal will encourage their customers to empty out their bank accounts, further exacerbating the unbanked-banked divide.

In a letter dated September 29, 2021, the Department of the Treasury cited that the IRS experiences 1.4 billion cyberattacks a year. I don't know a single American who would like to have their personal data reported to a system that is highly targeted by hackers and foreign adversaries. In addition, the IRS' track record for leaking personal information raises serious questions about their ability to implement a program of this scale.

I am proud to join my friend, Congressman FERGUSON, in his effort to protect Americans' privacy, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, when the gentlewoman from Minnesota yielded the gentleman from Illinois an additional minute, I was kind of hopeful that maybe he would be the one to say that he disassociates himself from the statement of Donald Trump today in which he said that the insurrection took place on November 3, election day.

I would be happy to yield 30 seconds to him if he wants to say that this was a statement that is not only unconscionable but that every American should condemn.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the majority whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MCGOVERN for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I often quote George Santayana, who warned: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

The insurrection on January 6 was the worst attack on our Constitution since the Civil War. While the secessionists were defeated in 1865, our Nation's experiment with multiracial democracy during Reconstruction did not last.

It was extinguished by the Lost Cause mythology that minimized the evils of the secessionists and raised monuments to the leaders of the Confederacy that they established. These willful circumventions and misrepresentations were used as justification

for avoiding accountability and violently stripping African Americans of constitutional rights.

We are at risk of repeating that history today. Just as the Lost Cause laid the ideological groundwork for Jim Crow and all its inhumanities, the big lie seeks to justify nullification laws that seek to suppress votes and establish autocratic rule.

The former President and his enablers are using the big lie to deny the horror of January 6. They are attempting to obstruct and subvert the select committee's work and to prevent a full accounting of their efforts to undermine our democracy.

We know from our history that when our government is attacked, failing to hold the perpetrators accountable emboldens them. Allowing their myths to gain currency incentivizes them. And underestimating their disregard for their fellow citizens enables them to deny those citizens their constitutional rights.

I urge adoption of this resolution so that we avoid repeating the past, at least that part of our past that dehumanizes our fellow citizens. We must act to strengthen our democracy and build a better future for our country so that it can once again be the envy of the world.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE).

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Speaker, while my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are singularly focused on the happenings only within the walls of Capitol Hill, the rest of us, working families, are struggling with the consequences of this failed administration, including rising inflation; pending unemployment; border threats; increased drugs and violence in our neighborhoods; and an out-of-control, power-hungry administration.

I cannot explain the chairman's and majority leader's absolute and unhealthy obsession with a former President, but I sincerely urge them to seek treatment so that they can focus on the insurmountable harms that are being caused by the current administration and how they are currently forcing them on all of the American people.

I rise in opposition to the previous question so that the House can immediately consider H.R. 5586, legislation critical to stopping the Democrats' unending attempts to control every aspect of American lives.

Now the left is in an unrelenting pursuit of tracking every penny you and your family personally earn and spend. If the price tag for their socialist policies weren't alarming enough, what is hidden inside the bill should truly horrify all Americans.

If you pay rent, if you buy groceries, or pay a mortgage, you are going to be subject to surveillance. From the lowest income earners on up, every American will be checked.

Thousands more IRS bureaucrats will be hired for their new surveillance pro-

gram, with authority to monitor every transaction you make. Every account transaction would be traced and reported to the Federal Government, edging us closer and closer to a communist-controlled police state.

Republicans are unified in our fight against this new surveillance program. My friend and ranking member, KEVIN BRADY, led the charge to stop this early on, but not a single Democrat stood up for Americans' financial privacy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. VAN DUYNE. First, things are reported and monitored, and then they are controlled. We cannot let Democrats push us down this dangerous and slippery slope.

□ 1330

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, oh, my God, can somebody, please—I beg of you on the other side—can somebody, please, disassociate yourself or condemn the statement by the former President who said today that the insurrection took place on November 3?

All my colleagues were elected on November 3 as well. If you believe that election day was an insurrection, then your election results are illegitimate.

Can somebody, please, for the sake of our democracy, say that what was said by the former President is wrong? Please.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH).

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues today, I rise in opposition to the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 5586, Prohibiting IRS Financial Surveillance Act.

Mr. Speaker, Hoosiers are outraged. My friends across the aisle would have you believe that it is just the Hoosier financial institutions that are outraged at having to hand over the personal account information of their customers. It is, in fact, those account owners that are outraged at the notion that my friends across the aisle would build an apparatus to surveil and snoop in their personal bank accounts.

Now, their horror only grows as I answer questions for them. First, they ask, surely this must apply only to the super rich and not to me. But I reply, no, it applies to you if you spend just over \$200 a week.

Then they will ask, surely this must only apply to those that are suspected of a crime. And I say, no, it is collection on every account, irrespective of whether there is a suspected crime or tax evasion afoot.

Then, of course, they will ask me, surely the IRS has a very good track

record of keeping this data safe. And I have to reply, no, the track record, in fact, indicates the opposite. The IRS has a terrible track record of keeping this data safe against the intrusion of actors from around the world and right here at home.

And then they say, well, surely the IRS has a good track record of not mobilizing this data for political purposes. And yet, again, I have to say, no, in fact, the evidence indicates the IRS has mobilized this data for their own political purposes and for the political purposes across the aisle.

My friends, this is horrifying, this surveillance state that is trying to be built. Hoosiers understand what is being asked of them. Trillions of dollars are being proposed to be spent, and now they are being asked to give up their personal information from their personal bank accounts to foot that bill for my colleagues across the aisle. I hope this stops here.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if this microphone is working, because I am not sure my colleagues can hear me when I have asked them over and over again, can you please disassociate yourself from the former President's statement today? It is important. It is on topic.

By the way, what the gentleman just talked about has nothing to do with what we are talking about today. It is amazing that nobody wants to talk about what is on the floor today.

But my constituents, when they talk to me, you know what they are fearful about? They are fearful about losing our democracy in their lifetime. And the inability or the unwillingness of my friends on the other side to be able to disassociate themselves with a statement by the former President, which today he said the election on November 3 was somehow the insurrection. It is stunning to me. He is tearing this country apart, and the silence and the indifference on the other side is aiding him in his quest to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), my good friend.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, Republicans will amend the rule to include H.R. 5586, the Prohibiting IRS Financial Surveillance Act, legislation to prevent the IRS from snooping into Americans' personal financial accounts.

Under President Biden and Congressional Democrats' policies, American families continue to be squeezed by inflation at the gas pump, at the grocery store, and in their monthly energy bills. But this inflation squeeze isn't enough for them. Now, they want to monitor the average American's bank account. As part of Democrats' misguided tax-and-spending spree, they

have proposed new reporting requirements, from financial institutions to the IRS, regarding private account information.

This vast government overreach would turn financial institutions in my district into local outposts of the IRS, all with the sole purpose of reporting Hoosiers' personal financial account information back to the Government. Make no mistake, this will capture virtually every American, who will be subject to increased levels of IRS intrusion in their daily lives.

The IRS already has been challenged by the leak of thousands of documents, including sensitive taxpayer information. The collection of additional data would only exacerbate this problem and subject many Americans to the potential exposure of their personal information. Let's not forget, under the Obama administration, the IRS systematically targeted certain groups applying for tax-exempt status simply because of their political affiliation.

I hope that we can defeat the previous question to protect the privacy of all Americans and to ensure that the IRS won't be surveilling every financial transaction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, the majority has chosen to turn the committee into a vehicle to push their own narrative, and it is clearly more interested in pursuing a partisan agenda to politicize January 6 rather than conducting a legitimate, good-faith investigation into the security failures leading up to that day.

As my colleague from Pennsylvania pointed out, where is the legitimate legislative purpose? The Members across the aisle have yet to address what kind of legitimate legislative purposes could, might, or even possibly come out of the commission investigation.

A lawful subpoena, according to the Supreme Court, needs to serve a legitimate legislative purpose. The majority leader used words like "oversight," "the American people need to understand," and "hold perpetrators accountable." These statements do not qualify as a legitimate legislative purpose.

This is nothing more than an attempt by the Democrats to distract from the very real issues facing Americans every day. I look forward to getting back to the real work of solving the supply chain issues, reclaiming American energy production, and empowering U.S. citizens to live their lives without government interference or surveillance.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the previous question, the rule, and the underlying legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I can't adequately express the outrage I feel about what happened in this institution on January 6. It was not only an attack on this building; it was an attack on our democracy.

I will tell you, if we don't have our democracy intact, you are not going to fix the supply chain issues or the energy issues or any other issues.

Our democracy is in peril. It was attacked on January 6.

Mr. Speaker, I am the chairman of the Rules Committee, so I understand what the rules of the House are, so I cannot say what I really feel about what went on in this Chamber today with this debate. I am disgusted, to be quite honest with you.

We are trying to get to the bottom of what happened on January 6, and many on the other side have done everything they could to frustrate that effort. Now, we have somebody who doesn't want to comply with a subpoena, and we are saying we are going to put some force behind that. We need to be able to do our oversight. We need to get to the truth, and my friends are trying to frustrate that.

Then today, former President Trump issues a statement saying insurrection day took place on November 3. That was election day, when we were all elected. That is what he thought? That is what he thinks was an insurrection? And January 6 was just a protest.

We were all here that day. We saw the violence. People lost their lives that day. People were wounded that day. People were traumatized by that day. Again, it was not just an attack on this building and the people who work here; it was an attack on our democracy.

And my friends on the other side of the aisle can't even muster the courage to say that the former President was wrong in his statement. That is what fear looks like. That is what fear of Donald Trump looks like. It is so sad that a once great party has come to this.

I said it earlier. Members come and go. I know people are all worried about the latest polls and where our base is and what political implications will come from this or that. But at the end of the day, you ought to be worried about your legacy, about what your children and grandchildren think.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. FISCHBACH is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 727

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the

consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 5586) to prohibit the implementation of new requirements to report bank account deposits and withdrawals. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3: Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5586.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 206, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

YEAS—221

Adams	DeGette	Kininger
Aguilar	DeLauro	Kirkpatrick
Allred	DelBene	Krishnamoorthi
Auchincloss	Delgado	Kuster
Axne	Demings	Lamb
Barragán	DeSaulnier	Langevin
Bass	Deutch	Larsen (WA)
Beatty	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Bera	Doggett	Lawrence
Beyer	Doyle, Michael	Lawson (FL)
Bishop (GA)	F.	Lee (CA)
Blumenauer	Escobar	Lee (NV)
Blunt Rochester	Eshoo	Leger Fernandez
Bonamici	Españillat	Levin (CA)
Bourdeaux	Evans	Levin (MI)
Bowman	Fletcher	Lieu
Boyle, Brendan	Foster	Lofgren
F.	Frankel, Lois	Lowenthal
Brown	Gallego	Luria
Brownley	Garamendi	Lynch
Bush	Garcia (IL)	Malinowski
Bustos	Garcia (TX)	Maloney,
Butterfield	Golden	Carolyn B.
Carbajal	Gomez	Maloney, Sean
Cárdenas	Gonzalez,	Manning
Carson	Vicente	Matsui
Carter (LA)	Gottheimer	McBath
Cartwright	Green, Al (TX)	McCollum
Case	Grijalva	McEachin
Casten	Harder (CA)	McGovern
Castor (FL)	Hayes	McNerney
Castro (TX)	Higgins (NY)	Meeks
Cheney	Himes	Meng
Chu	Horsford	Mfume
Cicilline	Houlahan	Moore (WI)
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Morelle
Clarke (NY)	Huffman	Moulton
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Mrvan
Clyburn	Jacobs (CA)	Murphy (FL)
Cohen	Jayapal	Nadler
Connolly	Jeffries	Napolitano
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Neal
Correa	Johnson (TX)	Neguse
Costa	Jones	Newman
Courtney	Kahale	Norcross
Craig	Kaptur	O'Halleran
Crist	Keating	Ocasio-Cortez
Crow	Kelly (IL)	Omar
Cuellar	Khanna	Pallone
Davids (KS)	Kildee	Panetta
Davis, Danny K.	Kilmer	Pappas
Dean	Kim (NJ)	Pascrell
DeFazio	Kind	Payne

Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider

NAYS—206

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Hill
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez

NOT VOTING—4

Buck
Lamborn

Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suoizzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus

NAYS—206

Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)

Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyn
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

□ 1411

Ms. FOXX and Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. SPANBERGER changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Brown)	Khanna	Payne (Pallone)
Burgess (Lucas)	(Bowman)	Rodgers (WA)
Cooper (Clark)	Kirkpatrick	(Joyce (PA))
(MA))	(Stanton)	Rush
DeFazio (Brown)	Lawson (FL)	(Underwood)
Frankel, Lois	(Evans)	Salazar
(Clark (MA))	Lynch (Trahan)	(Cammack)
Garcia (TX)	Meng (Jeffries)	Sires (Pallone)
(Escobar)	Moore (WI)	Tlaib (Omar)
Hice (GA)	(Beyer)	Wasserman
(Greene (GA))	Napolitano	Schultz (Soto)
Huffman	(Correa)	Wilson (FL)
(Stanton)	Ocasio-Cortez	(Hayes)
	(Escobar)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 205, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 328]

YEAS—221

Adams	Davids (KS)	Kaptur
Agullar	Davis, Danny K.	Keating
Allred	Dean	Kelly (IL)
Auchincloss	DeFazio	Khanna
Axne	DeGette	Kildee
Barragán	DeLauro	Kilmer
Bass	DelBene	Kim (NJ)
Beatty	Delgado	Kind
Bera	Demings	Kinzinger
Beyer	DeSaunier	Kirkpatrick
Bishop (GA)	Deutch	Krishnamoorthi
Blumenauer	Dingell	Kuster
Blunt Rochester	Doggett	Lamb
Bonamici	Doyle, Michael	Langevin
Bourdeaux	F.	Larsen (WA)
Bowman	Escobar	Larson (CT)
Boyle, Brendan	Eshoo	Lawrence
F.	Españat	Lawson (FL)
Brown	Evans	Lee (CA)
Brownley	Fletcher	Lee (NV)
Bush	Poster	Leger Fernandez
Bustos	Frankel, Lois	Levin (CA)
Butterfield	Gallego	Levin (MI)
Carbajal	Garamendi	Lieu
Cárdenas	Garcia (IL)	Lofgren
Carson	Garcia (TX)	Lowenthal
Carter (LA)	Golden	Luria
Cartwright	Gomez	Lynch
Case	Gonzalez,	Malinowski
Casten	Vicente	Maloney,
Castor (FL)	Gottheimer	Carolyn B.
Castro (TX)	Green, Al (TX)	Maloney, Sean
Cheney	Grijalva	Manning
Chu	Harder (CA)	Matsui
Cicilline	Hayes	McBath
Clark (MA)	Higgins (NY)	McCollum
Clarke (NY)	Himes	McEachin
Cleaver	Horsford	McGovern
Clyburn	Houlahan	McNerney
Cohen	Hoyer	Meeks
Connolly	Huffman	Meng
Cooper	Jackson Lee	Mfume
Correa	Jacobs (CA)	Moore (WI)
Costa	Jayapal	Morelle
Courtney	Jeffries	Moulton
Craig	Johnson (GA)	Mrvan
Crist	Johnson (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Crow	Jones	Nadler
Cuellar	Kahele	Napolitano

Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger

Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suoizzi
Swalwell

NAYS—205

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Hill
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs

Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyn
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyn
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—5

Lamborn Reed Westerman
Pence Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1430

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 328.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Brown)	Khanna	Payne (Pallone)
Burgess (Lucas)	(Bowman)	Rodgers (WA)
Cooper (Clark)	Kirkpatrick	(Joyce (PA))
(MA))	(Stanton)	Rush
DeFazio (Brown)	Lawson (FL)	(Underwood)
Frankel, Lois	(Evans)	Salazar
(Clark (MA))	Lynch (Trahan)	(Cammack)
Garcia (TX)	Meng (Jeffries)	Sires (Pallone)
(Escobar)	Moore (WI)	Tlaib (Omar)
Hice (GA)	(Beyer)	Wasserman
(Greene (GA))	Napolitano	Schultz (Soto)
Huffman	(Correa)	Wilson (FL)
(Stanton)	Ocasio-Cortez	(Hayes)
	(Escobar)	

RECOMMENDING THAT THE HOUSE FIND STEPHEN K. BANNON IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, by the direction of the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol, I call up the report (H. Rept. 117-152) and accompanying resolution recommending that the House of Representatives find Stephen K. Bannon in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena duly issued by the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol.

The Clerk read the title of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 727, the report is considered read.

The text of the report is as follows:

The Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol, having considered this Report, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the Report be approved.

The form of the Resolution that the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol would recommend to the House of Representatives for citing Stephen K. Bannon for contempt of Congress pursuant to this Report is as follows:

Resolved, That Stephen K. Bannon shall be found to be in contempt of Congress for failure to comply with a congressional subpoena.

Resolved, That pursuant to 2 U.S.C. §§192 and 194, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall certify the report of the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol, detailing the refusal of Stephen K. Bannon to produce documents or appear for a deposition before the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol as directed by subpoena, to

the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that Mr. Bannon be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House shall otherwise take all appropriate action to enforce the subpoena.

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

On January 6, 2021, a violent mob breached the security perimeter of the United States Capitol, assaulted and injured scores of police officers, engaged in hand-to-hand violence with those officers over an extended period, and invaded and occupied the Capitol building, all in an effort to halt the lawful counting of electoral votes and reverse the results of the 2020 election. In the words of many of those who participated in the violence, the attack was a direct response to false statements by then-President Donald J. Trump—beginning on election night 2020 and continuing through January 6, 2021—that the 2020 election had been stolen by corrupted voting machines, widespread fraud, and otherwise.

In response, the House adopted House Resolution 503 on June 30, 2021, establishing the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol (hereinafter referred to as the “Select Committee”).

The Select Committee is investigating the facts, circumstances, and causes of the January 6th attack and issues relating to the peaceful transfer of power, in order to identify how the events of January 6th were planned, what actions and statements motivated and contributed to the attack on the Capitol, how the violent riot that day was coordinated with a political and public relations strategy to reverse the election outcome, and why Capitol security was insufficient to address what occurred. The Select Committee will evaluate all facets of these issues, create a public record of what occurred, and recommend to the House, and its relevant committees, corrective laws, policies, procedures, rules, or regulations.

According to many published reports, and his own public statements, Stephen K. Bannon had specific knowledge about the events planned for January 6th before they occurred. He said on his January 5th podcasts, for example:

It's not going to happen like you think it's going to happen. OK, it's going to be quite extraordinarily different. All I can say is, strap in. [. . .] You made this happen and tomorrow it's game day. So strap in. Let's get ready.

All hell is going to break loose tomorrow. [. . .] So many people said, ‘Man, if I was in a revolution, I would be in Washington.’ Well, this is your time in history.

Mr. Bannon appears to have had multiple roles relevant to this investigation, including his role in constructing and participating in the “stop the steal” public relations effort that motivated the attack, his efforts to plan political and other activity in advance of January 6th, and his participation in the events of that day from a “war room” organized at the Willard InterContinental Washington D.C. Hotel (the “Willard Hotel”). Although he was a private citizen not employed by the White House at the time, he reportedly spoke with Mr. Trump directly regarding the plans for January 6th on at least one occasion. In short, Mr. Bannon appears to have played a multi-faceted role in the events of January 6th, and the American people are entitled to hear his first-hand testimony regarding his actions. The Select Committee expects that such testimony will be directly relevant to its report and recommendations for legislative and other action.

On September 23, 2021, Chairman BENNIE G. THOMPSON signed a subpoena for documents and testimony and transmitted it along with a cover letter and schedule to counsel for Mr. Bannon, who accepted service on Mr. Bannon's behalf on September 24, 2021. The subpoena required that Mr. Bannon produce responsive documents not later than October 7, 2021, and that Mr. Bannon appear for a deposition on October 14, 2021. Subsequent communications between counsel for Mr. Bannon and Chairman THOMPSON, however, failed to reach any accommodation for Mr. Bannon's appearance for testimony or production of documents. Indeed, counsel for Mr. Bannon on October 7, 2021, flatly stated that Mr. Bannon would not produce any documents or appear at the scheduled deposition, as ordered by the lawful subpoena. Although Mr. Bannon's counsel referenced vague claims of executive privilege purportedly relayed by the former President, no such claims have been presented by the former President to the Select Committee. And although the Select Committee is confident that such claims could not bar any of its requests, there is no conceivable executive privilege claim that could bar *all* of the Select Committee's requests or justify Mr. Bannon's flat refusal to appear for the required deposition. The Chairman's October 8, 2021, response addressed the legal arguments raised by Mr. Bannon's counsel and made clear that the Select Committee expected—as the law demands—that Mr. Bannon appear before the Select Committee at his deposition and raise any privilege or other concerns regarding specific questions on the record of that proceeding.

The contempt of Congress statute, 2 U.S.C. §192, makes clear that a witness summoned before Congress must appear or be “deemed guilty of a misdemeanor” punishable by a fine of up to \$100,000 and imprisonment for up to 1 year. Further, the Supreme Court in *United States v. Bryan* (1950) emphasized that the subpoena power is a “public duty, which every person within the jurisdiction of the Government is bound to perform when properly summoned.” The Supreme Court recently reinforced this clear obligation by stating that “[w]hen Congress seeks information needed for intelligent legislative action, it unquestionably remains the duty of all citizens to cooperate.”

Mr. Bannon did not produce documents by the subpoena's October 7, 2021, deadline nor did he appear for a deposition scheduled for October 14, 2021, as ordered by the subpoena and in contravention of the clear instructions by the Select Committee Chairman on October 8, 2021, to appear at the deposition and raise any privilege concerns in response to specific questions on the record. Mr. Bannon's refusal to comply with the Select Committee's subpoena *in any way* represents willful default under the law and warrants contempt of Congress and referral to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia for prosecution as prescribed by law. The denial of the information sought by the subpoena impairs Congress's central powers under the United States Constitution.

BACKGROUND ON THE SELECT COMMITTEE'S INVESTIGATION

House Resolution 503 sets out the specific purposes of the Select Committee, including: to investigate and report upon the facts, circumstances, and causes “relating to the January 6, 2021, domestic terrorist attack upon the United States Capitol Complex”;

to investigate and report upon the facts, circumstances, and causes “relating to the interference with the peaceful transfer of power”;

to investigate and report upon the facts, circumstances, and causes relating to “the

influencing factors that fomented such an attack on American representative democracy while engaged in a constitutional process.”

The Supreme Court has long recognized Congress’s oversight role. “The power of the Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process.” Indeed, Congress’s ability to enforce its investigatory power “is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function.” “Absent such a power, a legislative body could not ‘wisely or effectively’ evaluate those conditions ‘which the legislation is intended to affect or change.’”

The oversight powers of House and Senate committees are also codified in legislation. For example, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 directed committees to “exercise continuous watchfulness” over the executive branch’s implementation of programs within its jurisdictions, and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 authorized committees to “review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, and execution” of laws.

Pursuant to House rule XI and House Resolution 503, the Select Committee is authorized “to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it considers necessary.” Further, section 5(c)(4) of House Resolution 503 provides that the Chairman of the Select Committee may “authorize and issue subpoenas pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI in the investigation and study” conducted pursuant to the enumerated purposes and functions of the Select Committee. The Select Committee’s authorizing resolution further states that the Chairman “may order the taking of depositions, including pursuant to subpoena, by a Member or counsel of the Select Committee, in the same manner as a standing committee pursuant to section 3(b)(1) of House Resolution 8, One Hundred Seventeenth Congress.”

A. The Select Committee seeks information from Mr. Bannon central to its investigative purposes

Mr. Bannon’s testimony and document production are critical to the Select Committee’s investigation. Among other topics, the Select Committee seeks facts that explain why the events of January 6th turned violent. Statements publicly made by Mr. Bannon on January 5, 2021, suggest that he had some foreknowledge about extreme events that would occur the next day. Mr. Bannon noted on January 5th that the country was facing a “constitutional crisis” and “that crisis is about to go up about five orders of magnitude tomorrow.” He also stated that, “All hell is going to break loose tomorrow. [. . .] It’s not going to happen like you think it’s going to happen. OK, it’s going to be quite extraordinarily different.” Congress, through the Select Committee, is entitled to discover facts concerning the activities leading up to the violence on January 6th. Under House Resolution 503, the Select Committee is directed to investigate those facts, which include “the influencing factors that fomented such an attack.” And after making public statements on January 5th like those quoted above, Mr. Bannon is obliged by law to comply with the reasonable requests of the Select Committee through its subpoena. If any witness so close to the events leading up to the January 6th attack could decline to provide information to the Select Committee, Congress would be severely hamstrung in its ability to exercise its constitutional powers with highly relevant information informing its choices. Information in Mr. Bannon’s possession is es-

sential to putting other witnesses’ testimony and productions into appropriate context and to ensuring the Select Committee can fully and expeditiously complete its work.

Mr. Bannon was the Chief Executive Officer of Mr. Trump’s 2016 presidential campaign and served as then-President Trump’s chief strategist, a White House position, for 8 months in 2017. Mr. Trump fired Mr. Bannon in August 2017, and Mr. Bannon did not thereafter hold a position in the executive branch.

After Mr. Bannon left government service, he remained actively involved in media and politics. In October 2019, Mr. Bannon began a radio show and podcast focused on rallying supporters of Mr. Trump in support of various causes and issues. According to one report, before the election even occurred in 2020, Mr. Bannon made public efforts to explain “his belief that the Democrats are plotting to steal the 2020 election.” One account of conversations involving Mr. Bannon (and Mr. Trump) prior to January 6th describes Mr. Bannon as encouraging Mr. Trump to “focus on January 6th” and articulating a plan to have millions of Americans consider Mr. Biden an illegitimate President. That same reporting suggests that Mr. Bannon was in frequent contact with the White House in late-December and early-January and spoke directly with the President several times. Mr. Bannon is reported to have urged then-President Trump to pressure then-Vice President Michael R. Pence to assist in overturning the results of the 2020 election.

Mr. Bannon was reportedly encouraging President Trump’s supporters to take dramatic action. According to one report, immediately after the November 3rd election, Mr. Bannon began promoting false conspiracy claims that the election had been stolen and referred to the election as “a mass fraud.”

The day before the January 6th attack on the Capitol, Mr. Bannon predicted that “All hell is going to break loose tomorrow.” He told the listeners of his radio show:

It’s not going to happen like you think it’s going to happen. OK, it’s going to be quite extraordinarily different. All I can say is, strap in. [. . .] You made this happen and tomorrow it’s game day. So strap in. Let’s get ready.

He added:

So many people said, “Man, if I was in a revolution, I would be in Washington.” Well, this is your time in history.²⁶

And:

It’s all converging, and now we’re on the point of attack tomorrow.²⁷

Public reporting also suggests that Mr. Bannon was among several prominent supporters of efforts to undermine the election results who gathered at the Willard Hotel, two blocks from the White House, on the days surrounding the January 6th attack.²⁸ The group that assembled at the Willard Hotel is reported to have included members of the Trump campaign’s legal team (including Rudolph Giuliani and John Eastman), several prominent proponents of false election fraud claims that had been promoted by Mr. Trump (e.g., Russell Ramsland, Jr. and Boris Epshteyn), as well as Roger Stone, who left the hotel with Oath Keeper bodyguards, and campaign spokesman Jason Miller.²⁹ It has been reported that the participants in the meetings at the Willard Hotel discussed plans to stop or delay the January 6th counting of the election results and persuade Members of Congress to block the electoral count.³⁰

Mr. Bannon’s statements the day before the January 6th attack, and his association

with both the Trump inner circle and outside groups involved in the “Stop the Steal”³¹ events, make his testimony about the Willard Hotel meetings essential to fully understanding and establishing responsibility for the events of January 6th. In addition to the indications noted above regarding Mr. Bannon’s role in various activities leading up to January 6th, he also reportedly spoke directly to Mr. Trump on one or more occasions regarding what could or should happen on January 6th.³²

B. Mr. Bannon’s refusal to comply with the Select Committee’s subpoena for testimony and documents

On September 23, 2021, Chairman THOMPSON signed and transmitted a subpoena, cover letter, and schedule to Mr. Bannon ordering the production of both documents and testimony relevant to the Select Committee’s investigation into “important activities that led to and informed the events at the Capitol on January 6, 2021.”³³ Chairman THOMPSON’s letter identified public reports describing Mr. Bannon’s activities and past statements, documenting some of the public information that gave the Select Committee reason to believe Mr. Bannon possesses information about matters within the scope of the Select Committee’s inquiry.

The specific documents requested are found in the schedule in the Appendix, Exhibit 1, (pp. 4-5). The schedule included with the subpoena addressed topics including but not limited to Mr. Bannon’s role in planning and promoting the January 6, 2021, rally and march in support of Mr. Trump; Mr. Trump’s participation in the rally and march; Mr. Bannon’s podcast and its use for promoting the rally and march; and Mr. Bannon’s strategic communications with a host of individuals known to be involved with the former President’s 2020 election campaign and subsequent efforts to undermine or cast doubt on the results of that election.

The subpoena required Mr. Bannon to produce the requested documents to the Select Committee on October 7, 2021, at 10 a.m. and required Mr. Bannon’s presence for the taking of testimony on October 14, 2021, at 10 a.m.³⁴ Mr. Bannon had designated Robert J. Costello as his attorney for the purposes of the Select Committee’s inquiry, and Mr. Costello accepted service of the subpoena on behalf of Mr. Bannon on September 24, 2021.³⁵

On October 7, 2021, at 10 a.m., at the designated location identified in the subpoena, Mr. Bannon failed to appear and produce documents. Instead, over 7 hours later, Mr. Costello sent a letter to Chairman THOMPSON via email at 5:04 p.m. reinforcing Mr. Bannon’s refusal to comply.

Mr. Costello’s letter cited an October 6, 2021, letter from former President Trump’s counsel Justin Clark to Mr. Costello that purportedly instructed Mr. Bannon to “invoke any immunities and privileges he may have from compelled testimony,” “not produce any documents concerning privileged material,” and “not provide any testimony concerning privileged material[.]”³⁶ Mr. Costello’s letter then asserted that Mr. Bannon was “legally unable to comply,” with the subpoena for “documents or testimony,” claiming to rely on the instructions of Mr. Trump to not disclose privileged information.³⁷ The two-page letter contained only conclusory statements, no legal analysis, and approximately half of it purported to quote from the letter of October 6, 2021, from the counsel to Mr. Trump.

On October 8, 2021, Chairman THOMPSON responded to Mr. Costello’s October 7, 2021, letter.³⁸ He said that Mr. Trump had not communicated an invocation of privilege either formally or informally to the Select Committee. He further stated that, regardless,

the information the Select Committee seeks from Mr. Bannon concerns his actions as a private citizen and involves a range of subjects not even conceivably reached by any executive privilege assertion. Chairman THOMPSON also noted that—even assuming Mr. Bannon were correct that a privilege applied to his documents and testimony and Mr. Trump had formally invoked a privilege through the long-standing practice of consultation with the current President (which is not the case)—Mr. Bannon does not enjoy anything like the type of absolute immunity his attorney suggested would insulate Mr. Bannon from an obligation to comply with the Select Committee's subpoena. Again, there is no conceivable legal claim to support such an assertion.

The Chairman underscored that Mr. Bannon remained obligated to produce documents and testimony about all non-privileged material that was responsive to the subpoena, was expected to produce a privilege log identifying any documents being withheld based on any specific privilege claims, and that the Select Committee expected Mr. Bannon to appear at the deposition on October 14th and state on the record any privilege concerns raised by specific questions. As made clear by the deposition rules provided to Mr. Bannon by the Select Committee, under House deposition regulation 3, Mr. Bannon may be accompanied at the deposition by a personal, nongovernmental counsel to advise him of his rights.³⁹

The Chairman concluded by saying that Mr. Bannon was therefore not in compliance with the Chairman's duly issued subpoena for documents, and that the Select Committee would view refusal to produce documents and refusal to appear at the October 14th deposition as willful non-compliance with the subpoena. The Chairman warned that this willful non-compliance would put Mr. Bannon in jeopardy of a vote to refer him to the House to consider a criminal contempt referral to a U.S. Attorney pursuant to 2 U.S.C. §§ 192 and 194.⁴⁰

On October 13, 2021, at approximately 12:35 p.m., Select Committee staff emailed Mr. Costello to discuss logistics for the deposition at which Mr. Bannon was compelled to appear on October 14, 2021, at 10 a.m. Approximately an hour later, Select Committee staff and Mr. Costello spoke on the telephone, during which Mr. Costello informed the Select Committee that Mr. Bannon would not appear the next day, and that a letter to that effect was forthcoming. Mr. Costello indicated that he was in contact with Mr. Trump's attorney, and he had informed Mr. Trump's attorney of the Select Committee's explanation of the deficiencies in Mr. Bannon's and Mr. Trump's justifications for Mr. Bannon's defiance of the subpoena.

On that call, Mr. Costello represented to the Select Committee that he had asked Mr. Trump's counsel to identify, with specificity, communications for which executive privilege would apply. Later that day, Mr. Costello transmitted a response to Chairman THOMPSON's October 8, 2021, letter. In that letter, Mr. Costello reiterated his position that Mr. Bannon's refusal to comply with the Select Committee subpoena was based on the former President's "executive and other privileges."⁴¹ Mr. Costello claimed that President Trump's counsel had "exercis[ed] his executive privilege" and "directed Mr. Bannon not to produce documents or testify until the issue of executive privilege is resolved."⁴² He further stated that Mr. Bannon would refuse to produce any documents or appear for testimony until after a court had ruled on, or former President Trump and the Select Committee reached an agreement on, the matter of executive privilege that the

former President had never actually communicated to the Select Committee. In defiance of the clear instructions by the Select Committee to appear at the deposition and state any privilege concerns as they applied to specific questions, Mr. Bannon refused to appear to make any objections in person. Further, he refused to engage at all with the specifics of the document demands, including failing to provide a privilege log identifying any privilege claims regarding specific documents.

On October 14, 2021, at 10 a.m., Mr. Bannon failed to appear at the designated location to provide testimony relevant to the Select Committee's inquiry in response to questions posed, as was required by the subpoena.⁴³

At 2:05 p.m. on October 15, 2021, Chairman THOMPSON sent a letter to Mr. Costello noting that Mr. Bannon had not even attempted to provide the Select Committee any explanation for refusing to comply with the Select Committee's demand for documents and testimony on a range of subjects that do not involve communications with the former President. The Chairman also reiterated that Mr. Bannon does not enjoy absolute immunity from testifying before the Select Committee. The Chairman reminded Mr. Costello that the Select Committee views Mr. Bannon's conduct as willful non-compliance with the subpoena. He notified Mr. Costello that, accordingly, the Select Committee would meet on October 19, 2021, to consider a criminal contempt referral for Mr. Bannon, and invited Mr. Costello to submit any written materials he believed the Select Committee should consider in its deliberations on this referral.

On October 18, 2021, Mr. Costello wrote Chairman Thompson requesting a "one-week adjournment of our response" to the Chairman's October 15th letter, citing the need to "assess" litigation Mr. Trump filed on October 18, 2021, concerning the Select Committee's request for documents from the National Archives.⁴⁴ The Chairman replied on October 19, 2021, that Mr. Trump's lawsuit was immaterial to the Select Committee's subpoena to Mr. Bannon, and accordingly, no grounds existed for any further delay in Mr. Bannon's compliance with the subpoena.⁴⁵

C. Mr. Bannon's purported basis for non-compliance is wholly without merit

Mr. Bannon has relied on no legal authority to support his refusal to comply in any fashion with the subpoena. Mr. Bannon's refusal to comply with the subpoena is ostensibly based on his decision to "honor [former President Trump's] invocation of executive privilege" and instruction that, "to the fullest extent permitted by law," Mr. Bannon "invoke any immunities and privileges he may have from compelled testimony," "not produce any documents concerning privileged material," and "not provide any testimony concerning privileged material."⁴⁶ Far from being "permitted by law," Mr. Bannon's conduct in response to the Select Committee's subpoena constitutes a violation of the contempt of Congress statutory provisions.

1. Executive privilege has not been invoked

Mr. Trump has had no communication with the Select Committee. In an October 7th letter to the Select Committee, Mr. Bannon's attorney referred to purported correspondence from Mr. Trump's attorney, Justin Clark, in which Mr. Clark asserted that the Select Committee subpoena seeks information that is "potentially protected from disclosure by executive and other privileges, including among others the presidential communications, deliberative process, and attorney-client privileges."⁴⁷ According to Mr. Bannon's attorney, Mr. Clark also stated that, "President Trump is pre-

pared to defend these fundamental privileges in court."⁴⁸

In *United States v. Reynolds*, 345 U.S. 1, 7-8 (1953), the Supreme Court held that executive privilege:

[B]elongs to the Government and must be asserted by it; it can neither be claimed nor waived by a private party. It is not to be lightly invoked. There must be a formal claim of privilege, lodged by the head of the department which has control over the matter, after actual personal consideration by that officer.⁴⁹

Here, the Select Committee has not been provided with any formal invocation of executive privilege by the President, the former President,⁵⁰ or any other employee of the executive branch.

In fact, in an October 18, 2021, letter to Mr. Bannon's attorney, the White House Counsel's Office specifically stated that "at this point we are not aware of any basis for [Mr. Bannon's] refusal to appear for a deposition." The letter also informed Mr. Bannon's counsel that:

[P]resident Biden determined that an assertion of executive privilege is not justified with respect to a set of documents shedding light on events within the White House on and about January 6, 2021, and with respect to documents and testimony concerning the former President's efforts to use the Department of Justice to advance a false narrative that the 2020 election was tainted by widespread fraud. President Biden's determination that an assertion of privilege is not justified with respect to these subjects applies to [Mr. Bannon's] deposition testimony and to any documents [Mr. Bannon] may possess concerning either subject.⁵¹

With respect to the former President, the Select Committee has not received a formal invocation of executive privilege. Mr. Costello's October 13th letter merely states that the attorney for former President Trump had informed him that "President Trump is exercising his executive privilege." This third-hand, non-specific assertion of privilege, without any description of the documents or testimony over which privilege is claimed, is insufficient to activate a claim of executive privilege.

2. *Even assuming an invocation of executive privilege (which is not justified here), assertion of privilege could not bar the Select Committee from lawfully obtaining the documents and testimony it seeks from Mr. Bannon*

The Select Committee seeks information from Mr. Bannon on a wide range of subjects that it is inconceivable executive privilege would reach. Mr. Bannon was a private citizen during the relevant time period and the testimony and documents the Select Committee is demanding do not concern discussion of official government matters with the President and his immediate advisors. The law is clear that executive privilege does not extend to discussions between the President and private citizens relating to non-governmental business or among private citizens. In *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683, 708 (1974), the Supreme Court recognized a qualified, presumptive privilege for presidential communications. The scope of the so-called "presidential communications privilege" was further defined by the Court to apply only to "communications in performance of [a President's] responsibilities of his office and made in the process of shaping policies and making decisions."⁵²

In *In re Sealed Case (Espy)*, 121 F.3d 729, 752 (D.C. Cir. 1997), the DC Circuit extended the presidential communications privilege to "communications authored or solicited and received by those members of an immediate

White House adviser's staff who have broad and significant responsibility for investigating and formulating the advice to be given the President on the particular matter to which the communications relate." The court stressed that the privilege only applies to communications intended to advise the President "on official government matters."⁵³ In *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Department of Justice*, 365 F.3d 1108, 1123 (D.C. Cir. 2004), the court reaffirmed that the presidential communications privilege applies only to documents "solicited and received by the President or his immediate advisers in the Office of the President." Relying on *In re Sealed Case* and the principle that "the presidential communications privilege should be construed as narrowly as is consistent with ensuring that the confidentiality of the President's decision-making process is adequately protected,"⁵⁴ the court refused to extend the privilege even to executive branch employees whose sole function was to provide advice to the President in the performance of a "quintessential and nondelegable Presidential power."⁵⁵

Here, neither Mr. Bannon nor former President Trump has asserted that Mr. Bannon's testimony would reveal communications involving the President or members of his immediate White House staff regarding the performance of the President's responsibilities of his office. At no point during the time period under investigation by the Select Committee was Mr. Bannon a government employee, much less a key White House adviser in the Office of the President. Moreover, the matters under review by the Select Committee concern efforts to overturn legitimate election results and an attack on our democratic institutions. Communications regarding these subjects (or any other matter related to the presidential campaign), by definition, would not constitute advice on "official government matters" that could be shielded by executive privilege. In any event, any confidentiality interest in such communications would be far outweighed by the oversight needs for this information that are at stake in the Select Committee's investigation.

In sum: In this instance, there is no reasonable argument that Mr. Bannon's communications with the President regarding January 6th are the type of matters on which privilege can be asserted. Also, the Select Committee is confident that no executive privilege assertion would bar Mr. Bannon's testimony regarding his communications directly with the President regarding January 6th—because the privilege is qualified and could be overcome by an appropriate showing of need. Again, there is no conceivable assertion that privilege could apply to other information sought that does not constitute communications with Mr. Trump during his presidency. Beyond communications between Mr. Bannon and Mr. Trump, the Select Committee seeks documents and testimony from Mr. Bannon regarding his own actions and interactions with other private citizens relating to the events of January 6th. For example, the subpoena to Mr. Bannon includes requests for documents related to many other matters, including:

His presence, purpose, statements, and activities at a meeting with Members of Congress at the Willard Hotel on January 5, 2021, or the presence, purpose, statements, or activities of others in attendance related to that meeting.

Anyone with whom he communicated by any means with respect to any aspect of the planning, objectives, conduct, or participation in the January 6, 2021, rally, including but not limited to Boris Epshteyn.

Anyone with whom he communicated with respect to efforts, plans, or proposals to con-

test the 2020 presidential election results or delay, influence, or impeded the electoral count, including but not limited to communications with Boris Epshteyn, Kashyap Patel, and Ezra Cohen-Watnick.

All public relations, advertising, or other communications efforts to persuade Americans that the election was stolen.

The January 6, 2021, rally on The Mall and Capitol grounds in Washington, DC, in support of President Donald J. Trump and opposition to the counting of the results of the 2020 presidential election, including its permitting, planning, objectives, financing, and conduct, as well as any communications to or from any person or group involved in organizing or planning for the January 6, 2021, rally.

The financing or fundraising to assist any individual's or organization's travel to or accommodation in Washington, DC, to attend or participate in the January 6, 2021, rally.

The "War Room" podcast, insofar as at any time he communicated through it statements referring or relating to the January 6, 2021, rally, including all statements concerning its planning, objectives, purpose, organization, message, or sponsorship.

The organization or group named "March for Trump" and its activities relating to the January 6, 2021, rally, including any communications Mr. Bannon had with any officer or member of "March for Trump" relating in any way to the planning, objectives, organization, message, sponsorship, and participation in the January 6, 2021, rally.

No colorable claim of executive privilege could possibly be made with respect to documents or testimony related to these and other matters sought by the subpoena, or any other topics that were not connected to official decisionmaking by the President.

3. Mr. Bannon is not entitled to absolute immunity

Mr. Bannon has refused to provide any responsive documents or appear for a deposition based on his asserted reliance on Mr. Trump's purported invocation of executive privilege. However, even if Mr. Trump had invoked executive privilege, and even if certain testimony or documents would fall within that privilege, Mr. Bannon would not be immune from compelled testimony before the Select Committee.

The law is clear that even senior White House aides who advise the President on official government business are not immune from compelled congressional process. To the extent there has been a formal invocation of executive privilege by the Office of the President, and in the unlikely event that testimony by Mr. Bannon relates to information covered by that privilege, Mr. Bannon was nonetheless required to appear before the Select Committee to provide testimony and invoke executive privilege where appropriate. If there are responsive documents that Mr. Bannon claims include privileged information, he was required to provide the Select Committee with a privilege log that "identifies and describes the material in a manner 'sufficient to enable resolution of any privilege claims.'" Mr. Bannon did neither. He should be held in contempt.

D. Precedent supports the Select Committee's position to proceed with holding Mr. Bannon in contempt

An individual who fails or refuses to comply with a House subpoena may be cited for contempt of Congress. Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. § 192, the willful refusal to comply with a congressional subpoena is punishable by a fine of up to \$100,000 and imprisonment for up to 1 year. A committee may vote to seek a contempt citation against a recalcitrant witness. This action is then reported to the House. If a resolution to that end is adopted

by the House, the matter is referred to a U.S. Attorney, who has a duty to refer the matter to a grand jury for an indictment.

In his October 8th letter to Mr. Bannon's counsel, the Chairman of the Select Committee advised Mr. Bannon that his claims of executive privilege were not well-founded and did not absolve him of his obligation to produce documents and testify in deposition. The Chairman made clear that the Select Committee expected Mr. Bannon to appear for his scheduled deposition on October 14th and produce the requested documents at that time. The Chairman warned Mr. Bannon that his continued non-compliance would put him in jeopardy of a vote to refer him to the House to consider a criminal contempt referral. Mr. Bannon's failure to appear for deposition or produce responsive documents in the face of this clear advisement and warning by the Chairman constitutes a willful failure to comply with the subpoena.

SELECT COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The Select Committee met on Tuesday, October 19, 2021, with a quorum being present, to consider this Report and ordered it and the Resolution contained herein to be favorably reported to the House, with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 9 ayes to 0 noes.

SELECT COMMITTEE VOTES

Clause 3(b) of rule XIII requires the Select Committee to list the recorded votes during consideration of this Report:

1. A motion by Vice Chair CHENEY to report the Select Committee Report for a Resolution Recommending that the House of Representatives find Stephen K. Bannon in Contempt of Congress for Refusal to Comply with a Subpoena Duly Issued by the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol favorably to the House, as amended, was agreed to by a recorded vote of 9 ayes to 0 noes (Rollcall No. 1).

Select Committee Rollcall No. 1

(Motion by Vice Chair Cheney to Favorably Report, as Amended)
(Agreed to: 9 ayes to 0 noes)

Members	Vote
Ms. Cheney, Vice Chair	Aye
Ms. Lofgren	Aye
Mr. Schiff	Aye
Mr. Aguilar	Aye
Mrs. Murphy (FL)	Aye
Mr. Raskin	Aye
Mrs. Luria	Aye
Mr. Kinzinger	Aye
Mr. Thompson (MS), Chairman	Aye

SELECT COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

In compliance with clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII, the Select Committee advises that the oversight findings and recommendations of the Select Committee are incorporated in the descriptive portions of this Report.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE

The Select Committee finds the requirements of clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and the requirements of clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII and section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, to be inapplicable to this Report. Accordingly, the Select Committee did not request or receive a cost estimate from the Congressional Budget Office and makes no findings as to the budgetary impacts of this Report or costs incurred to carry out the Report.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII, the objective of this Report is to enforce the Select Committee's authority to investigate the facts, circumstances, and causes of the

January 6th attack and issues relating to the peaceful transfer of power, in order to identify and evaluate problems and to recommend corrective laws, policies, procedures, rules, or regulations; and to enforce the Select Committee's subpoena authority found in section 5(c)(4) of House Resolution 503.

ENDNOTES

1. Steve Bannon, "War Room: Pandemic, 'EP 634—Tuesday Special (with Maggie VandenBerghe, Ben Berquam, and Peter Navarro)," (Jan. 5, 2021), available at <https://rumble.com/vch0pu-ep-634-tuesday-special-w-maggie-vandenbergh-ben-berquam-and-peter-navarro.html>.
2. Aaron Blake, "Who could have predicted the Capitol riot? Plenty of people—including Trump allies," *Washington Post*, (Jan. 28, 2021), available at <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/01/28/who-could-have-predicted-capitol-siege-plenty-people/>.
3. See Appendix, Exs. 1, 2 (Subpoena from Chairman BENNIE G. THOMPSON to Stephen K. Bannon and attachments (Sept. 23, 2021)).
4. See Appendix, Ex. 3 (Letter from Robert J. Costello to Chairman BENNIE G. THOMPSON (Oct. 7, 2021)).
5. See Appendix, Ex. 4 (Letter from Chairman BENNIE G. THOMPSON to Robert J. Costello (Oct. 8, 2021)).
6. The prison term for this offense makes it a Class A misdemeanor. 18 U.S.C. § 3559(a)(6). By that classification, the penalty for contempt of Congress specified in 2 U.S.C. § 192 increased from \$1,000 to \$100,000. 18 U.S.C. § 3571(b)(5).
7. *United States v. Bryan*, 339 U.S. 323, 331 (1950).
8. *Trump v. Mazars USA LLP*, 140 S.Ct. 2019, 2036 (2020) (emphasis in original; internal quotation marks removed). See also *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178, 187–88 (1957) (stating of citizens that "It is their unremitting obligation to respond to subpoenas, to respect the dignity of the Congress and its committees, and to testify fully with respect to matters within the province of proper investigation.").
9. *Mazars*, 140 S.Ct. at 2031 (2020) (citing *Watkins*, 354 U.S. at 187) (internal quotation marks removed).
10. *Mazars*, 140 S.Ct. at 2031 (2020) (citing *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 174 (1927)).
11. *Ashland Oil, Inc. v. FTC*, 409 F.Supp. 297, 305 (D.D.C. 1976), aff'd, 548 F.2d 977 (D.C.Cir. 1976) (quoting *McGrain*, 273 U.S. at 175).
12. Pub. L. 79–601, 79th Cong. § 136, (1946).
13. Pub. L. 91–510, 91st Cong. § 118, (1970).
14. Steve Bannon, "War Room: Pandemic, 'EP 634—Tuesday Special (with Maggie VandenBerghe, Ben Berquam, and Peter Navarro)," (Jan. 5, 2021), available at <https://rumble.com/vch0pu-ep-634-tuesday-special-w-maggie-vandenbergh-ben-berquam-and-peter-navarro.html>.
15. *Id.*
16. Brian Bennett, "'You Got to Be the Last Guy He Talks To.' The Rise and Fall of Trump Adviser Steve Bannon," *Time*, (Aug. 21, 2020), available at <https://time.com/5882072/rise-and-fall-of-steve-bannon/>.
17. Jeff Mason and Steve Holland, "Trump fired adviser Bannon," *Reuters*, (Aug. 18, 2017), available at <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-bannon/trump-fires-adviser-bannon-idUSKCN1AY205>.
18. Daniel Lippman, "Steve Bannon launches radio show and podcast on impeachment," *Politico*, (Oct. 24, 2019), available at <https://www.politico.com/news/2019/10/22/steve-bannon-radio-show-podcast-impeachment-055167>.
19. E.g., KUSI Newsroom, "Steve Bannon explains how the Democrats are plotting to steal the 2020 election," KUSI, (Oct. 1, 2020), available at <https://www.kusi.com/steve-bannon-explains-how-the-democrats-are-plotting-to-steal-the-2020-election>.
20. Bob Woodward and Robert Costa, *Peril*, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2021), p. 207.
21. *Id.*, pp. 207, 233–234.
22. *Id.*, p. 207.
23. Rob Kuznia, et al., "Stop the Steal's massive disinformation campaign connected to Roger Stone," *CNN* (Nov. 14, 2020), available at <https://www.cnn.com/2020/11/13/business/stop-the-steal-disinformation-campaign-invs/index.html>.
24. Aaron Blake, "Who could have predicted the Capitol riot? Plenty of people—including Trump allies," *Washington Post*, (Jan. 28, 2021), available at <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/01/28/who-could-have-predicted-capitol-siege-plenty-people/>.
25. Steve Bannon, "War Room: Pandemic, 'EP 634—Tuesday Special (with Maggie VandenBerghe, Ben Berquam, and Peter Navarro)," (Jan. 5, 2021), available at <https://rumble.com/vch0pu-ep-634-tuesday-special-w-maggie-vandenbergh-ben-berquam-and-peter-navarro.html>.
26. Aaron Blake, "Who could have predicted the Capitol riot? Plenty of people—including Trump allies," *Washington Post*, (Jan. 28, 2021), available at <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/01/28/who-could-have-predicted-capitol-siege-plenty-people/>.
27. *Id.*
28. Woodward and Costa, pp. 233–234; Andre J. Ellington, "Steve Bannon Confirms His Involvement in January 6 Insurrection on 'War Room' Podcast," *Newsweek*, (Sept. 22, 2021), available at <https://www.newsweek.com/steve-bannon-confirms-his-involvement-january-6-insurrection-war-room-podcast-1631667>.
29. Woodward and Costa, pp. 233–234; Michael Wolff, "Donald Trump's January 6: The view from inside the Oval Office," *New York*, (June 28, 2021), available at <https://nymag.com/intelligencer/article/michael-wolff-landslide-final-days-trump-presidency-excerpt.html>; Seth Abramson (@SethAbramson), Twitter (June 12, 2021, 10:51 a.m.), <https://twitter.com/SethAbramson/status/1403726643722547200/photo/3>.
30. Woodward and Costa, p. 233.
31. There were a number of events organized to take place on January 5th and January 6th at which supporters of President Trump gathered, and made and heard speeches, in support of the position that Congress should not affirm that Joe Biden had won the 270 or more electoral college votes necessary to be elected President.
32. See, e.g., Woodward and Costa, p. 207.
33. See Appendix, Exs. 1, 2.
34. See Appendix, Ex. 1.
35. See Appendix, Ex. 2 (Emails between Select Committee staff and Robert J. Costello (Sept. 23–24, 2021)).
36. See Appendix, Ex. 3 (Letter from Robert J. Costello to Select Committee staff (Oct. 7, 2021)).
37. *Id.*
38. See Appendix, Ex. 4 (Letter from Chairman BENNIE G. THOMPSON to Robert J. Costello (Oct. 8, 2021)).
39. U.S. House of Representatives, "117th Congress Regulations for Use of Deposition Authority," 167 Cong. Rec., (Jan. 4, 2021), p. H41.
40. See Appendix, Ex. 4 (Letter from Chairman BENNIE G. THOMPSON to Robert J. Costello (Oct. 8, 2021)).
41. See Appendix, Ex. 5 (Letter from Robert J. Costello to Chairman BENNIE G. THOMPSON (Oct. 13, 2021)).
42. *Id.*
43. See Appendix.
44. Letter from Robert J. Costello to Chairman THOMPSON, (Oct. 18, 2021).
45. Letter from Chairman THOMPSON to Robert J. Costello, (Oct. 19, 2021).
46. See Appendix, Ex. 3 (Letter from Robert J. Costello to Select Committee staff (Oct. 7, 2021)).
47. *Id.*
48. *Id.*
49. See also *United States v. Burr*, 25 F. Cas. 187, 192 (CCD Va. 1807) (ruling that President Jefferson had to personally identify the passages he deemed confidential and could not leave this determination to the U.S. Attorney). In *Reynolds*, the Court addressed the "state secrets privilege," which can be viewed as a subset of executive privilege.
50. The Supreme Court has held that a former President may assert executive privilege on his own, but his claim should be given less weight than that of an incumbent President. *Nixon v. Administrator of General Services*, 433 U.S. 425, 451 (1977) (the "expectation of the confidentiality of executive communications thus has always been limited and subject to erosion over time after an administration leaves office"). The Supreme Court in *Nixon v. GSA* made note of the fact that neither President Ford nor President Carter supported former President Nixon's assertion of privilege, which, the Court said, "detracts from the weight of his contention [that the disclosure of the information at issue] impermissibly intrudes into the executive function and the needs of the Executive Branch." *Id.*, p. 449.
51. Letter to Robert J. Costello from Jonathan C. Su, Deputy Counsel to the President, (Oct. 18, 2021).
52. *Nixon v. Administrator of General Services*, 433 U.S. at 449 (internal citations and quotations omitted).
53. *Id.* (Italics added.)
54. *Id.*, p. 1116.
55. *Id.*, p. 1111. See also *Committee on the Judiciary v. Miers*, 558 F. Supp.2d 53, 100 (D.D.C. 2008) (privilege claimants acknowledged that executive privilege applies only to "a very small cadre of senior advisors").
56. See Appendix, Ex. 1.
57. See also *Committee on the Judiciary v. McGahn*, 415 F.Supp.3d 148, 214 (D.D.C. 2019) (and subsequent history) ("To make the point as plain as possible, it is clear to this Court for the reasons explained above that, with respect to senior-level presidential aides, absolute immunity from compelled congressional process simply does not exist."); *Committee on the Judiciary v. Miers*, 558 F. Supp.2d 53, 101 (D.D.C. 2008) (holding that White House counsel may not refuse to testify based on direction from the President that testimony will implicate executive privilege).
58. See *Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform v. Holder*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 200278 at *7 (D.D.C., Aug. 20, 2014) (quoting *Miers*, 558 F. Supp. 2d at 107).
59. *Eastland v. United States Servicemen's Fund*, 421 U.S. 491, 505, 515 (1975).
60. See *supra* note 6. The prison term for this offense makes it a Class A misdemeanor. 18 U.S.C. § 3559(a)(6). By that classification, the penalty for contempt of Congress specified in 2 U.S.C. § 192 increased from \$1,000 to \$100,000. 18 U.S.C. § 3571(b)(5).
61. See 2 U.S.C. § 192.

APPENDIX

The official transcript that memorialized Mr. Bannon's failure to appear at his deposition as ordered by subpoena, along with exhibits included in that record, is as follows:

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE
U.S. CAPITOL, U.S. HOUSE OF REP-
RESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, DC
DEPOSITION OF: STEPHEN K. BANNON
(NO-SHOW)

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2021
WASHINGTON, DC

The deposition in the above matter was
held in *** commencing at 10:00 a.m.

PRESENT: Representative SCHIFF.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVE-
STIGATE THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK
ON THE U.S. CAPITOL:

****, ****

Sean Tonolli, Senior Investigative Counsel

****, ****

****, ****

****, ****

****, ****

Mr. TONOLLI. So we are on the record.
Today is October 14, 2021. The time is 10:00
a.m. We are convened in *** for the depo-
sition of Stephen K. Bannon to be conducted
by the House Select Committee to Investi-
gate the January 6th Attack on the United
States Capitol.

My name is Sean Tonolli. I am the des-
ignated Select Committee staff counsel for
this proceeding. And I'd ask everyone else to
please go around the room and introduce
themselves.

****, ****,

****, ****,

****, ****,

****, ****,

****, ****,

Mr. TONOLLI. For the record, it is 10:01
a.m., and Mr. Bannon is not present. The per-
son transcribing this proceeding is the House
stenographer and notary public authorized
to administer oaths.

On September 23, 2021, Chairman BENNIE
THOMPSON issued a subpoena to Mr. Bannon
both to produce documents by October 7,
2021, and to testify at a deposition today, Oc-
tober 14, 2021, at 10:00 a.m.

The subpoena is in connection with the Se-
lect Committee's investigation into the
facts, circumstances, and causes of the Janu-
ary 6th attack and issues relating to the
peaceful transfer of power, in order to iden-
tify and evaluate lessons learned and to rec-
ommend to the House and its relevant com-
mittees corrective laws, policies, procedures,
rules, or regulations.

This inquiry includes examination of how
various individuals, to include Mr. Bannon,
and entities coordinated their activities
leading up to the events of January 6, 2021.
Mr. Bannon has not produced any documents
or appeared today to testify.

I will mark as exhibit 1 and enter into the
record the Select Committee's subpoena to
Mr. Bannon, included with which are the ma-
terials that accompanied the subpoena,
namely, a letter from the chairman, a docu-
ment scheduled with accompanying produc-
tion instructions, and a copy of the deposi-
tion rules.

SUBPOENA

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTA-
TIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA

Stephen K. Bannon
c/o Robert Costello, Esq., Davidson,
Huthcher and Citron, LLP
To

You are hereby commanded to be and ap-
pear before the Select Committee to Investi-
gate the January 6th Attack on the United
States Capitol of the House of Representa-
tives of the United States at the place, date,
and time specified below.

☒ to produce the things identified on the at-
tached schedule touching matters of inquiry
committed to said committee or sub-
committee; and you are not to depart with-
out leave of said committee or sub-
committee.

Place of production: * * *

Date: October 7, 2021 Time: 10:00 a.m.

☒ to testify at a deposition touching mat-
ters of inquiry committed to said committee
or subcommittee; and you are not to depart
without leave of said committee or sub-
committee.

Place of testimony: * * *

Date: October 14, 2021 Time: 10:00 a.m.

☐ to testify at a hearing touching matters
of inquiry committed to said committee or
subcommittee; and you are not to depart
without leave of said committee or sub-
committee.

Place of testimony: _____

Date: _____ Time: _____

To any authorized staff member or the
United States Marshals Service
_____ to serve and make return.

Witness my hand and the seal of the
House of Representatives of the United
States, at the city of Washington, D.C. this
23rd day of September, 2021.

BENNIE G. THOMPSON

Chairman or Authorized Member.

Attest:

CHERYL L. JOHNSON

Clerk.

PROOF OF SERVICE

Subpoena for Stephen K. Bannon

c/o Robert Costello, Esq., Davidson,

Huthcher and Citron, LLP

Address * * *

* * *

before the Select Committee to Investigate
the January 6th Attack on the United States
Capitol

U.S. House of Representatives

117th Congress

Served by (print name) * * *

Title * * *

Manner of service * * *

* * *

Date 7/23/21

Signature of Server * * *

Address * * *

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE

THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE

UNITED STATES CAPITOL,

September 23, 2021.

Mr. Stephen K. Bannon

c/o Mr. Robert J. Costello

* * *

DEAR MR. BANNON: Pursuant to the au-
thorities set forth in House Resolution 503
and the rules of the House of Representa-
tives, the Select Committee to Investigate
the January 6th Attack on the United States
Capitol ("Select Committee") hereby trans-
mits a subpoena compelling you to produce
the documents set forth in the accom-
panying schedule by October 7, 2021, and to
appear for a deposition on October 14, 2021.

The Select Committee is investigating the
facts, circumstances, and causes of the Janu-
ary 6th attack and issues relating to the
peaceful transfer of power, in order to iden-
tify and evaluate lessons learned and to rec-
ommend to the House and its relevant com-
mittees corrective laws, policies, procedures,
rules, or regulations. This inquiry includes
examination of how various individuals and
entities coordinated their activities leading
up to the events of January 6, 2021.

The Select Committee has reason to be-
lieve that you have information relevant to
understanding important activities that led
to and informed the events at the Capitol on
January 6, 2021. For example, you have been
identified as present at the Willard Hotel on

January 5, 2021, during an effort to persuade
Members of Congress to block the certifi-
cation of the election the next day, and in
relation to other activities on January 6.¹
You are also described as communicating
with then-President Trump on December 30,
2020, and potentially other occasions, urging
him to plan for and focus his efforts on Janu-
ary 6.² Moreover, you are quoted as stating,
on January 5, 2021, that "[a]ll hell is going to
break loose tomorrow."³ Accordingly, the
Select Committee seeks both documents and
your deposition testimony regarding these
and multiple other matters that are within
the scope of the Select Committee's inquiry.

A copy of the rules governing Select Com-
mittee depositions, and a copy of document
production definitions and instructions are
attached. Please contact staff for the Select
Committee at 202-225-7800 to arrange for the
production of documents.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,

Chairman.

¹E.g., BOB WOODWARD & ROBERT COSTA, PERIL at
233 (2021).

²Id. at 207.

³Rub Kuznia, Curt Devine, & Drew Griffin, *How
Trump Allies Stoked the Flames Ahead of Capitol Riot*,
CNN (Jan. 18, 2021), <https://www.cnn.com/2021/01/18/politics/trump-bannon-stone-giuliani-capitol-riot-invs-index.html>.

SCHEDULE

In accordance with the attached Defini-
tions and Instructions, you, Stephen K.
Bannon, are hereby required to produce all
documents and communications in your pos-
session, custody, and control—including any
such documents or communications stored
or located on personal devices (e.g., personal
computers, cellular phones, tablets, etc.), in
personal or campaign accounts, and/or on
personal or campaign applications (e.g.,
email accounts, contact lists, calendar en-
tries, etc.)—referring or relating to referring
or relating to the following items. If no date
range is specified below, the applicable dates
are for the time period April 1, 2020–present:

1. The January 6, 2021, rally on the mall
and Capitol grounds in Washington, D.C., in
support of President Donald J. Trump and
opposition to certification of the results of
the 2020 presidential election, including any
permitting, planning, objectives, financing,
and conduct, as well as any communications
to or from any person or group involved in
organizing or planning for the January 6,
2021, rally.

2. Then-President Trump's participation in
the January 6, 2021, rally, including any
communications with President Trump or
any paid or unpaid attorney, advisor, aide, or
assistant to President Trump relating to the
nature, context, or content of President
Trump's intended or actual remarks to those
attending the January 6, 2021, rally.

3. Communications referring or relating to
the nature, planning, conduct, message, con-
text, or participation in the January 6, 2021,
rally between or among any person who, dur-
ing the administration of President Donald
J. Trump, worked in the White House com-
plex, including any employee or detailee.

4. Documents or other materials referring
or relating to the financing or fundraising to
assist any individual or organization's travel
to or accommodation in Washington, D.C., to
attend or participate in the January 6, 2021,
rally.

5. "The 'War Room' podcast," insofar as at
any time you communicated through it
statements referring or relating to efforts to
contest the election results, including plan-
ning for the January 6, 2021, rally, including
all statements concerning its planning, ob-
jectives, purpose, organization, message, or
sponsorship.

6. The organization or group named “March for Trump” and its activities relating to the January 6, 2021, rally, including any communications you had with any officer or member of “March for Trump” relating in any way to the planning, objectives, organization, message, sponsorship, and participation in the January 6, 2021, rally.

7. Your presence, purpose, statements, and activities at a meeting at the Willard Hotel on January 5, 2021, or the presence, purpose, statements, or activities of others in attendance, related to that meeting.

8. Your communications with President Donald J. Trump concerning events on January 6, 2021, including but not limited to communications on December 30, 2020.

9. Your communications with President Donald J. Trump between November 3 and January 20, 2021, concerning efforts to contest the election results or delay or impede the electoral count.

10. Anyone with whom you communicated by any means with respect to any aspect of the planning, objectives, conduct, or participation in the January 6, 2021, rally, including but not limited to Boris Epshteyn, Kashyap Patel, and Ezra Cohen-Watnick.

11. Anyone with whom you communicated by any means with respect to efforts, plans, or proposals to contest the 2020 Presidential election results or delay, influence, or impede the electoral count, including but not limited to communications with Boris Epshteyn, Kashyap Patel, and Ezra Cohen-Watnick.

12. All public relations, advertising, or other communications efforts to persuade Americans that the election was stolen or to attend the rally on January 6.

13. The role of the Vice President as the Presiding Officer in the certification of the votes of the electoral college.

14. Any communication with any employees of President Trump’s 2020 presidential campaign, the Republican National Committee, or any Trump Administration personnel including appointees, employees, and interns, about any of the foregoing topics.

15. Any communication regarding any of the foregoing topics with Proud Boys, Oath Keepers, Three Percenters, and Alex Jones.

16. Any communications with Representative Scott Perry and/or other Members of Congress about any of the foregoing topics.

17. Any communications with Rudolph Giuliani, John Eastman, Michael Flynn, Jenna Ellis, or Sydney Powell about any of the foregoing topics.

DOCUMENT PRODUCTION DEFINITIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

1. In complying with this request, produce all responsive documents, regardless of classification level, that are in your possession, custody, or control, whether held by you or your past or present agents, employees, and representatives acting on your behalf. Produce all documents that you have a legal right to obtain, that you have a right to copy, or to which you have access, as well as documents that you have placed in the temporary possession, custody, or control of any third party.

2. Requested documents, and all documents reasonably related to the requested documents, should not be destroyed, altered, removed, transferred, or otherwise made inaccessible to the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol (“Committee”).

3. In the event that any entity, organization, or individual denoted in this request is or has been known by any name other than that herein denoted, the request shall be read also to include that alternative identification.

4. The Committee’s preference is to receive documents in a protected electronic form

(i.e., password protected CD, memory stick, thumb drive, or secure file transfer) in lieu of paper productions. With specific reference to classified material, you will coordinate with the Committee’s Security Officer to arrange for the appropriate transfer of such information to the Committee. This includes, but is not necessarily limited to: a) identifying the classification level of the responsive document(s); and b) coordinating for the appropriate transfer of any classified responsive document(s).

5. Electronic document productions should be prepared according to the following standards:

a. If the production is completed through a series of multiple partial productions, field names and file order in all load files should match.

b. All electronic documents produced to the Committee should include the following fields of metadata specific to each document, and no modifications should be made to the original metadata:

BEGDOC, ENDDOC, TEXT, BEGATTACH, ENDATTACH, PAGECOUNT, CUSTODIAN, RECORDTYPE, DATE, TIME, SENTDATE, SENTTIME, BEGINDATE, BEGINTIME, ENDDATE, ENDTIME, AUTHOR, FROM, CC, TO, BCC, SUBJECT, TITLE, FILENAME, FILEEXT, FILESIZE, DATECREATED, TIMECREATED, DATELASTMOD, TIMELASTMOD, INTMSGID, INTMSGHEADER, NATIVELINK, INTFILPATH, EXCEPTION, BEGATTACH.

6. Documents produced to the Committee should include an index describing the contents of the production. To the extent more than one CD, hard drive, memory stick, thumb drive, zip file, box, or folder is produced, each should contain an index describing its contents.

7. Documents produced in response to this request shall be produced together with copies of file labels, dividers, or identifying markers with which they were associated when the request was served.

8. When you produce documents, you should identify the paragraph(s) or request(s) in the Committee’s letter to which the documents respond.

9. The fact that any other person or entity also possesses non-identical or identical copies of the same documents shall not be a basis to withhold any information.

10. The pendency of or potential for litigation shall not be a basis to withhold any information.

11. In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(d), the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and any statutory exemptions to FOIA shall not be a basis for withholding any information.

12. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(b)(9), the Privacy Act shall not be a basis for withholding information.

13. If compliance with the request cannot be made in full by the specified return date, compliance shall be made to the extent possible by that date. An explanation of why full compliance is not possible shall be provided along with any partial production, as well as a date certain as to when full production will be satisfied.

14. In the event that a document is withheld on any basis, provide a log containing the following information concerning any such document: (a) the reason it is being withheld, including, if applicable, the privilege asserted; (b) the type of document; (c) the general subject matter; (d) the date, author, addressee, and any other recipient(s); (e) the relationship of the author and addressee to each other; and (f) the basis for the withholding.

15. If any document responsive to this request was, but no longer is, in your possession, custody, or control, identify the document (by date, author, subject, and recipi-

ents), and explain the circumstances under which the document ceased to be in your possession, custody, or control. Additionally, identify where the responsive document can now be found including name, location, and contact information of the entity or entities now in possession of the responsive document(s).

16. If a date or other descriptive detail set forth in this request referring to a document is inaccurate, but the actual date or other descriptive detail is known to you or is otherwise apparent from the context of the request, produce all documents that would be responsive as if the date or other descriptive detail were correct.

17. This request is continuing in nature and applies to any newly-discovered information. Any record, document, compilation of data, or information not produced because it has not been located or discovered by the return date shall be produced immediately upon subsequent location or discovery.

18. All documents shall be Bates-stamped sequentially and produced sequentially.

19. Upon completion of the production, submit a written certification, signed by you or your counsel, stating that: (1) a diligent search has been completed of all documents in your possession, custody, or control that reasonably could contain responsive documents; and (2) all documents located during the search that are responsive have been produced to the Committee.

Definitions

1. The term “document” means any written, recorded, or graphic matter of any nature whatsoever, regardless of classification level, how recorded, or how stored/displayed (e.g. on a social media platform) and whether original or copy, including, but not limited to, the following: memoranda, reports, expense reports, books, manuals, instructions, financial reports, data, working papers, records, notes, letters, notices, confirmations, telegrams, receipts, appraisals, pamphlets, magazines, newspapers, prospectuses, communications, electronic mail (email), contracts, cables, notations of any type of conversation, telephone call, meeting or other inter-office or intra-office communication, bulletins, printed matter, computer printouts, computer or mobile device screenshots/screen captures, teletypes, invoices, transcripts, diaries, analyses, returns, summaries, minutes, bills, accounts, estimates, projections, comparisons, messages, correspondence, press releases, circulars, financial statements, reviews, opinions, offers, studies and investigations, questionnaires and surveys, and work sheets (and all drafts, preliminary versions, alterations, modifications, revisions, changes, and amendments of any of the foregoing, as well as any attachments or appendices thereto), and graphic or oral records or representations of any kind (including without limitation, photographs, charts, graphs, microfiche, microfilm, videotape, recordings and motion pictures), and electronic, mechanical, and electric records or representations of any kind (including, without limitation, tapes, cassettes, disks, and recordings) and other written, printed, typed, or other graphic or recorded matter of any kind or nature, however produced or reproduced, and whether preserved in writing, film, tape, disk, videotape, or otherwise. A document bearing any notation not a part of the original text is to be considered a separate document. A draft or non-identical copy is a separate document within the meaning of this term.

2. The term “communication” means each manner or means of disclosure or exchange of information, regardless of means utilized, whether oral, electronic, by document or otherwise, and whether in a meeting, by telephone, facsimile, mail, releases, electronic

message including email (desktop or mobile device), text message, instant message, MMS or SMS message, message application, through a social media or online platform, or otherwise.

3. The terms “and” and “or” shall be construed broadly and either conjunctively or disjunctively to bring within the scope of this request any information that might otherwise be construed to be outside its scope. The singular includes plural number, and vice versa. The masculine includes the feminine and neutral genders.

4. The term “including” shall be construed broadly to mean “including, but not limited to.”

5. The term “Company” means the named legal entity as well as any units, firms, partnerships, associations, corporations, limited liability companies, trusts, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, departments, branches, joint ventures, proprietorships, syndicates, or other legal, business or government entities over which the named legal entity exercises control or in which the named entity has any ownership whatsoever.

6. The term “identify,” when used in a question about individuals, means to provide the following information: (a) the individual’s complete name and title; (b) the individual’s business or personal address and phone number; and (c) any and all known aliases.

7. The term “related to” or “referring or relating to,” with respect to any given subject, means anything that constitutes, contains, embodies, reflects, identifies, states, refers to, deals with, or is pertinent to that subject in any manner whatsoever.

8. The term “employee” means any past or present agent, borrowed employee, casual employee, consultant, contractor, de facto employee, detailee, assignee, fellow, independent contractor, intern, joint adventurer, loaned employee, officer, part-time employee, permanent employee, provisional employee, special government employee, subcontractor, or any other type of service provider.

9. The term “individual” means all natural persons and all persons or entities acting on their behalf.

[From the Congressional Record—House,
Page H41, Jan. 4, 2021]

* * * health, safety, and well-being of others present in the Chamber and surrounding areas. Members and staff will not be permitted to enter the Hall of the House without wearing a mask. Masks will be available at the entry points for any Member who forgets to bring one. The Chair views the failure to wear a mask as a serious breach of decorum. The Sergeant-at-Arms is directed to enforce this policy. Based upon the health and safety guidance from the attending physician and the Sergeant-at-Arms, the Chair would further advise that all Members should leave the Chamber promptly after casting their votes. Furthermore, Members should avoid congregating in the rooms leading to the Chamber, including the Speaker’s lobby. The Chair will continue the practice of providing small groups of Members with a minimum of 5 minutes within which to cast their votes. Members are encouraged to vote with their previously assigned group. After voting, Members must clear the Chamber to allow the next group a safe and sufficient opportunity to vote. It is essential for the health and safety of Members, staff, and the U.S. Capitol Police to consistently practice social distancing and to ensure that a safe capacity be maintained in the Chamber at all times. To that end, the Chair appreciates the cooperation of Members and staff in preserving order and decorum in the Chamber and in displaying respect and safety for one

another by wearing a mask and practicing social distancing. All announced policies, including those addressing decorum in debate and the conduct of votes by electronic device, shall be carried out in harmony with this policy during the pendency of a covered period.

117TH CONGRESS REGULATIONS FOR USE OF DEPOSITION AUTHORITY

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 4, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 3(b) of House Resolution 8, 117th Congress, I hereby submit the following regulations regarding the conduct of depositions by committee and select committee counsel for printing in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules.

REGULATIONS FOR THE USE OF DEPOSITION AUTHORITY

1. Notices for the taking of depositions shall specify the date, time, and place of examination. Depositions shall be taken under oath administered by a member or a person otherwise authorized to administer oaths. Depositions may continue from day to day.

2. Consultation with the ranking minority member shall include three days’ notice before any deposition is taken. All members of the committee shall also receive three days written notice that a deposition will be taken, except in exigent circumstances. For purposes of these procedures, a day shall not include Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day.

3. Witnesses may be accompanied at a deposition by personal, nongovernmental counsel to advise them of their rights. Only members, committee staff designated by the chair or ranking minority member, an official reporter, the witness, and the witness’s counsel are permitted to attend. Observers or counsel for other persons, including counsel for government agencies, may not attend.

4. The chair of the committee noticing the deposition may designate that deposition as part of a joint investigation between committees, and in that case, provide notice to the members of the committees. If such a designation is made, the chair and ranking minority member of the additional committee(s) may designate committee staff to attend pursuant to regulation 3. Members and designated staff of the committees may attend and ask questions as set forth below.

5. A deposition shall be conducted by any member or committee counsel designated by the chair or ranking minority member of the Committee that noticed the deposition. When depositions are conducted by committee counsel, there shall be no more than two committee counsel permitted to question a witness per round. One of the committee counsel shall be designated by the chair and the other by the ranking minority member per round.

6. Deposition questions shall be propounded in rounds. The length of each round shall not exceed 60 minutes per side, and shall provide equal time to the majority and the minority. In each round, the member(s) or committee counsel designated by the chair shall ask questions first, and the member(s) or committee counsel designated by the ranking minority member shall ask questions second.

7. Objections must be stated concisely and in a non-argumentative and non-suggestive manner. A witness’s counsel may not in-

struct a witness to refuse to answer a question, except to preserve a privilege. In the event of professional, ethical, or other misconduct by the witness’s counsel during the deposition, the Committee may take any appropriate disciplinary action. The witness may refuse to answer a question only to preserve a privilege. When the witness has refused to answer a question to preserve a privilege, members or staff may (i) proceed with the deposition, or (ii) either at that time or at a subsequent time, seek a ruling from the Chair either by telephone or otherwise. If the Chair overrules any such objection and thereby orders a witness to answer any question to which an objection was lodged, the witness shall be ordered to answer. If a member of the committee chooses to appeal the ruling of the chair, such appeal must be made within three days, in writing, and shall be preserved for committee consideration. The Committee’s ruling on appeal shall be filed with the clerk of the Committee and shall be provided to the members and witness no less than three days before the reconvened deposition. A deponent who refuses to answer a question after being directed to answer by the chair may be subject to sanction, except that no sanctions may be imposed if the ruling of the chair is reversed by the committee on appeal.

8. The Committee chair shall ensure that the testimony is either transcribed or electronically recorded or both. If a witness’s testimony is transcribed, the witness or the witness’s counsel shall be afforded an opportunity to review a copy. No later than five days after the witness has been notified of the opportunity to review the transcript, the witness may submit suggested changes to the chair. Committee staff may make any typographical and technical changes. Substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments to the deposition transcript submitted by the witness must be accompanied by a letter signed by the witness requesting the changes and a statement of the witness’s reasons for each proposed change. Any substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments shall be included as an appendix to the transcript conditioned upon the witness signing the transcript.

9. The individual administering the oath, if other than a member, shall certify on the transcript that the witness was duly sworn. The transcriber shall certify that the transcript is a true record of the testimony, and the transcript shall be filed, together with any electronic recording, with the clerk of the committee in Washington, DC. Depositions shall be considered to have been taken in Washington, DC, as well as the location actually taken once filed there with the clerk of the committee for the committee’s use. The chair and the ranking minority member shall be provided with a copy of the transcripts of the deposition at the same time.

10. The chair and ranking minority member shall consult regarding the release of deposition testimony, transcripts, or recordings, and portions thereof. If either objects in writing to a proposed release of a deposition testimony, transcript, or recording, or a portion thereof, the matter shall be promptly referred to the committee for resolution.

11. A witness shall not be required to testify unless the witness has been provided with a copy of section 3(b) of H. Res. 8, 117th Congress, and these regulations.

REMOTE COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS
REGULATIONS PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 4, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, 117th Congress, I hereby submit the following regulations regarding remote committee proceedings for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
Chairman,
Committee on Rules.

REMOTE COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS REGULA-
TIONS PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8

A. PRESENCE AND VOTING

1. Members participating remotely in a committee proceeding must be visible on the software platform's video function to be considered in attendance and to participate unless connectivity issues or other technical problems render the member unable to fully participate on camera (except as provided in regulations A.2 and A.3).

2. The exception in regulation A.1 for connectivity issues or other technical problems does not apply if a point of order has been made that a quorum is not present. Members participating remotely must be visible on the software platform's video function in order to be counted for the purpose of establishing a quorum.

3. The exception in regulation A.1 for connectivity issues or other technical problems does not apply during a vote. Members participating remotely must be visible on the software platform's video function in order to vote.

4. Members participating remotely off-camera due to connectivity issues or other technical problems pursuant to regulation A.1 must inform committee majority and minority staff either directly or through staff.

5. The chair shall make a good faith effort to provide every member experiencing connectivity issues an opportunity to participate fully in the proceedings, subject to regulations A.2 and A.3.

Mr. TONOLLI. I will mark as exhibit 2 and enter into the record an email exchange between * * * and Robert Costello, Mr. Bannon's attorney.

From: Costello, Robert J. * * *

Sent: Friday, September 24, 2021 1:24 PM

To: * * *

Subject: Re: subpoena to Mr. Bannon

In response to your email of yesterday, this will advise you that I have been authorized by Steve Bannon to accept service of the subpoena from the House Select Committee on his behalf.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT J. COSTELLO.

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 23, 2021, at 6:38 PM, * * * wrote:

CAUTION: EXTERNAL MAIL. DO NOT CLICK ON LINKS OR OPEN ATTACHMENTS YOU DO NOT TRUST

DEAR MR. COSTELLO,

I am following up on our conversation today in which you confirmed that you represent Stephen Bannon. I understand that you are checking with Mr. Bannon regarding whether he will authorize you to accept service of a subpoena on his behalf. The Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol is today issuing the attached subpoena to Mr. Bannon for his testimony and the production of documents to the Committee. In the event that

you will accept service, I am attaching to this email the subpoena, along with a letter from Chairman Bennie Thompson, a document schedule with accompanying production instructions, and a copy of the deposition rules.

Please confirm whether you will accept service of this subpoena on Mr. Bannon's behalf.

Thank you,

* * *

<Bannon, Stephen K. Subpoena
9.23.21.attachments.pdf>

IMPORTANT NOTICE: Beware of Cyber Fraud. You should never wire money to any bank account that our office provides to you via email without first speaking with our office. Further, do not accept emailed wiring instructions from anyone else without voice verification from a known employee of our office. Even if an email looks like it has come from this office or someone involved in your transaction. Please call us first at a number you know to be correct for this office to verify the information before wiring any money. Be particularly wary of any request to change wiring instructions you already received.

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

The information contained in this electronic message and any attachments to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us immediately by email reply to sender or by telephone to Davidoff Hutcher & Citron LLP at (800) 793-2843, ext. 3284, and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.

IRS DISCLOSURE NOTICE

In accordance with Internal Revenue Service Circular 230, we inform you that any discussion of a federal tax issue contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and it cannot be used, by any recipient for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties that may be imposed on the recipient under United States federal tax laws, or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any tax-related matters addressed herein.

Mr. TONOLLI. On September 23, 2021, * * * * emailed Mr. Costello the subpoena to Mr. Bannon and the accompanying materials included in exhibit 1 and asked whether Mr. Costello was authorized to accept service of the subpoena on Mr. Bannon's behalf.

Mr. Costello replied to * * * * on September 24, 2021, that he was authorized to accept service of the subpoena on Mr. Bannon's behalf.

I will mark as exhibit 3 and enter into the record a letter Mr. Costello sent to * * * * on October 7, 2021.

DAVIDOFF HUTCHER & CITRON LLP,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW, * * *
Washington, DC, October 7, 2021.

* * *

Re: The Subpoena for Stephen K. Bannon dated September 23, 2021.

DEAR * * *

I write today on behalf of Stephen K. Bannon with respect to the above referenced subpoena, which I accepted on behalf of Mr. Bannon. On the afternoon of October 6, 2021, I received a letter from Justin Clark, as counsel for then President of the United States Donald J. Trump. That letter references the subpoena that your Committee served upon Mr. Bannon, and notes that the subpoena:

"seeks records and testimony purportedly related to the events of January 6th, 2021, including but not limited to information which

is potentially protected from disclosure by executive and other privileges, including among others the presidential communications, deliberative process, and attorney-client privileges. President Trump is prepared to defend these fundamental privileges in court.

Therefore, to the fullest extent permitted by law, President Trump instructs Mr. Bannon to: (a) where appropriate, invoke any immunities and privileges he may have from compelled testimony in response to the Subpoena; (b) not produce any documents concerning privileged material in response to the Subpoena; and (c) not provide any testimony concerning privileged material in response to the Subpoena."

It is therefore clear to us that since the executive privileges belong to President Trump, and he has, through his counsel, announced his intention to assert those executive privileges enumerated above, we must accept his direction and honor his invocation of executive privilege. As such, until these issues are resolved, we are unable to respond to your request for documents and testimony.

We will comply with the directions of the courts, when and if they rule on these claims of both executive and attorney client privileges. Since these privileges belong to President Trump and not to Mr. Bannon, until these issues are resolved, Mr. Bannon is legally unable to comply with your subpoena requests for documents and testimony.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT J. COSTELLO.

Mr. TONOLLI. In sum and substance, the letter states that Mr. Bannon is, "legally unable to comply with your subpoena requests for documents and testimony," because President Trump's attorney informed Mr. Costello by letter, dated October 6, 2021, that President Trump is invoking executive privilege, "to the fullest extent permitted by law," and instructing Mr. Bannon not to provide documents or testimony, "concerning privileged material," in response to the Select Committee's subpoena.

I will mark as exhibit 4 and enter into the record a letter that Chairman THOMPSON sent to Mr. Costello in response on October 8, 2021.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE
UNITED STATES CAPITOL,

October 8, 2021.

Mr. Robert J. Costello,
Davidoff Hutcher & Citron LLP
* * *

DEAR MR. COSTELLO, I write in response to your October 7, 2021 letter which states that your client, Stephen Bannon, is "legally unable to comply" with the September 23, 2021 subpoena (the "Subpoena") issued by the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol (the "Select Committee"). Your letter relies on an apparent instruction from former President Donald Trump that appears limited to requesting that Mr. Bannon not disclose privileged information. Despite this limited instruction, your letter takes the inappropriate position that Mr. Bannon will not comply with any request for information or testimony sought by the Select Committee. Moreover, Mr. Trump's stated "intention to assert those executive privileges" that may or may not belong to him, does not provide a legal basis for Mr. Bannon's refusal to comply with the Subpoena.

You accepted service of the Subpoena for documents and testimony on Mr. Bannon's behalf on September 24, 2021. The Subpoena required that, by October 7, 2021 at 10:00 a.m., Mr. Bannon produce certain documents and

other records referring or relating to the matters described in the Subpoena's schedule. All the requested documents relate directly to the inquiry being conducted by the Select Committee, serve a legitimate legislative purpose, and are within the scope of the authority expressly delegated to the Select Committee pursuant to House Resolution 503. In the letter accompanying the Subpoena, the Select Committee set forth the basis for its determination that the documents and records sought by the Subpoena and Mr. Bannon's deposition testimony are of critical importance to the issues being investigated by the Select Committee.

Your letter indicates that the sole basis for defiance of the Subpoena is Mr. Trump's "direction" to your client and his decision to "honor [Mr. Trump's] invocation of executive privilege." That position has no basis in law, and your letter does not cite any statute, case law, or other legal precedent for support.

First, virtually all the documents and testimony sought by the Subpoena concern Mr. Bannon's actions as a private citizen and involve a broad range of subjects that are not covered by executive privilege. You have provided no basis for Mr. Bannon's refusal to comply with those portions of the Subpoena not covered by any privilege. Furthermore, blanket assertions of the deliberative process and attorney-client privileges, such as those apparently requested by Mr. Trump, have been rejected by courts as "unsustainable" even when—unlike the situation with Mr. Bannon—the subpoena recipient is an Executive Branch agency. See *Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform v. Holder*, 2014 WL 2662665, at *2 (D.D.C. 2014) (rejecting DOJ's assertion of deliberative process privilege on all documents after a particular date and noting that the "Attorney General has not cited any authority that would justify this sort of blanket approach").

Second, the Select Committee has not received any assertion, formal or otherwise, of any privilege from the Mr. Trump. Even assuming that, as a former President, Mr. Trump is permitted to formally invoke executive privilege, he has not done so. At most, Mr. Trump has "announced his intention to assert those executive privileges." The Select Committee is not aware of any legal authority, and your letter cites none, holding that the mere intention to assert a privilege absolves a subpoena recipient of his duty to comply.

Third, your letter indicates that Mr. Trump has requested that your client "to the fullest extent permitted by law . . . not provide any testimony concerning privileged material in response to the Subpoena." Even if your client had been a senior aide to the President during the time period covered by the contemplated testimony, which he was most assuredly not, he is not permitted by law to the type of immunity you suggest that Mr. Trump has requested he assert. To the contrary, every court that has considered the absolute immunity Mr. Trump alludes to has rejected it. See, e.g., *Harlow v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800 (1982); *Comm. on the Judiciary v. Miers*, 558 F. Supp. 2d 53, 106 (D.D.C. 2008) (rejecting former White House counsel's assertion of absolute immunity from compelled congressional process). *Miers* made clear that even the most senior Presidential advisors may not resist a congressional subpoena "based solely on their proximity to the President." *Id.* at 101 (citing *Harlow*, 457 U.S. at 810).¹ If there is no absolute immunity for senior Presidential advisors, then there certainly can be no such immunity for private citizens, such as Mr. Bannon, who occasionally communicate with the President on nonofficial, non-governmental, or campaign-related matters.

Regardless of any purported privilege assertion by Mr. Trump, Mr. Bannon has an ongoing obligation to produce documents to the Select Committee. Accordingly, please produce all responsive documents and records identified in the Subpoena. Should Mr. Bannon seek to withhold specific responsive documents, consistent with the Subpoena instructions, he must provide the Select Committee with a privilege log that "identifies and describes the material in a manner 'sufficient to enable resolution of any privilege claims.'" See *Comm. on Oversight*, 2014 WL 2662665 at *2 (quoting *Miers*, 558 F. Supp. 2d at 107). Such a privilege log should, at a minimum, provide the author(s) and recipient(s), indicate the general subject matter of each document being withheld, and the specific basis for withholding it.

Finally, the Select Committee expects Mr. Bannon's appearance at the time and place designated in the Subpoena for a deposition and respond fully to questions by the Select Committee. If there are specific questions at that deposition that you believe raise privilege issues, Mr. Bannon should state them at that time for the deposition record for the Select Committee's consideration and possible judicial review.

Please be advised that the Select Committee will view Mr. Bannon's failure to respond to the Subpoena as willful non-compliance with the Subpoena. His willful non-compliance with the Subpoena would force the Select Committee to consider invoking the contempt of Congress procedures in 2 U.S.C. §§192, 194—which could result in a referral from the House to the Department of Justice for criminal charges—as well as the possibility of having a civil action to enforce the Subpoena brought against Mr. Bannon in his personal capacity.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

¹ It is also worth noting that the court in *Miers* rejected the former White House Counsel's claim of absolute immunity from congressional testimony even though the sitting President had formally invoked executive privilege. *Id.* at 62.

Mr. TONOLLI. And I'll take a brief pause to recognize that Mr. SCHIFF has joined us.

Turning back to the letter that Chairman THOMPSON sent on October 8th, in sum and substance, the response states that Mr. Costello's, "letter relies on an apparent instruction from former President Donald Trump that appears limited to requesting that Mr. Bannon not disclose privileged information. Despite this limited instruction, your letter takes the inappropriate position that Mr. Bannon will not comply with any request for information or testimony sought by the Select Committee. Moreover, Mr. Trump's stated 'intention to assert those executive privileges' that may or may not belong to him does not provide a legal basis for Mr. Bannon's refusal to comply with the subpoena."

The letter states the Select Committee's expectation that Mr. Bannon would appear today for the deposition and respond fully to the Select Committee's questions and to state for the record any objections to particular questions for the Select Committee's consideration and possible judicial review.

The letter concludes by advising that the Select Committee will view Mr. Bannon's failure to respond to the subpoena as, "willful noncompliance," that would force the Select Committee to consider invoking the contempt of Congress procedures entitled to United States Code, sections 192 and 194, which could result in a referral from the House to the Department of Justice for criminal charges as well as the possibility of

a civil action against Mr. Bannon personally to enforce the subpoena.

I will mark as a final exhibit, exhibit 5, and enter into the record a reply letter that Mr. Costello sent to Chairman THOMPSON, the evening of October 13, 2021.

DAVIDOFF HUTCHER & CITRON LLP,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW, * * *
Washington, DC, October 13, 2021.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, House Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack

* * *

Re: The Subpoena for Stephen K. Bannon dated September 23, 2021

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I write on behalf of Stephen K. Bannon to respond to some of the inaccurate statements made in your letter to me dated October 8, 2021, which purports to address the positions taken by Mr. Bannon with respect to the above-referenced subpoena.

As an initial matter, your use of the word "defiance" is inappropriate. Mr. Bannon's position is not in defiance of your Committee's subpoena; rather, Mr. Bannon noted that President Trump's counsel stated that they were invoking executive and other privileges and therefore directed us not to produce documents or give testimony that might reveal information President Trump's counsel seeks to legally protect. Mr. Bannon has testified on three prior occasions, before the Mueller Investigation, the House Intelligence Committee and the Senate Intelligence Committee. In each of those instances, when President Trump waived his invocation of the executive privileges, Mr. Bannon testified.

As recently as today, counsel for President Trump, Justin Clark Esq., informed us that President Trump is exercising his executive privilege; therefore, he has directed Mr. Bannon not to produce documents or testify until the issue of executive privilege is resolved. Your Committee will have the right to challenge that exercise or its scope. That is an issue between the Committee and President Trump's counsel and Mr. Bannon is not required to respond at this time. See *Comm. on the Judiciary v. McGahn*, 415 F. Supp. 3d 148, FN 34 (D.D.C. 2019) ("The President can certainly identify sensitive information that he deems subject to executive privilege, and his doing so gives rise to a legal duty on the part of the aide to invoke the privilege on the President's behalf when, in the course of his testimony, he is asked a question that would require disclosure of that information.")

Until such time as you reach an agreement with President Trump or receive a court ruling as to the extent, scope and application of the executive privilege, in order to preserve the claim of executive and other privileges, Mr. Bannon will not be producing documents or testifying. As noted previously, Mr. Bannon will revisit his position if President Trump's position changes or if a court rules on this matter.

Mr. Bannon's communications with President Trump on the matters at issue in the Subpoena are well within the scope of both the presidential communications and deliberative process executive privileges. See *In re Sealed Case (Espy)*, 121 F.3d 729 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (holding that the presidential communications privilege covers communications made or received by presidential advisors in the course of preparing advice for the President even if those communications are not made directly to the President); *Coastal States Gas Corp. v. U.S. Dep't of Energy*, 617 F.2d 854, 868 (D.C. Cir. 1980) (finding that deliberative process privilege applies to "recommendations, draft documents, proposals, suggestions, and other subjective documents

which reflect the personal opinions of the writer rather than the policy of the agency.”)

Very truly yours,

ROBERT J. COSTELLO.

Mr. TONOLLI. In sum and substance, the letter reiterates that Mr. Bannon is abiding by President Trump's invocation of executive privilege and direction to Mr. Bannon not to produce documents or testify.

In support of Mr. Bannon's position, the letter cites several judicial opinions on executive privilege, including a 2019 decision of the United States District Court in Washington in the case of *Committee on the Judiciary v. McGahn*.

In particular, the letter cites the following sentence from the court's opinion: “The President can certainly identify sensitive information that he deems subject to executive privilege, and his doing so gives rise to a legal duty on the part of the aide to invoke the privilege on the President's behalf when, in the course of his testimony, he is asked a question that would require disclosure of that information.”

However, Mr. Bannon is not here today to assert executive privilege on a question-by-question basis. He chose instead not to appear at all, just as he chose not to produce any documents at all or even a log of responsive documents that he is withholding based on the claim of executive privilege.

With that, I will note for the record that it is 10:06 a.m., and Mr. Bannon still has not appeared or communicated to the Select Committee that he will appear today as required by the subpoena.

Accordingly, the record is now closed as of 10:06 a.m.

[Whereupon, at 10:06 a.m., the deposition was concluded.]

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 730) recommending that the House of Representatives find Stephen K. Bannon in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena duly issued by the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 727, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 730

Resolved, That Stephen K. Bannon shall be found to be in contempt of Congress for failure to comply with a congressional subpoena.

Resolved, That pursuant to 2 U.S.C. §§ 192 and 194, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall certify the report of the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol, detailing the refusal of Stephen K. Bannon to produce documents or appear for a deposition before the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol as directed by subpoena, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that Mr. Bannon be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House shall otherwise take all appropriate action to enforce the subpoena.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), and an opponent, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, since Speaker PELOSI asked me to chair the January 6th Select Committee, I have spent a lot of time thinking about the importance of what we are doing, the weight of it, the urgency. We need to give the American people answers about what happened. There needs to be swift accountability. But there are longer-term considerations, too.

Madam Speaker, I am a grandfather, and when I talk to my grandkids about that horrific attack on our democracy on January 6, my mind jumps ahead to the future in store for them—questions about whether American democracy, as we know it now, will remain strong, whether it will withstand future tests.

That has to be the legacy of this committee's work. To be sure, we are going to answer questions about what happened on that day. But we also need to draw a roadmap for making sure our democracy remains strong tomorrow.

We will look backward at what happened and try to explain how and why the insurrection came about. But we will also look forward and generate recommendations for legislative policy and process changes that will help ensure that nothing like this ever happens again.

When we get to the end of this process and look back, we are going to ask ourselves: Did we do everything in our power to uncover every fact? Did we use the tools at our disposal to get a full accounting, or did we let someone stand in our way without facing consequences? Did we learn what we needed to know for Congress to forge legislation to help ensure we never experience another January 6 again?

That is why we are taking up this resolution today, citing Steve Bannon with criminal contempt and referring him for prosecution by the Justice Department.

We didn't choose to be here. This isn't about punishing Steve Bannon.

The select committee would prefer and, frankly, expect all witnesses to fully cooperate. But Steve Bannon has led us down this path by refusing to cooperate in any way with our investigation.

We believe Mr. Bannon has information valuable to our probe. He was deeply involved in the so-called stop the steal campaign. He was reportedly in a war room meeting the day before the riot and had been pressuring the former President to try to stop the counting of the electoral college ballots.

He himself warned that “all hell” would break loose on January 6. We believe he can help inform our inquiry as to how the riot came together and what it was intended to achieve. He is clearly an important witness.

We subpoenaed him. And unlike other witnesses who have engaged and worked with our team to find a way to cooperate, Mr. Bannon told us he wouldn't comply because the former President told him not to. He hid behind vague and baseless claims of privilege. That is just not acceptable.

The select committee told Mr. Bannon several times that he would face the consequences if he didn't change course. Well, he didn't change course, and his actions have brought us to this point.

Madam Speaker, we need to make it clear that no person is above the law. We need to take a stand for the integrity of the select committee's investigation and for the integrity of this body.

What sort of precedent would it set for the House of Representatives if we allow a witness to ignore us flat out without facing any kind of consequences? What message would it send to other witnesses in our investigation?

I am not willing to find out. I am not willing to get to the end of the select committee's work and look back wishing we had done more to uncover all the facts, not when we know what is on the line, when we know that our democracy isn't yet out of danger, when we know that the forces that tried to overturn the election persist in their assault on the rule of law.

Our investigation is going forward. We are hearing from witnesses, reviewing documents, and analyzing data. Mr. Bannon stands alone in his defiance, and we will not stand for it. We will not allow anyone to derail our work because our work is too important: helping ensure that the future of American democracy is strong and secure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, a year ago today, the election was still a couple of weeks off. We knew it would be a tight race. Most of us did not anticipate that President Trump, or any President, frankly, would ever simply reject the outcome of the vote.

President Trump had the right to challenge the outcome in our State and Federal courts, which have an appropriate and constitutional role in resolving election claims. But what he did thereafter has no precedent in our history. He rejected the courts' rulings in dozens of cases, including the rulings of judges President Trump himself appointed.

He rejected what his own Department of Justice officials told him over and over again, that they found no evidence of widespread fraud sufficient to overcome the election. He rejected the conclusions of both the Department of Justice and the intelligence community that the Dominion Voting machines had not secretly changed the election outcome.

President Trump had no factual or constitutional basis for his claims. And the lawyers he found who would carry his false claims forward have paid the consequences. Rudy Giuliani's license to practice law has been suspended, and Sidney Powell has been sanctioned by a Federal judge.

But Donald Trump persisted, attempting through every manner he could imagine to try to overturn the outcome of the election. We all saw what happened. The people who attacked this building have told us on video, on social media, and now before the Federal courts exactly what motivated them. They believed what Donald Trump told them, that the election was stolen and that they needed to take action.

Today, Madam Speaker, we are here to address one witness, Mr. Steve Bannon. I urge all Americans to watch what Mr. Bannon said on his podcast on January 5 and 6. It is shocking and indefensible. He said, "All hell is going to break loose." He said, "We are coming in right over the target. This is the point of attack we have always wanted."

Madam Speaker, there are people in this Chamber right now who were evacuated with me and with the rest of us on that day during that attack; people who now seem to have forgotten the danger of the moment, the assault on the Constitution, the assault on our Congress; people who you will hear argue that there is simply no legislative purpose for this committee, for this investigation, or for this subpoena.

In fact, there is no doubt that Mr. Bannon knows far more than what he said on the video. There is no doubt that all hell did break loose. Just ask the scores of brave police officers who were injured that day protecting all of us. The American people deserve to hear his testimony.

Let me give you just four examples of the legislative purpose of this investigation.

First, the plot we are investigating, involving Mr. Eastman, Mr. Giuliani, Mr. Bannon, President Trump, and many others, their plot attempted to halt or delay our count of electoral votes and reverse the outcome of the

2020 election. The 1887 Electoral Count Act is directly at issue, and our investigation will lead to recommendations to amend or reform that act.

□ 1445

Second, while the attack was underway, President Trump knew it was happening; indeed, he may have been watching it all unfold on television, and yet he took no immediate action to stop it. This appears to be a supreme dereliction of duty by President Trump, and we are evaluating whether our criminal laws should be enhanced to supply additional and more severe consequences for this type of behavior.

Third, we know from our investigation to date that President Trump was pressuring the Department of Justice in late December 2020 to support his false claims that the election was stolen. Several brave and honorable Trump appointees at the department flatly refused to go along with this fraud and threatened to resign. We are evaluating what, if any, additional laws may be required to prevent a future President from succeeding in such an effort.

Fourth, we know that President Trump made efforts to persuade State election officials to "find votes" to change the election outcome in his favor. We are evaluating whether the criminal laws of the United States should be enhanced to make the penalty for this type of behavior even more severe, and, if so, in what manner.

Mr. Bannon's own public statements made clear he knew what was going to happen before it did, and thus he must have been aware of and may well have been involved in the planning of everything that played out on that day.

The American people deserve to know what he knew and what he did.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, 3 months ago, for the first time in the history of Congress, Speaker PELOSI vetoed JIM JORDAN and me from serving on the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol.

Not all firsts are worth celebrating. It was a shameful and divisive decision with real consequences. Today, because of that decision, there is no committee conducting a legitimate investigation into January 6. Congress is prohibited from conducting criminal investigations, period.

But that is exactly what the select committee is doing, conducting an illicit, criminal investigation into American citizens. Steve Bannon was a private citizen before, after, and during January 6.

So why is the select committee interested in Steve Bannon?

It is simple. He is a Democratic Party bogeyman. The select committee despises Steve Bannon's politics, so

they are abusing their power to put him in jail.

The committee explained it is seeking documents from Mr. Bannon because he helped "construct and participated in" the permitted and legal Stop the Steal rally.

To date, the select committee has subpoenaed 11 other private citizens for organizing the Stop the Steal rally.

Here, in the land of the free, 12 American citizens are under congressional investigation for the sole crime of planning a legal political protest. Never in the history of Congress has a committee or a political party stooped so low.

Congress has no authority to conduct criminal investigations. Congress can only issue subpoenas to serve a legislative purpose.

The question that the committee must answer is: Why are they seeking information about a permitted political rally?

What legislative purpose does that serve?

Is the committee considering laws to limit Americans' right to political protest?

It is clear that the select committee doesn't give a lick about Congress' subpoena authority.

Does the committee share the same disdain for the First Amendment?

I wouldn't put it past them. As we all know, the Department of Justice has a highly active criminal investigation into the January 6 attack. They have made something like 600 arrests—as I said, very active, even hyperactive, compared to the Biden Department of Justice's typical reaction to political violence. But the Department of Justice's investigation isn't comprehensive.

There are still questions that only Congress can answer. Congress still has a role to play, but the select committee has completely abandoned that role.

Why else does the select committee want to hear from Mr. Bannon?

Because on January 5, Mr. Bannon warned that "all hell was going to break loose tomorrow."

So according to the select committee, no person could have predicted that violence might occur that day. According to the committee, that because Mr. Bannon warned of violence on the 5th is proof that Mr. Bannon had "foreknowledge" of the attack on the 6th.

Never mind that the FBI found that the attack wasn't coordinated. Never mind that the Capitol Police received actionable intelligence about potential violence occurring weeks before the 6th. Never mind that every Member of Congress, every single D.C. resident, and every American with internet access knew that violence was a possibility on January 6.

The question the committee should be asking is this: How did the United States Capitol Police, the D.C. Metropolitan Police, and the FBI all have no

clue that “all hell was going to break loose?”

Steve Bannon, a private citizen, knew.

So why didn't the Capitol Police have enough riot shields?

Why did it take multiple hours to deploy the National Guard?

These are worthwhile questions, and Congress has a duty to answer them because January 6 was an enormous intelligence failure. There was a breakdown in security, a breakdown that was repeated on Good Friday when Officer Billy Evans was brutally murdered.

The issues that plagued the Capitol Police on January 6 have not been fixed. In fact, according to a Capitol Police whistleblower, the officers most responsible for the intelligence failure on the 6th were promoted by Speaker PELOSI's team.

To be clear, the select committee is engaged in an unconstitutional, political investigation. It is a sham investigation conducted by a sham committee that refuses to answer real questions about what happened on January 6.

The Capitol was attacked, and instead of figuring out what went wrong, the committee launched its own attack on Congress' norms.

The Select Committee's politicization of January 6 cuts both ways. The committee's inaction has made the Capitol less secure, and the committee's actions have further separated Congress from its constitutional role.

The American people and the United States Capitol Police deserve a real investigation into the 6th, and the select committee has abandoned them.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to make the moral vote. Do the right thing. I urge Members to vote for the rule of law, for the institution of Congress, and against the select committee's dangerous abuse of Congress' oversight authority.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I heard the gentleman opposing this resolution. We are not actually seeking information from Mr. Bannon because of his opinions. We issued the subpoena because we believe he has knowledge of relevant facts that we need to discover. We are not violating anything and, certainly, not Mr. Bannon's First Amendment rights. The only violation we can talk about is the violation of this building on January 6, and Mr. Bannon's claim that the election was stolen helped foment that attack. Investigating that is also part of our charter.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I wanted to correct the RECORD. The gentleman from Indiana asserted that the FBI has found

there was no coordination. That is just simply not true.

The gentleman also said that he is not on the committee. He noted that the Speaker had determined that he wouldn't be on the committee.

Madam Speaker, I have a number of letters the gentleman from Indiana has been sending to Federal agencies, and I include in the RECORD one dated September 16, 2021, for example, signing his name as the ranking member of the committee he has just informed the House he is not on and that, in fact, he is not on.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 16, 2021.

Hon. DEB HAALAND,
Secretary, Department of the Interior,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY HAALAND: You are receiving this letter because the House of Representatives Select Committee to Investigate the events of January 6th may have sent you a request for information. The House Republican Leader Kevin McCarthy appointed me to serve as the Ranking Member of the Select Committee. Yet, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi refused to allow me to fulfill my duties as Ranking Member.

Pursuant to the rules of the House of Representatives, the minority party in Congress retains rights to the same information that is provided to the majority party. For those reasons, I ask that you provide me any information that is submitted to the Select Committee. Additionally, please include me on any update or briefing that you provide. If you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact my staff.

Sincerely,

JIM BANKS,
Ranking Member.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I would note that the gentleman from Indiana is incorrect. We are not pursuing a law enforcement investigation. Only the DOJ can do that.

What we are doing is taking the steps that are provided for under the congressional contempt statute that has existed for many decades because the select committee's charge is to get to the bottom of what happened on January 6, who planned it, who paid for it, what was the intent, and what legislative steps can we recommend to remove future threats to our Constitution.

To do that, we need information, both documents and testimony; and to get that we issue subpoenas.

Now what is a subpoena?

Is it just a suggestion, a mere request, an encouragement to testify?

No. A subpoena is a writ issued by a government agency, in this case the Congress, to compel testimony or production of evidence. When you get a subpoena, Madam Speaker, the law requires you to comply. If you think there may be some valid reason that excuses you from telling the truth under oath, then you have to come in and make your case to the committee.

Steve Bannon is the only person who has outright refused to engage with the committee. He thinks that if he simply

obstructs Congress by not showing up he will escape the consequences. But as Theodore Roosevelt said, “No man is above the law and no man is below the law.”

If you get a subpoena, you cannot hide behind vague and immaterial claims of privilege.

The cases make it clear—Judicial Watch, Nixon v. GSA, and the McGahn case—executive privilege is limited to immediate White House advisers on government policy. Bannon is a private citizen. His extravagant claims can't shield his conversations and plotting with other private citizens. His status, according to the cases, doesn't get executive privilege protection. He has no absolute immunity.

Madam Speaker, what would happen if an American received a subpoena from Congress or a court?

Do you think they could get away with just saying: Go fly a kite? They would be held accountable.

And so should Mr. Bannon be held to account for defying the law regarding this subpoena.

Madam Speaker, to defend the rule of law, we must vote “yes” on this resolution.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, no one has said that the select committee doesn't have a legislative purpose.

Let's be very clear. There is important work that, frankly, we wish they were doing; like answering, why was this campus left unprotected? And what are we doing to keep it from happening again? That hasn't happened yet.

What we are saying is that the subpoenas that have so far been issued do not ask for information that would meet any legitimate legislative purpose.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the great State of Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) for yielding.

I can tell you, when I got elected to serve in this body almost 9 years ago, I didn't expect to be standing here today to talk about such an important issue.

I spent 16 years as a congressional staffer working for a Member of Congress whom I looked up to and who respected this institution for what it was and what it meant to our country.

When I came to Congress to serve with him, I had the utmost respect for this institution at the same time. That is why I wanted to be part of the House Administration Committee because I wanted to make this Congress and this House work better, act in a much more bipartisan manner, and make sure that we protect those who run this campus, but also at the same time protect those who protect us.

Madam Speaker, we are now months and months in, months and months

post January 6. From my many conversations with U.S. Capitol Police officers and those who work on this campus, they have the same concerns I have.

The question they ask is: Why were we so unprotected on January 6? And what has changed since then?

□ 1500

Getting to the bottom of those questions should be the top priority for all of us in this House. There are serious security vulnerabilities that have not been addressed by this House in nearly 11 months after January 6. And this is what the majority has decided to spend its time on, holding a private citizen, who wasn't even part of the administration at the time, in contempt for refusing to comply with House Democrats' subpoenas. This is after more than 600 people have been arrested for their role in the tragedies we saw on January 6.

When I get the article, I will submit for the RECORD, Madam Speaker, a Reuters article that talks about senior officials stating at the FBI that there was no organized effort to overthrow the government on January 6. So I will submit it once I get a copy of that. I did not bring it with me.

But our job, again, is to secure this Capitol. We have never seen a breach like the one that we saw that day. And it is our responsibility to make sure it doesn't happen again.

But that hasn't been done under the leadership of this House. We have had two independent reports regarding January 6, one bipartisan report in the Senate and another one commissioned by the Speaker herself, and that came out in March. These have never been acted on. But this is what the select committee has been working on?

The Capitol Police IG has released seven reports related to January 6, making recommendations on what is needed to secure this Capitol. To my disappointment, the majority has not acted in a meaningful way to ensure that all 103 IG findings are implemented.

These reports have all told us what the problems are and the recommendations on how to fix them. But Congress, us, have failed to even debate these changes, let alone act on them.

We know massive changes to intel, perimeter protection training, leadership structure, decisionmaking processes, and many, many more are needed, but neither the select committee, nor the Committee on House Administration, seem at all interested in ensuring these changes are made.

The Committee on House Administration, which has oversight of security, hasn't held a single hearing since August 5, with no upcoming hearings scheduled according to the majority's website.

The select committee, right now, as we see, is just purely focused on political subpoenas.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the articles I previously mentioned.

[From Reuters, Aug. 20, 2021]

EXCLUSIVE: FBI FINDS SCANT EVIDENCE U.S. CAPITOL ATTACK WAS COORDINATED—SOURCES
(By Mark Hosenball and Sarah N. Lynch)

WASHINGTON, Aug. 20 (Reuters).—The FBI has found scant evidence that the Jan. 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol was the result of an organized plot to overturn the presidential election result, according to four current and former law enforcement officials.

Though federal officials have arrested more than 570 alleged participants, the FBI at this point believes the violence was not centrally coordinated by far-right groups or prominent supporters of then-President Donald Trump, according to the sources, who have been either directly involved in or briefed regularly on the wide-ranging investigations.

"Ninety to ninety-five percent of these are one-off cases," said a former senior law enforcement official with knowledge of the investigation. "Then you have five percent, maybe, of these militia groups that were more closely organized. But there was no grand scheme with Roger Stone and Alex Jones and all of these people to storm the Capitol and take hostages."

Stone, a veteran Republican operative and self-described "dirty trickster", and Jones, founder of a conspiracy-driven radio show and webcast, are both allies of Trump and had been involved in pro-Trump events in Washington on Jan. 5, the day before the riot.

FBI investigators did find that cells of protesters, including followers of the far-right Oath Keepers and Proud Boys groups, had aimed to break into the Capitol. But they found no evidence that the groups had serious plans about what to do if they made it inside, the sources said.

Prosecutors have filed conspiracy charges against 40 of those defendants, alleging that they engaged in some degree of planning before the attack.

They alleged that one Proud Boy leader recruited members and urged them to stockpile bulletproof vests and other military-style equipment in the weeks before the attack and on Jan. 6 sent members forward with a plan to split into groups and make multiple entries to the Capitol.

But so far prosecutors have steered clear of more serious, politically-loaded charges that the sources said had been initially discussed by prosecutors, such as seditious conspiracy or racketeering.

The FBI's assessment could prove relevant for a congressional investigation that also aims to determine how that day's events were organized and by whom.

Senior lawmakers have been briefed in detail on the results of the FBI's investigation so far and find them credible, a Democratic congressional source said.

The chaos on Jan. 6 erupted as the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives met to certify Joe Biden's victory in November's presidential election.

It was the most violent attack on the Capitol since the War of 1812, forcing lawmakers and Trump's own vice president, Mike Pence, to scramble for safety.

Four people died and another died the following day, and more than 100 police officers were injured.

TRUMP'S SPEECH

Trump made an incendiary speech at a nearby rally shortly before the riot, repeating false claims that the 2020 election was stolen and urging supporters to march on the Capitol to pressure lawmakers to reject Biden's victory.

In public comments last month to the Democratic-led congressional committee formed to investigate the violence, police of-

ficers injured in the mayhem urged lawmakers to determine whether Trump helped instigate it. Some Democrats have said they want him to testify.

But the FBI has so far found no evidence that he or people directly around him were involved in organizing the violence, according to the four current and former law enforcement officials.

More than 170 people have been charged so far with assaulting or impeding a police officer, according to the Justice Department. That carries a maximum sentence of 20 years.

But one source said there has been little, if any, recent discussion by senior Justice Department officials of filing charges such as "seditious conspiracy" to accuse defendants of trying to overthrow the government. They have also opted not to bring racketeering charges, often used against organized criminal gangs.

Senior officials had discussed filing such charges in the weeks after the attack, the sources said.

Prosecutors have also not brought any charges alleging that any individual or group played a central role in organizing or leading the riot. Law-enforcement sources told Reuters no such charges appeared to be pending.

Conspiracy charges that have been filed allege that defendants discussed their plans in the weeks before the attack and worked together on the day itself. But prosecutors have not alleged that this activity was part of a broader plot.

Some federal judges and legal experts have questioned whether the Justice Department is letting defendants off too lightly.

Judge Beryl Howell in July asked prosecutors to explain why one defendant was allowed to plead to a misdemeanor charge carrying a maximum sentence of six months, rather than a more serious felony charge.

Spokespeople for the Justice Department and U.S. Attorney's office in Washington, which is leading the Jan. 6 prosecutions, declined to comment.

The congressional committee investigating the attack will talk with the FBI and other agencies as part of its probe.

[From Business Insider, Aug. 20, 2021]

FBI FINDS NO EVIDENCE THAT TRUMP AND HIS ALLIES WERE DIRECTLY INVOLVED WITH ORGANIZING THE VIOLENCE OF THE CAPITOL RIOT: REPORT

(By Bryan Metzger)

The FBI has found no evidence that Trump was directly involved in organizing Capitol-riot violence.

It also found little evidence of an organized plot to overturn the election results.

Ninety to ninety-five percent of these are one-off cases," said one former official.

See more stories on Insider's business page.

The FBI hasn't found any evidence that the January 6 assault on the US Capitol was part of an organized plot to overturn the election results, Reuters reported, citing law-enforcement officials.

The officials also said that the FBI has "so far found no evidence" that former President Donald Trump or "people directly around him were involved in organizing the violence," Reuters reported.

"Ninety to ninety-five percent of these are one-off cases," a former law-enforcement official familiar with the investigation told Reuters. "There was no grand scheme with Roger Stone and Alex Jones and all of these people to storm the Capitol and take hostages."

More than 570 participants have been arrested by federal officials. Investigators have found that groups such as the Oath Keepers

and Proud Boys did plan ahead of time to break into the Capitol, but they didn't engage in much planning beyond that step. Reuters reported that 40 percent of the defendants are being prosecuted on conspiracy charges, implying a certain amount of planning and coordination.

But prosecutors have generally shied away from alleging a broader plot. Senior Department of Justice officials do not intend to bring forward seditious-conspiracy charges or even racketeering charges, which are commonly used against organized criminal gangs.

A Democratic congressional source told Reuters that senior lawmakers who have been briefed on the FBI's investigation find the results credible.

Though the FBI has not found an organized plot or direct involvement by Trump, that doesn't mean that Trump didn't play an important role in instigating the violence. Earlier this year, the House of Representatives impeached Trump on the charge of "incitement of insurrection" after he spent weeks promoting conspiracy theories about the results of the 2020 election. On January 6, Trump gave a speech on The Ellipse where he urged supporters to march on the Capitol.

Read the original article on Business Insider.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Additionally, a number of questions from that day still remain unanswered. I am still waiting for the Speaker of the House to answer a letter I sent her back in February that asked why the National Guard, requested by Police Chief Sund, were denied? And why was the Speaker's office and the Speaker involved in eventually approving the request? Why has the House Sergeant at Arms refused to comply with preservation and production requests from my office?

We have many, many more questions about why the Capitol was so unprepared that day. Our top priority should be ensuring our Capitol is never as vulnerable as it was on January 6, but this majority has done absolutely nothing to make the security changes needed to make this Capitol safer.

Madam Speaker, we must do better. We have not fixed the institutional problems with our security apparatus that led to the lack of preparation, the danger that our brave officers were put in on that day and any other possible day like that in the future. That is a failure of leadership in this institution.

We must fix the problems that led to the terrible security posture here—and I will tell you, after witnessing what we saw a few different days and security postures that this House was put into a couple of other days since January 6—and I urge you to talk to the brave officers that stand around these buildings and protect all of us every day; ask them the same question I do. Ask them if we have put them in a better position than they were in on January 6? And the answer out of every single officer I asked that question to is "no."

What is stopping this House from fixing the problems? It is a lack of will. It is a lack of focusing on the true issues that led for them to be put in a dangerous spot on January 6. Instead, we

are talking politics. It is wrong, and we must do better.

I have said this time and time again, I stand willing to work with my Democrat colleagues to make this House, this Capitol, safer for everyone. Instead, it is all about political points like the one being scored today.

I am disappointed. You can tell. My frustration is going to continue to boil over until we are in a position to fix the problems that I have laid out and that we know exist.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Illinois' statement, the first hearing of the select committee that we actually held interviewed four officers who put their lives on the line defending all of us who work here in this body. So I assure you, my directions to the committee have always been, we will look at all of the facts and circumstances surrounding what occurred.

We are genuinely interested in getting to the facts. We are working to get the answers. And that is why we are on the floor today, to get answers from Steve Bannon about what he knew, what he did leading up to January 6.

Also, to the gentleman from Indiana, I am glad he finally agrees that the select committee has a legitimate legislative purpose and that is why we are here today, pursuing that legislative purpose. So I am happy that the RECORD will reflect his comments.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY), a valiant member of the select committee.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to refer Stephen Bannon to the Department of Justice for prosecution for contempt of Congress.

It didn't have to be this way. Mr. Bannon, a self-professed patriot, could have done the patriotic thing and cooperated with our bipartisan committee.

If Mr. Bannon was proud of the role he played in connection with January 6, he should be eager to tell his side of the story. Instead, he is acting like a man who has something to hide. Our committee seeks only the truth. That is our legal charge and our moral obligation. We cannot let any individual impede our inquiry, and we will not tolerate Mr. Bannon's evasion.

Why must we be so unrelenting in our pursuit of truth? Because on January 6, the greatest Nation on Earth came under attack. And this attack wasn't carried out by officials in Beijing, Moscow, or Tehran, or by foreign terrorists even. It was an attack conducted by our fellow citizens, regular Americans who were radicalized because they believed outrageous lies fed to them by other Americans in positions of power and influence.

The attack was launched against the seat and symbol of our Republic. It was

designed to disrupt the certification of the Presidential election results, to defy the will of the voters. This was no peaceful protest in a proud American tradition. It was violent and vicious. Members of the mob wielded weapons. They called for the death of the Vice President. They hunted Members of Congress. They caused severe harm to law enforcement officers. And the real disservice to the police comes from those who want to whitewash the violence of January 6 and pretend that the riot of that day was anything short of the violent attack it was, aimed at derailing the peaceful transfer of power.

America is not just a place; it is an idea. And on January 6, there was an attack on the very idea of America. I believe that patriots of all political stripes should want to protect our Capitol, this country, and her Constitution. Our committee will make a full accounting of what happened, and we will make recommendations to ensure it never happens again.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the vice chair for yielding.

Like many of my colleagues, I was right here on the House floor when the violent mob attacked our Capitol. I saw those doors shaking, nearly overrun with rioters attempting to enter. I saw my colleagues shed their jackets and roll up their sleeves preparing for the eventuality. And I saw Capitol Police acting quickly and thoughtfully to conduct a successful evacuation of Members from this Chamber. Their actions, undoubtedly, saved lives.

What we didn't know at the time was that on the steps of the Capitol, the Capitol Police and the Metro PD officers were engaged in brutal hand-to-hand combat. Officer Michael Fanone told us he was grabbed, beaten, and tased, all while being called a traitor to this country.

This is what officers dealt with to defend our democracy. Some lost their lives; many are still living with both the physical wounds and the trauma that they suffered that day. This is what our officers dealt with to defend democracy.

Officer Harry Dunn told us more than 6 months later, January 6 still isn't over for me. These officers are heroes. I want to thank the chair and the vice chair for their leadership in making our first order of business hearing directly from those heroes in their own words.

We wanted to hear and make sure that all of our colleagues and this country heard firsthand what we experienced on the ground that day. We asked them to explain the violence they had to endure to protect our democratic process, and in return, they made one simple request: to get to the bottom of this.

They want answers, and, quite frankly, they deserve answers. So far, both the Metro PD and the Capitol Police

have been excellent allies in this investigation. They have cooperated, shared their stories and expertise, and provided us with key evidence and accounts of the violence they endured that day. And we owe it to them to see this investigation through.

The vote we take today is a crucial step toward removing a roadblock in our investigation. We owe it to every officer who put their life on the line that day and every day to protect us here in the Capitol. We owe them answers. And this committee intends to get to those answers by all means necessary.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution.

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), an Iraq and Afghanistan Air Force veteran and a lieutenant colonel in the Air National Guard.

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. Let me just say first, Madam Speaker, as a Republican, don't let my side use the security posture as the straw-man argument in this. The reality is that that is the equivalent of blaming the victim of a crime for the crime. And while it is important, that is not what we are here to talk about today.

Madam Speaker, voting on a criminal contempt resolution is not the position we had hoped to be in, but Steve Bannon went out of his way to earn this resolution before us and now we must approve it.

Mr. Bannon's willful disregard for the select committee's subpoena demonstrates his utter contempt for the American people's right to know how the attacks on January 6 came about. He has advanced a ludicrous legal argument in support of his decision not to corroborate or comply, a decision that defies the rule of law and rejects the will of the American people.

Mr. Bannon's reported actions put him near the center of the investigation into the events surrounding January 6. His own words strongly suggest that the actions of the mob that stormed the Capitol and invaded this very Chamber came as no surprise to him. He and a few others were, by all accounts, involved in planning that day's events, and encouraged those who attacked the Capitol, our officers, and our democracy.

I have no doubt that Mr. Bannon's scorn for our subpoena is real. But no one—and I repeat, no one—is above the law, and we need to hear from him.

As the select committee's contempt report states, it was Mr. Bannon who on January 5 predicted with chilling accuracy: "All hell is going to break loose tomorrow."

On his radio show that day he stated: "It's not going to happen like you think it's going to happen. Okay. It's going to be quite extraordinarily dif-

ferent. All I can say is, strap in. You made this happen and tomorrow it's game day. So strap in. Let's get ready."

And it was Mr. Bannon, who was recorded as saying: "It's all converging, and now we're on the point of attack tomorrow."

□ 1515

Mr. Bannon said these things publicly, as a private citizen, someone deeply involved with the Stop the Steal movement, and he said them nearly 3 years after leaving his job at the White House.

Mr. Bannon was also reportedly among the small group of Trump confidants assembled at the Willard Hotel to discuss plans to stop or delay the January 6 count.

Is it any wonder that the select committee needs to hear from him; that we want to see related materials that he has?

Furthermore, does anyone really believe Mr. Bannon's actions are covered by a blanket, no-questions-asked claim of executive privilege? One the former President has never actually made.

Madam Speaker, Steve Bannon is a key witness to the select committee's probe. He has yet to say or produce anything in response to the subpoena. His assertion of executive privilege is farfetched in the extreme and not his to make.

I urge my colleagues to join me to support the contempt resolution.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, today, Donald Trump said the insurrection took place on November 3. No, Mr. Trump. I am sorry. That is what we call an election in America; an election that was validated by more than 60 Federal or State courts, including before eight judges nominated to the bench by President Trump himself, and all the way up to the United States Supreme Court, all of them rejecting every claim of electoral fraud and corruption that was advanced.

We know an insurrection when we see one in this body, because we lived through one. Under the banner of this continuing and deranged big lie, the Stop the Steal movement brought down a violent insurrection against this Congress in an attempted coup against Vice President Mike Pence. They interrupted the counting of electoral college votes for the first time in American history. They caused the worst attack on Congress since the War of 1812; and they injured and wounded more than 140 police officers, Capitol Police officers, Metropolitan Police Department officers, and others, breaking their noses, breaking their necks, breaking their vertebrae, breaking their arms, breaking their legs, breaking their hearts and their spirits.

We are investigating the attack on American democracy because we are Americans. We are investigating the

attack on Congress by domestic enemies of our Constitution because we are sworn to do so by our oaths of office.

But now, the big lie has become a big coverup. After being impeached twice by the House, after losing in 61 different courts, after seeing a 57-43 vote against him in the U.S. Senate, in the most sweeping bipartisan Senate Presidential conviction vote in American history, Trump now tries to get his followers, like Steve Bannon, not to testify here and not to turn over evidence that they have about this vicious assault on American democracy.

In America, when you are subpoenaed to testify in court or in Congress, you show up, period. You can invoke your Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination to specific questions if you think you committed a crime. You can claim executive privilege to specific questions if you think you are President of the United States. But you cannot blow off a subpoena in America. You cannot sit on your couch and defy the people's representatives in Congress.

So we must enforce the rule of law here, my colleagues. We must do it. If you act deliberately, with sneering, cavalier contempt for the American people and their representatives, we will hold you in contempt. We will get to the truth of the violent assault on America.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, you don't have to look far to realize the absurdity of what is happening in Congress today. In fact, Politico just reported moments ago that the Capitol Police whistleblower is telling us—telling Politico—that they have not been contacted by the January 6 select committee.

The Capitol Police whistleblower said that the United States Capitol Police deserves more scrutiny than it has gotten so far and that he would talk to investigators if they reach out to him. And the select committee has not reached out to the Capitol Police whistleblower.

Yet, here we are today focused on holding a private citizen in contempt, an unprecedented action by this sham committee and their sham investigation.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, why are we here on the floor of the House of Representatives listening to the Democrats and socialists and their Republican puppets reviewing Steve Bannon's podcast?

I can't imagine that that would be the case if they actually had a bill, a reconciliation deal, legislation to help the American people. We are not here because of democracy. Save me the alligator tears on that. These are the folks who assaulted our democracy for 2 years under the specter of the Russia hoax. It is sure not about violence, because they didn't seem to give a damn

when our country was being engulfed in flames during the riots of the summer of 2020.

It is not about Congressional process. If it was about Congressional process, Democrats would be doing what they have done in other cases; they would go to court. But the reason they haven't gone to court, like they did for Trump's taxes, in the Deutsche Bank subpoenas, in the Mazars matter, or in the Don McGahn matter, is because in each of those circumstances, they did not prevail in court. The courts realized that their subpoenas were overly broad.

So instead of using the real process, here we are just enduring this politics. And because they can't build back better, they have just decided to build back meaner.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, just for the record, again, the gentleman from Indiana referenced the whistleblower. We have not talked to the whistleblower, but we have talked to the whistleblower's lawyer. We are doing our work. So, clearly, since he is quoting Politico, I want him to just get the record straight.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. LURIA), who served two decades in the Navy and was among the first women to serve in the Navy's nuclear power program.

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic."

We reaffirmed that oath on January 3. Yet only 3 days later in this very Chamber, this body was assaulted while carrying out the peaceful transfer of power, the very hallmark of our democracy.

I first took that oath when I was 17 years old and entered the Naval Academy. I was willing to put my life on the line to serve my country and protect the foundation of this republic, a foundation that was shaken but not broken on January 6.

Mr. Bannon, a former naval officer like me, at one point understood this oath. He took it multiple times. He served his country honorably in the Navy.

I don't know what happened between the time Lieutenant Bannon left the Navy and today. What forces corrupted his understanding of this oath?

Mr. Bannon has been given the opportunity to voluntarily provide information relevant to the work of our committee, but he has not complied.

Truly, this is larger than Mr. Bannon, this is larger than this investigation, and this is larger than the tragic and horrific events of January 6.

This vote is a test of that oath. To my colleagues who chose to vote against enforcing the subpoena, you are saying to all future men and women who are called before this body that they can ignore a subpoena from Congress without consequence.

You can make that choice today. But that will be a vote to abdicate the

power of the legislative branch in which you are elected to serve. That will be a vote to undermine the government and the Constitution which you took an oath to support and defend.

The consequences of that vote won't be limited to this investigation and this subpoena alone. Your vote will do serious, long-lasting damage to Congress as an institution. That, in turn, will do serious damage to our country, which we all love so dearly.

We ask our young men and women in uniform to go forth every day and protect us, to protect this republic, to protect our form of government. I am asking you to do the same, to protect our democracy from those forces seeking to destroy it from within.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Look, we have seen the worst 10 months of any administration in history. We went from a secure border to chaos. We went from safe streets to violent crime. We have seen stable prices turn into inflation and empty shelves. The respect around the world we had has now turned into the debacle that was the exit from Afghanistan. And we went from peace in the Middle East with the Abraham Accords to thousands of rockets being fired on our friend and ally, Israel; not to mention, energy independence to now the spectacle of the President of the United States begging OPEC to increase production.

But what scares me most is what this administration and Democrats are doing to freedom. Every right we enjoy under the First Amendment has been assaulted over the last year.

Your right to practice faith. There are still places today in the country where a full congregation can't meet on Sunday morning.

Your right to petition your government, your right to assemble, freedom of the press, freedom of speech—every single one has been attacked.

We just learned in the Judiciary Committee from the Attorney General that the National School Boards Association last month, September 29, sends a letter to the President of the United States asking the FBI to get involved in local school board matters. Five days later, the Attorney General issues a memo to do just that.

The first sentence of the Attorney General's memo says this: In recent months, there has been a disturbing spike in harassment, intimidation, and threats at school board meetings.

We asked him a simple question: What is the evidence for a spike in threats? What is the data? What did you review?

Guess what his answer was. His only evidence, the only thing he reviewed, was the letter from the school boards association, from a political organiza-

tion. Now, they are going to target parents at school board meetings.

And we have the January 6 committee issuing subpoena after subpoena. Eleven of the people they have issued subpoenas to were names on an application asking the government for permission to hold a rally. Individuals exercising their First Amendment right to assemble, asked the government for permission, the government granted them permission, and now these 20- and 30-year-olds, whose names are on that application, they are going to be deposed by these guys for simply exercising their First Amendment right.

Here is what they are asking them, we want to know who the speakers were and how were they selected. We want to know any communications these people—who put their names on a permit, got permission from the government—we want to know any Member of Congress you talked to.

Wow. Your right to petition your government, that is why they are subpoenaing these people? This is scary, where they want to go.

These questions—coordination of speakers, discussions of contents—this sounds like what the IRS did to people 10 years ago when they were asking 501(c) groups applying for tax-exempt status, do you pray at the start of your meeting?

First, it is school boards, then it is people applying for a permit. We saw what the IRS did to people just a few years ago; not to mention what else the committee is doing; preservation letters to all of the carriers, all of the companies; preserve every call, every email, every text. Think about that. Every call someone made to—hundreds and hundreds, supposedly, according to news reports. They have done this for texts to your spouse, calls to your mom. Preserve it all. And this is just what we know about. This is just what has been reported.

And now Steve Bannon. Now Steve Bannon. Mr. Bannon is a target of the investigation, for the investigation, because—and this is the select committee's own report—"His efforts to plan political activity."

That is the standard. If you are involved in political activity, they are going to investigate you.

We know what this is really about. This is about getting at President Trump. They tried to stop President Trump before he was even elected with the Russia investigation; tried to remove President Trump from office twice while he was in office. And now they are trying to get him after the fact, after he has left, all because this guy cut taxes, reduced regulation, gave us the greatest economy in 50 years, lowest unemployment, all because he built the wall, got us out of the Iran deal, put the embassy in Jerusalem. When President Trump was President, Americans got their Christmas presents on time. But they are coming after him.

The Reuters story said this: The FBI has found no evidence that President Trump, or people directly around him, were involved in organizing the violence.

They don't care. They don't care that the FBI has no evidence. The Senate report said no evidence of a coordinated plan. They don't care. They are going to drag these 11 people in for depositions with subpoenas, because they are so determined to get their political enemies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

□ 1530

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Chair, the vice chair of the committee put in the RECORD the fact that the FBI and Department of Justice declared no such thing in terms of January 6, so the assertion that somehow they have conducted an investigation is just not true.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the distinguished chairman of the House Intelligence Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, we are here this afternoon to test a proposition as old as the country's founding: Are we a nation of laws?

We are here because one man has decided that we are now only a nation of men and that rich and powerful men need not follow the law. And the question we must confront is nothing less than this: Is he right?

Are some people now truly above the law, beholden to nothing and no one, free to ignore the law and without consequence?

Congress is investigating the worst attack on our Capitol in over a century, made worse still by the fact that it was carried out by our own people, people who had been misled to believe that their election had been stolen and that violence was now justified, people who are still being misled by a dangerous lie that may lead to even more bloodshed.

This is not some theoretical matter. We were here. We heard the doors breaking, the glass shattering, the cries from outside the Chamber. And we saw the bloody results, the officers injured, and those who died.

And in the wake of the horrors of that day, a day in which the Capitol Police put their lives on the line to defend our democracy, it falls on us to defend that same democracy, albeit at far less risk to ourselves.

The Founders intended that ambition should be made to check ambition. If we fail to uphold Congress' power to compel information, then we cease to be a coequal branch of government, unable to perform our oversight or check any abuses of executive power.

Take away a court's power to subpoena witnesses, and it fails to be a court. Take away the Congress' ability to do the same, and it fails to be a Congress, becoming instead a mere plaything for a corrupt executive.

Do not believe for one moment that if we fail to hold Steve Bannon accountable that he will be the exception. He will become the rule—not a rule of law, but the misrule of men.

Either we are all equal before the law or none of us is. This is the essence of our democracy.

As Lincoln said, "Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy."

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wyoming has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Mississippi has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has no time remaining.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, just outside this Chamber, over the north door in Statuary Hall, which was the old House Chamber, stands a statue of Clio, the muse of history. She is one of the oldest works of art in our Capitol. She stands in a winged chariot, the chariot of time, and she takes notes in her book, reminding all of us that our words and our actions will be judged by history. History will particularly judge those of us in positions of public trust for what we are doing today.

In the immediate aftermath of the attack, Madam Speaker, we all recognized how profoundly wrong January 6 was. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), who just suggested that we were here because we opposed President Trump's policies, seems to have forgotten that actually on January 6 he, himself, said, "What happened today is wrong and is not what America is about."

The next day Mr. JORDAN said, "What happened Wednesday is a tragedy. Everyone knows that. It is as wrong as wrong can be."

And today, Madam Speaker, the former President suggested that the violence was justified.

My colleagues in the Republican Party, the Republican Members of this body, have to understand, have to recognize, that there is a moment when politics must stop if we want to defend and protect our institutions.

A violent assault on the Capitol to stop the constitutional process of counting electoral votes is that moment. They all knew that on that day.

In fact, the minority leader himself stood in this Chamber and said, "The President bears responsibility for Wednesday's attack on Congress by mob rioters. He should have immediately denounced the mob when he saw what was unfolding."

Mr. MCCARTHY was right then. The President bears responsibility.

We need to know what happened. This body must have the ability to understand what caused the attack, to understand who was responsible, and to take legislative action to ensure that it never happens again.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion for contempt for Mr. Steve Bannon. I urge them to do so because it is right; it is morally right; it is constitutionally right; and it is all of our duty.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Over the last hour, we have heard a lot about what we are not debating today. The select committee is charged with investigating a deadly attack on the seat of our democracy and making recommendations to ensure it never happens again. I can't think of anything more serious, but many of our colleagues would rather talk about anything else.

I think I know why. I think they are performing for an audience of one.

I do, however, want to commend my colleagues on the select committee for laying out clearly why the House must cite Mr. Bannon for contempt. If our investigation is to succeed, if the House's constitutional authority to investigate and legislate is to remain robust, then we cannot let this man flout the laws with impunity.

The select committee is made up of people of character, of profound commitment to public service and our Constitution. They all elevate the committee's work.

I especially want to thank and acknowledge our vice chair, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), for her leadership and partnership. There is no doubt in my mind that history will record her courage in stark relief.

History will record all of what we do here today. We can be on the right side or the wrong side. I urge all my colleagues to remember that as we cast this vote.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, today the House has been deliberating on the criminal contempt of Congress citation of Steven K. Bannon reported from the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol on Tuesday, October 19, 2021. This is a grave matter and not one the House takes lightly.

As I have said on many occasions, the Select Committee would prefer not to be in this position. We expect—and the law (2 U.S.C. § 192) demands—witnesses comply with duly issued, lawful subpoenas of Congress. We lay out the factual record of Mr. Bannon's willful defiance of the Select Committee's September 23, 2021, subpoena in House Report 117–152.

There have been developments since the Report was written and adopted, and I memorialized some of those at the Select Committee's business meeting. To perfect the factual record in this case, I now include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD correspondence between myself and Mr. Bannon's attorney, Robert J. Costello, and further correspondence between the Office of White House Counsel and Mr. Costello, which states President Biden's position on issues relating to the subpoena to Mr. Bannon.

First, on Friday, October 15, 2021, I wrote Mr. Costello to reiterate to him and his client that the Select Committee would view Mr. Bannon's decision not to appear for his deposition as willful defiance that would lead to a business meeting of the Select Committee to consider a contempt report. I include that letter in the RECORD.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE
UNITED STATES CAPITOL,

October 15, 2021.

MR. ROBERT J. COSTELLO,
Davidoff Hutcher & Citron LLP,
* * *

DEAR MR. COSTELLO: The Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack ("Select Committee") is in receipt of your October 13, 2021 letter (the "October 13 letter"), in which you reassert that your client, Stephen Bannon, will not comply with the September 23, 2021 Subpoena to him for documents and deposition testimony (the "Subpoena"). As you know, the Subpoena demanded that Mr. Bannon produce documents by October 7, 2021 and appear on October 14, 2021 before the Select Committee to provide deposition testimony on a wide range of issues relating to the January 6, 2021 attack on the United States Capitol, as well as plans to interfere with the count of the 2020 Electoral College results. Mr. Bannon has now willfully failed to both produce a single document and to appear for his scheduled deposition. The Select Committee believes that this willful refusal to comply with the Subpoena constitutes a violation of federal law.

As justification for Mr. Bannon's complete failure to comply with any portion of the Subpoena, you continue to rely on ex-President Trump's stated intention to invoke executive privilege with respect to Mr. Bannon, and Mr. Trump's purported request that Mr. Bannon not produce documents to or testify before the Select Committee. As was explained in the Select Committee's October 8, 2021 letter (attached), the former President has not communicated any such assertion of privilege, whether formally or informally, to the Select Committee. Moreover, we believe that any such assertion of privilege—should it be made by the former President—will not prevent the Select Committee from lawfully obtaining the information it seeks.

Further, your letter makes no attempt to justify Mr. Bannon's failure to comply with the Subpoena's demand for documents and testimony on a range of subjects that do not involve communications with the former President. As is clear from the Subpoena and accompanying letter, and as underscored in the Select Committee's October 8, 2021 response letter, the Select Committee seeks documents and testimony on numerous other matters, including Mr. Bannon's communications with Members of Congress, presidential campaign representatives, and other private parties concerning the events of January 6, 2021, that could not conceivably be barred by a privilege claim.

Moreover, even if the Select Committee were inclined to accept the unsupported premise that executive privilege reaches communications that the Select Committee seeks to examine between President Trump and Mr. Bannon, Mr. Bannon does not enjoy any form of absolute immunity from testifying or producing documents in response to a Congressional subpoena. Your citation to *Committee on Judiciary v. McGahn*, 415 F. Supp. 3d 148 (D.D.C. 2019) actually supports the Select Committee, not your client. In *McGahn*, the district court unequivocally held that even senior White House aides are not entitled to absolute immunity from tes-

tifying in response to a Congressional subpoena. *Id.* at 214 ("To make the point as plain as possible, it is clear to this Court . . . that, with respect to senior-level presidential aides, absolute immunity from compelled congressional process simply does not exist."). Indeed, the footnote in *McGahn* that you selectively quote makes clear that a President lacks legal authority to order an aide not to appear before Congress based on a claim of executive privilege. *See Id.* at 213, n. 34 ("But the invocation of the privilege by a testifying aide is an order of magnitude different than DOJ's current claim that the President essentially owns the *entirety* of a senior-level aide's testimony such that the White House can order the individual not to appear before Congress *at all*." (Emphasis in original)).

Accordingly, the Select Committee views Mr. Bannon's failure to produce documents by the October 7, 2021 deadline as willful non-compliance with the Subpoena. Mr. Bannon has persisted in his refusal to produce any documents to the Select Committee, and he has failed to provide a privilege log identifying specific, asserted privileges. Mr. Bannon has now further compounded his non-compliance by refusing to appear on October 14, 2021 at the Select Committee deposition to which he was summoned to provide testimony. The Select Committee will therefore be meeting on Tuesday, October 19, 2021 to consider invoking the contempt of Congress procedures set forth in 2 U.S.C. §§ 192, 194.

If Mr. Bannon believes that there are any additional issues relating to his non-compliance with the Subpoena that have not been addressed, please submit them in writing to the Select Committee by 6:00 p.m. E.S.T. on Monday, October 18, 2021 for the Select Committee's consideration in its deliberations.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

MR. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, at 6 p.m. on Monday, October 18, 2021, Mr. Costello replied to that letter and requested a 1-week "adjournment" to respond. Mr. Bannon's attorney said they needed time to "assess" the Select Committee's requests for documents and testimony in light of litigation filed by former President Trump in DC District Court. I include Mr. Costello's letter in the RECORD.

DAVIDOFF HUTCHER & CITRON LLP,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW, * * *,
October 18, 2021.

Re: The Subpoena for Stephen K. Bannon dated September 23, 2021.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, House Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack,

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: We write on behalf of Stephen Bannon. We have just been advised of the filing of a lawsuit in federal court for the District of Columbia entitled *Donald J. Trump v. Bennie Thompson*, et al., 21-Civ-02769 (D.D.C. 2021). In light of this late filing, we respectfully request a one-week adjournment of our response to your latest letter so that we might thoughtfully assess the impact of this pending litigation.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT J. COSTELLO.

MR. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, the former President's lawsuit, however, is immaterial to Mr. Bannon's defiance of our lawful subpoena. As House Report 117-152 makes clear, Mr. Bannon had a duty to produce documents and appear before the Select Committee. His flat refusal to comply with the subpoena is unacceptable. I made

that clear in a letter to Mr. Costello before the Select Committee's business meeting on Tuesday, October 19, 2021. I include in the RECORD my response to Mr. Costello's October 18th letter.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE
UNITED STATES CAPITOL,

October 19, 2021.

MR. ROBERT J. COSTELLO,
Davidoff Hutcher & Citron LLP,

DEAR MR. COSTELLO: The Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol ("Select Committee") is in receipt of your October 18, 2021, letter requesting a one-week "adjournment" of your response to my October 15, 2021, letter. The only basis for your request is yesterday's filing of litigation by former President Trump against the Chairman, Select Committee, Archivist of the United States, and the National Archives and Records Administration. That litigation relates to the Select Committee's requests for documents in the possession of the National Archives and is immaterial to the Select Committee's demand for documents and testimony from Mr. Bannon. The investigation of the Select Committee is extremely important and urgent for the nation, and further delay in compliance by Mr. Bannon undermines the ability of the Committee to timely complete its essential responsibilities. Accordingly, no grounds exist for any "adjournment" or other delay and your request is denied.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

MR. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, meanwhile, with regard to Mr. Bannon's claims that executive privileges somehow precluded his production or appearance pursuant to the Select Committee's subpoena, on Monday, October 18, 2021, the Office of White House Counsel wrote a letter to Mr. Costello and specifically stated that "at this point we are not aware of any basis for [Mr. Bannon's] refusal to appear for a deposition." It further stated that President Biden "has already determined that an assertion of executive privilege is not in the public interest, and therefore is not justified, with respect to certain subjects within the purview of the Select Committee." I include the full White House letter in the RECORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, October 18, 2021.

ROBERT J. COSTELLO,
Davidoff Hutcher & Citron LLP,
* * *

DEAR MR. COSTELLO: I write regarding the subpoena for documents and deposition testimony issued on September 23, 2021, by the House Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol (the "Select Committee") to your client, Stephen K. Bannon.

As you are aware, Mr. Bannon's tenure as a White House employee ended in 2017. To the extent any privileges could apply to Mr. Bannon's conversations with the former President or White House staff after the conclusion of his tenure, President Biden has already determined that an assertion of executive privilege is not in the public interest, and therefore is not justified, with respect to certain subjects within the purview of the Select Committee. Specifically, President Biden determined that an assertion of executive privilege is not justified with respect to a set of documents shedding light on events within the White House on and about January 6, 2021, and with respect to documents

and testimony concerning the former President's efforts to use the Department of Justice to advance a false narrative that the 2020 election was tainted by widespread fraud. President Biden's determination that an assertion of privilege is not justified with respect to these subjects applies to your client's deposition testimony and to any documents your client may possess concerning either subject.

Please contact me if you have questions about the matters described herein. Please note, however, that at this point we are not aware of any basis for your client's refusal to appear for a deposition.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN C. SU,
Deputy Counsel to the President.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, after the Select Committee's October 19th business meeting, I wrote to Mr. Costello yet again to urge Mr. Bannon to change course and comply with the Select Committee's subpoena of September 23, 2021. I reiterated that Mr. Costello's stated reasons for Mr. Bannon's flat refusal to provide documents and appear at a deposition have no legal basis or support. I provided him with a link to the Select Committee's adopted report on a contempt citation to review the detailed basis for our recommendation to the House. I include my October 19th letter in the RECORD.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE
UNITED STATES CAPITOL,

October 19, 2021.

Mr. ROBERT J. COSTELLO,
Davidoff Hutcher & Citron LLP,
* * *

DEAR MR. COSTELLO: I write yet again to urge your client Stephen K. Bannon to change course and comply with the September 23, 2021, subpoena from the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol ("Select Committee").

As explained in our prior correspondence, your stated reasons for Mr. Bannon's flat refusal to provide documents and appear at a deposition have no legal basis or support. Because of Mr. Bannon's continued refusal to comply with the subpoena, the Select Committee has unanimously voted to recommend that the House of Representatives find Mr. Bannon to be in contempt of Congress. The detailed basis for that recommendation is contained in the Select Committee's report, a copy of which is available at the following link: <https://docs.house.gov/Committee/Calendar/ByEvent.aspx?EventID=114156>. Should the House of Representatives agree with that recommendation, the Speaker of the House will certify the relevant statement of facts to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, "whose duty it shall be to bring the matter before the grand jury for its action." See 2 U.S.C. §194.

Additionally, President Biden's recently communicated views relating to your client's reliance on executive privilege as a basis for his non-compliance provide further support for the Select Committee's position. As you know, in its October 18, 2021, letter, the Office of the White House Counsel concluded that "at this point we are not aware of any basis for [Mr. Bannon's] refusal to appear for a deposition." The letter further noted that President Biden has "already determined that an assertion of executive privilege is not in the public interest, and therefore is not justified, with respect to certain subjects within the purview of the Select Committee." In short, the current President's statements should remove any doubt regarding the inappropriateness of Mr.

Bannon's reliance on assertions of executive privilege as grounds for his noncompliance with the subpoena. Mr. Bannon has no basis in law to continue to defy the appropriate use of congressional subpoena authority.

These developments underscore the folly of any continuing defiance of the Select Committee subpoena by Mr. Bannon. The Select Committee remains focused on expeditiously obtaining the testimony and documents necessary to meet our responsibilities and we continue to expect immediate compliance by Mr. Bannon. Should Mr. Bannon choose to change his posture, please notify Select Committee staff * * *.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, the importance of our investigation, and the recommendations we make for legislative and other policy changes that result from our investigation, require the participation of witnesses who have clear knowledge of the events leading up to and during the January 6th attack. Mr. Bannon's own actions in defiance of our lawful subpoena for a valid legislative purpose demand the consequences reflected in the House resolution citing him with contempt and referring his case to the Department of Justice.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, Congress has a long-recognized and essential role in conducting oversight. The Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol has the solemn responsibility to investigate and report upon the facts, circumstances, and causes related to the attack on January 6, 2021. This domestic terrorist attack sought to interfere with the peaceful transfer of power and undermine American representative democracy during the exercise of a constitutional process.

Mr. Bannon reportedly held multiple roles and had specific knowledge relevant to the investigation of the January 6th attack on the Capitol. Mr. Bannon has defied a lawful Congressional subpoena. The investigation by the Select Committee is fundamental to our democracy, and I will vote today to hold Mr. Bannon in contempt of Congress for his failure to comply with a Congressional Subpoena. Mr. Bannon has a duty to cooperate with the Congressional investigation into the fundamental attack on our democracy on January 6th. Therefore, I will vote in support of finding Stephen K. Bannon in contempt of Congress for failure to comply with a Congressional subpoena.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Committees on the Judiciary, on Homeland Security, and on the Budget, I rise in support of the rule governing debate for H. Res. 730, "Resolution Recommending that the House of Representatives Find Stephen K. Bannon in Contempt of Congress for Refusal to Comply with a Subpoena Duly Issued by the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol."

On January 6th the domestic terrorists who beat law enforcement officers and breached the Citadel of democracy of the United States wore insignias of White Supremacist groups, waved confederate flags, hung a noose on the lawn, and they were shouting racial epithets.

According to published reports and his own public statements, Mr. Bannon had specific knowledge about the events planned for January 6th before they occurred: just before the

day of the attack, Mr. Bannon told his listeners:

All hell is going to break loose tomorrow . . . It's not going to happen like you think it's going to happen. OK, it's going to be quite extraordinarily different. All I can say is, strap in . . . You made this happen and tomorrow it's game day. So strap in. Let's get ready. So many people said, 'Man, if I was in a revolution, I would be in Washington.' Well this is your time in history.

At 12:15 p.m. on January 6th he said to the assembled multitude on the Ellipse: "You will never take back our country with weakness."

Less than an hour later, at 1:10 p.m., he admonished the crowd: "We fight like hell, and if you don't fight like hell you will not have a country anymore."

Madam Speaker, the assault on the U.S. Capitol by domestic terrorists and insurrectionists rightly takes its place as one of the darkest moments in our nation's history since the Civil War.

Madam Speaker, the January 6 insurrection caused tragic loss of life and many injuries, while leaving behind widespread physical damage to the Capitol Complex and emotional trauma for Members, Congressional employees, and the Capitol Police.

It bears repeating often that the Congress and the nation owe undying gratitude to the men and women who answered the call of constitutional duty and heroically won the day on that bloody and deadly afternoon.

Madam Speaker, the domestic terrorists and secessionists who attacked the Capitol Building on January 6, 2021 were not, as some of their ardent defenders and apologists across the aisle have stated falsely, on a "normal tour visit"; nor was their effort to lay siege to the Capitol and disrupt the processes of government an act of persons who love their country.

And it is absurd to suggest that it was a celebration of the United States and what it stands for when the leading edge of terrorists desecrated the Capitol by offensively parading the treasonous Confederate flag through the building and when, because of their insurrection, several members of law enforcement made the supreme sacrifice and scores more were seriously injured.

Madam Speaker, we owe it not just to those who lost their lives during that day, but to all Americans to figure out exactly what happened and how that day came to be.

We must understand that day in order to prevent the intended purpose of the January 6 insurrection—to disrupt the Joint Meeting of Congress to tally the votes of presidential electors and announce the results to the nation and the world—from every occurring again, because it was the greatest threat to the American Experiment since the Civil War when the pro-slavery forces decided to make war rather than let the nation survive. and the pro-freedom forces would accept war rather than let the nation perish.

The Select Committee has diligently continued in their duty to determine the causes and events that transpired during the insurrectionist attack.

Specifically, the Select Committee's purposes include:

To investigate and report upon the facts, circumstances, and causes "relating to the January 6, 2021 domestic terrorist attack upon the United States Capitol Complex;"

To investigate and report upon the facts, circumstances, and causes “relating to the interference with the peaceful transfer of power;” and

To investigate and report upon the facts, circumstances, and causes relating to “the influencing factors that fomented such an attack on American representative democracy while engaged in a constitutional process.”

In line with these purposes, the Select Committee requested information from Mr. Bannon central to its legislative purpose:

On September 23, 2021, Chairman Thompson signed and transmitted a subpoena to Mr. Bannon, ordering the production of both documents and testimony relevant to the January 6th attack on the Capitol.

The subpoena required Mr. Bannon to produce the documents on October 7 and required his presence for deposition testimony on October 14.

Mr. Bannon simply defied the subpoena—failing to produce the documents on October 7 and failing to show up for the deposition on October 14.

In a letter to Mr. Bannon’s counsel on October 15, Chairman Thompson noted that Mr. Bannon had not even attempted to provide the Select Committee any explanation for refusing to comply with the Select Committee’s demand for documents and testimony on a range of subjects that do not involve communications with the former President.

An individual who fails or refuses to comply with a House subpoena may be cited for contempt of Congress, and in his October 8th letter to Mr. Bannon’s counsel, Chairman Thompson warned Mr. Bannon that his continued non-compliance would put him in jeopardy of a vote to refer him to the House to consider a criminal contempt referral.

Mr. Bannon’s failure to appear for deposition or produce responsive documents in the face of this clear advisement and warning by the Chairman constitutes willful failure to comply with the subpoena.

The purpose behind seeking this information is because Mr. Bannon played a central role in organizing January 6th attack on the Capitol, and understanding this role is essential to understanding the context in which the January 6th attack occurred.

Mr. Bannon constructed and participated in the “stop the steal” public relations effort that motivated the January 6th attack.

Mr. Bannon planned political and other activities in advance of January 6th.

Mr. Bannon participated in a “war room” of promoters and prominent supporters of the “stop the steal” movement that met on January 5th.

Mr. Bannon communicated with President Trump several times in advance of the January 6th attack, urging him to take measures to interfere with the count of electoral votes and to make January 6th a day of reckoning.

In fact, according to published reports and his own public statements, Mr. Bannon had specific knowledge about the events planned for January 6th before they occurred: just before the day of the attack, Mr. Bannon urged his listeners:

All hell is going to break loose tomorrow. . . . It’s not going to happen like you think it’s going to happen. OK, it’s going to be quite extraordinarily different. All I can say is, strap in. You made this happen and tomorrow it’s game day. So strap in. Let’s get

ready. So many people said, ‘Man, if I was in a revolution, I would be in Washington.’ Well this is your time in history.

In sum, Mr. Bannon appears to have played a multi-faceted role in the events of the January 6th attack and the American people are entitled to hear his first-hand testimony regarding his actions.

As recognized by the Supreme Court, “The power of the Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process,” and that the subpoena power is a “public duty, which every person within the jurisdiction of the Government is bound to perform when properly summoned.”

Rather than comply with Congress’ inherent powers, and help heal the trauma this nation witnessed on January 6th, Mr. Bannon has simply refused to comply with the Select Committee’s subpoena.

Madam Speaker, this should not be a partisan issue; it is the very power of Congress to investigate matters of issue that is at stake.

For this reason, I rise in support of the rule governing debate for H. Res. 370, “Resolution Recommending that the House of Representatives Find Stephen K. Bannon in Contempt of Congress for Refusal to Comply with a Subpoena Duly Issued by the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol,” and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 202, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

YEAS—229

Adams	Chu	Espallat
Aguilar	Ciilline	Evans
Allred	Clark (MA)	Fitzpatrick
Auchincloss	Clarke (NY)	Fletcher
Axne	Cleave	Foster
Barragán	Clyburn	Frankel, Lois
Bass	Cohen	Galleo
Beatty	Connolly	Garamendi
Bera	Cooper	Garcia (IL)
Beyer	Correa	Garcia (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Golden
Blumenauer	Courtney	Gomez
Blunt Rochester	Craig	Gonzalez (OH)
Bonamici	Crist	Gonzalez,
Bourdeaux	Crow	Vicente
Bowman	Cuellar	Gotthelmer
Boyle, Brendan	David (KS)	Green, Al (TX)
F.	Davis, Danny K.	Grijalva
Brown	Dean	Harder (CA)
Brownley	DeFazio	Hayes
Bush	DeGette	Herrera Beutler
Bustos	DeLauro	Higgins (NY)
Butterfield	DelBene	Himes
Carbajal	Delgado	Horsford
Cárdenas	Demings	Houlahan
Carson	DeSaulnier	Hoyer
Carter (LA)	Deutch	Huffman
Cartwright	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Case	Doggett	Jacobs (CA)
Casten	Doyle, Michael	Jayapal
Castor (FL)	F.	Jeffries
Castro (TX)	Escobar	Johnson (GA)
Cheney	Eshoo	Johnson (TX)

Jones	Meng	Schrader
Kahele	Mfume	Schrier
Kaptur	Moore (WI)	Scott (VA)
Katko	Morelle	Scott, David
Keating	Moulton	Sewell
Kelly (IL)	Mrvan	Sherman
Khanna	Murphy (FL)	Sherrill
Kildee	Nadler	Sires
Kilmer	Napolitano	Slotkin
Kim (NJ)	Neal	Smith (WA)
Kind	Neguse	Soto
Kinzinger	Newman	Spanberger
Kirkpatrick	Norcross	Speier
Krishnamoorthi	O'Halleran	Stansbury
Kuster	Ocasio-Cortez	Stanton
Lamb	Omar	Stevens
Langevin	Pallone	Strickland
Larsen (WA)	Panetta	Suozi
Larson (CT)	Pappas	Swalwell
Lawrence	Pascrell	Takano
Lawson (FL)	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Lee (CA)	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Lee (NV)	Perlmutter	Titus
Leger Fernandez	Peters	Tlaib
Levin (CA)	Phillips	Tonko
Levin (MI)	Pingree	Torres (CA)
Lieu	Pocan	Torres (NY)
Lofgren	Porter	Trahan
Lowenthal	Pressley	Trone
Luria	Price (NC)	Underwood
Lynch	Quigley	Upton
Mace	Raskin	Vargas
Malinowski	Rice (NY)	Veasey
Maloney,	Ross	Vela
Carolyn B.	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Wasserman
Manning	Ruppersberger	Schultz
Matsui	Rush	Waters
McBath	Ryan	Watson Coleman
McCollum	Sánchez	Welch
McEachin	Sarbanes	Wexton
McGovern	Scanlon	Wild
McNerney	Schakowsky	Williams (GA)
Meeks	Schiff	Wilson (FL)
Meijer	Schneider	Yarmuth

NAYS—202

Aderholt	Fallon	Joyce (PA)
Allen	Feenstra	Keller
Amodei	Ferguson	Kelly (MS)
Armstrong	Fischbach	Kelly (PA)
Arrington	Fitzgerald	Kim (CA)
Babin	Fleischmann	Kustoff
Bacon	Fortenberry	LaHood
Baird	Fox	LaMalfa
Balderson	Franklin, C.	Lamborn
Banks	Scott	Latta
Barr	Fulcher	LaTurner
Bentz	Gaetz	Lesko
Bergman	Gallagher	Letlow
Bice (OK)	Garbarino	Long
Biggs	Garcia (CA)	Loudermilk
Bilirakis	Gibbs	Lucas
Bishop (NC)	Gimenez	Luetkemeyer
Boebert	Gohmert	Malliotakis
Bost	Gonzales, Tony	Mann
Brady	Good (VA)	Massie
Brooks	Gooden (TX)	Mast
Buchanan	Gosar	McCarthy
Buck	Granger	McCaul
Bucshon	Graves (LA)	McClain
Budd	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Burchett	Green (TN)	McHenry
Burgess	Greene (GA)	McKinley
Calvert	Griffith	Meuser
Cammack	Grothman	Miller (IL)
Carl	Guest	Miller (WV)
Carter (GA)	Guthrie	Miller-Meeks
Carter (TX)	Hagedorn	Moolenaar
Cawthorn	Harris	Mooney
Chabot	Harshbarger	Moore (AL)
Cline	Hartzler	Moore (UT)
Cloud	Hern	Mullin
Clyde	Herrell	Murphy (NC)
Cole	Hice (GA)	Nehls
Comer	Higgins (LA)	Newhouse
Crawford	Hill	Norman
Crenshaw	Hinson	Nunes
Curtis	Hollingsworth	Oberholte
Davidson	Hudson	Owens
Davis, Rodney	Huizenga	Palazzo
DesJarlais	Issa	Palmer
Diaz-Balart	Jackson	Perry
Donalds	Jacobs (NY)	Pfuger
Duncan	Johnson (LA)	Posey
Dunn	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Ellzey	Johnson (SD)	Reschenthaler
Emmer	Jordan	Rice (SC)
Estes	Joyce (OH)	Rodgers (WA)

Rogers (AL)	Smucker	Van Duyne
Rogers (KY)	Spartz	Wagner
Rose	Stauber	Walberg
Rosendale	Steel	Walorski
Rouzer	Stefanik	Waltz
Roy	Steil	Weber (TX)
Rutherford	Steube	Webster (FL)
Salazar	Stewart	Wenstrup
Scalise	Taylor	Westerman
Schweikert	Tenney	Williams (TX)
Scott, Austin	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Sessions	Tiffany	Wittman
Simpson	Timmons	Womack
Smith (MO)	Turner	Young
Smith (NE)	Valadao	Zeldin
Smith (NJ)	Van Drew	

NOT VOTING—1

Pence

□ 1609

Messrs. SIMPSON and FULCHER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GOMEZ changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Brown)	Kirkpatrick	Rodgers (WA)
Cooper (Clark)	(Stanton)	(Joyce (PA))
(MA)	Lawson (FL)	Rush
DeFazio (Brown)	(Evans)	(Underwood)
Frankel, Lois	Lynch (Trahan)	Salazar
(Clark (MA))	Meng (Jeffries)	(Cammack)
Garcia (TX)	Moore (WI)	Sires (Pallone)
(Escobar)	(Beyer)	Stewart
Hice (GA)	Napolitano	(Crawford)
(Greene (GA))	(Correa)	Tlaib (Omar)
Huffman	Ocasio-Cortez	Wasserman
(Stanton)	(Escobar)	Schultz (Soto)
Khanna	Payne (Pallone)	Wilson (FL)
(Bowman)		(Hayes)

□ 1615

PROVIDING ACCOMMODATIONS
FOR NURSING MOTHERS IN THE
WORKPLACE

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

Ms. BOURDEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act, which will be considered by the House later this week.

As a working mother, I strongly support this bipartisan bill to provide reasonable accommodations to nursing mothers in the workplace.

The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act, among other critical changes, would extend the break time and space protections to workers who are currently excluded from overtime protections, including teachers, transportation workers, and agriculture workers.

I was proud to work as part of a bipartisan group along with the bill's sponsor, Representative CAROLYN B. MALONEY, to offer an amendment which maintains the undue hardship exemption threshold at its current level of 50 employees.

The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act is supported by a broad coalition of stakeholders, including the National Retail Federation, the U.S. Chamber of

Commerce, the National Education Association, and the American Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically support this bill and urge all Members to do the same when it comes before the House this week.

IRS DATA COLLECTION PROPOSAL
BAD FOR FAMILIES, BUSINESSES

(Mr. GUEST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to join me in opposition to the proposed IRS reporting plan that would intrude on the bank accounts of Americans and impose new regulations on our already overregulated banking system.

First, it is not apparent that the IRS has any constitutional authority to monitor Americans in this way.

Second, the American public does not support the expansion of IRS bank data collection. Recent polling shows bipartisan opposition, with 67 percent of those polled opposed to the IRS collecting bank deposit and withdrawal information.

Finally, this would add another regulatory burden to our financial institutions after a historic year when banks and credit unions provided lifelines to families, businesses, and communities during the COVID-19 pandemic.

This proposal imposes upon our right to privacy and is bad for families, small businesses, and financial institutions. I hope my colleagues across the aisle will reconsider their support for this unwarranted expansion of government.

BUILD BACK BETTER FOR
HEALTHCARE

(Mr. KAHELE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KAHELE. Mr. Speaker, for far too long, America's broken for-profit healthcare system has left millions of Americans uninsured or underinsured.

While out-of-pocket costs and corporate profits continue to rise, 8 million Americans have turned to a new form of health insurance, online fundraisers like GoFundMe, to pay their medical bills.

My nephew, Sean Day, was one of them. He passed away from cancer earlier this month at just 22 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, we live in the richest country in the world. No one should be priced out of the healthcare that they need or delay seeing a doctor just because they can't afford it. No one should be forced to ask strangers online to crowdfund their medical bills. It is simply not right.

This is why we must pass the Build Back Better Act. The Build Back Better Act will invest in our communities' healthcare, expand medical coverage for our kupuna, and lower prescription drug prices. It will save lives.

During the deadliest pandemic in U.S. history, we must deliver the care that American families deserve. We must leave no one behind.

BIDEN'S BANK SURVEILLANCE
SCHEME IS POWER GRAB

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the Biden proposed surveillance scheme is an ill-advised power grab, which is turning trusted local financial institutions into IRS reporting agents infringing upon the privacy of everyday Americans.

The IRS already knows how much you earn. Now they want to know exactly how you spend it. This is a total breach of personal financial privacy with a presumption of guilt that I am not okay with.

How can we expect our citizens to place trust in their government when their government is keeping tabs on their every single transaction?

A lot of people wonder how people come to Congress and become millionaires while they are serving in Congress.

This is just another push by the government to exercise control over our everyday lives. It is also a disincentive for people to save and keep money in banks and credit unions because they don't want to have every single thing tracked. Do we want to have our savings kept in coffee cans or mattresses? That is a pretty bad way to go.

Whether it is \$600 per transaction or up to \$10,000 per year cumulative, it is an invasion of privacy. We don't need another 80,000 IRS agents tracking us when we have a border that is like a sieve and other problems of much greater magnitude than what you or I are saving or spending our personal wealth on.

It is a wrongheaded policy. The Biden administration and this House needs to take back such ideas.

RECOGNIZING DR. RENEE F.
WASHINGTON GARDNER

(Mr. ESPAILLAT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a woman of many firsts, an upstanding member of our community, and someone I am blessed to call a constituent. Her name is Dr. Renee F. Washington Gardner.

She is the longest-serving female pastor of Harlem's Memorial Baptist Church in its entire history, dedicating decades of her life in service to church, her community, and God. This past Sunday marked her 17th year of service.

She is the first woman to also be named a moderator of the United Missionary Baptist Association in the group's 60-year history. Pastor Gardner

is no stranger to shattering glass ceilings and paving the way for the next generation of cleric leaders.

Under her guiding principle of unity, hope, and grace, Memorial Baptist Church has proven vital to the strength and resiliency of Harlem, and we are forever indebted.

With Pastor Gardner at the helm, I trust that this work is only the beginning, and the Memorial Baptist Church will continue their mission of uplifting our community's most vulnerable and ingraining the spirit of strength into the fabric of our neighborhood.

RECOGNIZING ALBERT EDWARD PELHAM

(Ms. SHERRILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Albert Edward Pelham, a beloved community leader and student advocate from my town, Montclair, New Jersey.

Al was known for bringing people together. His work aided and inspired generations of Montclairians, and he leaves behind a beautiful legacy.

Al was raised in Montclair and graduated from Montclair High School. He served our country in the U.S. Army before returning to New Jersey and graduating from Bloomfield College.

From his leadership in the Montclair NAACP, the Montclair Neighborhood Development Corporation, Statewide Parent Advocacy Network, Montclair African-American Heritage Foundation, and more, he dedicated himself to making his community a better and fairer place.

One of Al's many achievements was the creation of Project Oasis, which offers year-round educational and recreational opportunities for students. When the COVID-19 pandemic began, Al adapted the program and organized a remote learning space so that all students had access to a computer to attend their virtual classes.

He also created a program for students who were suspended to provide them with academic training and counseling as an alternative to staying at home.

Al worked to ensure that all students, regardless of their background, had opportunities to excel.

Al fought tirelessly for racial justice and inclusivity, guiding both the Montclair NAACP and the Montclair African-American Heritage Foundation through especially difficult times in our country. In 2019, he was recognized for these efforts with the Essex County Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Leadership Award.

Al's dedication to his community was matched by his deep commitment to his family. Al took any opportunity he could to be with his wife, Audrey; his children, Dwayne and Rhonda; his grandchildren, Charles and Cameron; his sisters; and extended family.

On August 19, 2021, Al passed away after a battle with cancer. His selfless

commitment to making Montclair a better place will not soon be forgotten. I was honored to have known Al and to have called him my friend. The counsel he gave me and so many others over the years will continue to impact us and the entire Montclair community for generations to come.

WE CANNOT ALLOW AN INDIVIDUAL TO UNDERMINE DEMOCRACY

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to be able to further defend and add to my statement regarding H. Res. 730 recommending that the House of Representatives find Stephen K. Bannon in contempt of Congress.

It is well known that even from his own words and published reports, these are the words that Mr. Bannon told his listeners:

"All hell is going to break loose tomorrow."

"It is not going to happen like you think it is going to happen. Okay. It is going to be quite extraordinarily different. All I can say is, strap in. . . . You have made this happen, and tomorrow, it is game day. So strap in. Let's get ready."

"So many people through my life said, man, if I was in the Revolution, I would be with Washington at Trenton. Well, this is your time in history."

There is no constitutional provision that would deny the January 6th Select Committee the right to receive information from Mr. Bannon after he has been subpoenaed for information regarding the insurrection, the riot, the attack on January 6.

The idea of executive privilege is exerted by the existing President, limited on a President of the United States no longer in office. In fact, Mr. Bannon has been gone from the White House since 2017. He has no legitimate basis.

Based on three equal branches of government, we cannot allow an individual to undermine democracy. This is a democratic republic, and I expect that the referral to the United States Department of Justice will be handled.

INVESTMENTS TO BUILD BACK BETTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOWMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to talk about the importance of this historic moment indeed, this historic moment of where we will be investing—investing in our children, investing in our planet, investing in our future. We are talking about the Build Back Better agenda.

I want to begin by talking about my district, which is made up of beautifully diverse rural communities. My district is the size of Pennsylvania, but my communities in this district are rich in culture and rich in love. You know what? They have also been historically left behind with little investments made to improve their lives and to allow them to thrive.

New Mexican values are rooted in caring for each other. We know that we invest in what we care about. We know we invest in what we believe in. Well, we must invest in addressing the climate crisis because, in my district, we know that *agua es vida*, water is life. Our farmers and ranchers are depending on us to act and preserve their water resources.

Communities along our rivers, along our acequias, need us to pass a Build Back Better plan that tackles the crisis head-on so that we can preserve the water flowing from our mountains and cascading along our streams for decades to come—to feed our ranchers, to feed our farmers, and to quench our thirst.

In these same communities, people often come back home to care for their loved ones, their parents and grandparents. I have heard their stories. We asked them: Why did you come back? It is because there was nobody else available to care for my grandmother. There was nobody else to care for my tia. And we know that that care is a full-time job on its own.

What does it take to go to work in rural America? It is more than just roads and bridges. It is comprehensive paid family and medical care. It is investments in long-term care and affordable childcare.

□ 1630

In my State, 53 percent of people live in a childcare desert. Seventy-one percent of rural families live in areas without enough licensed childcare providers. We can change that.

The Build Back Better plan must invest in our rural communities. We are talking about empowering rural regions, including our Tribal nations, with the resources to grow their economies, expanding access to affordable healthcare, lowering prescription drug prices, and making housing affordable. We can do this for our communities now. We can make this happen. We made progress with the American Rescue Plan, but we cannot stop there. We must build back better.

It is not good enough to go back to where we were, because we know that where we were wasn't good enough. So

we need to make sure that the child tax credit does not run out. We cannot kick our children out who came out of poverty. Fifty percent of the children in poverty in my State came out, and I am not willing to tell them: I am sorry, the clock struck 12, and you must go back into living in poverty.

No. We must include an expansion extension of the child tax credit in the Build Back Better Act.

Mr. Speaker, those children who were living in poverty are coming out. We also need to make sure that those children in rural America get their early pre-K that they need, and that is what Build Back Better will do.

So the question I ask is simple: Do we want to keep an economy that serves only the wealthiest people and corporations?

Or do we finally give our families a fair shot to truly thrive?

As I said, we invest in the things we believe in. Well, we believe in our youngest children. We believe in our workers. We believe in the promise that lies in each of our communities.

I am glad to be on the floor with my Progressive Caucus colleagues this evening to shine the light on the brilliance of the Build Back Better agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico for her leadership. I am very glad that she has emphasized the unanimity and the unity of Democrats as relates to all of our constituents, all Americans, whether we are in New Mexico, Texas, or whether, we are in New York, whether in Mississippi, Illinois, California, whether we are up in the New England States or down the coast in the Carolinas and down to Florida and all in between, it is important, again, to emphasize to the American people that this is about you.

Breaking news. Each of these elements that we are fighting for—and we take no discomfort in you saying at the bus stop, while taking your child to school, what are they talking about?

It is our responsibility to let you know what we are talking about and to let you know that the Congressional Progressive Caucus has been talking and working and talking and working. We now are at a point where we will say to you: We will not negotiate against ourselves.

But we are the engine to get it done working with the Quad Caucus, the Tri Caucus, and the Democratic Caucus.

So, Mr. Speaker, you have heard that there are numbers that may be different from \$3.5 trillion of which I still stand on. But we are working to see how we can respond to the American people, and that is you have indicated that there is a framework that will change my life. I want to see it sooner than later.

So here is where we are. There is the INVEST Act, though, we are talking tonight about Build Back Better. I want you to know that, Mr. Speaker,

as some would say, it is on the table. It is on the table for broadband. It is on the table for high-speed rail. It is on the table for electric cars. It is on the table for the trials and tribulations of your commute where there is a pothole here or a freeway that is out of commission or a bridge or a dam, it is there. So go home and be sure that we will have that framework.

But then Build Back Better is what I want to conclude my remarks on today. We will provide you with the kind of quality of life that gives you more time with your children, that gives you better wages, that gives you climate change response, and gives your child a universal pre-K and kindergarten to ensure that they are competitive around the world; and, yes, Medicaid for those who never lived in States where they opted into the public option or expanded Medicaid. So if you are working every day, we want you to have health insurance, and on Medicare we want that hearing, we want those eyes, and we want dental to be part of your life.

This is what is the bowl of fruit that is there for you. The next step as we work out for how these plans will be implemented is to get it done. My view is what I heard from a Member—I will give him credit—from Arizona. Put them together and let's move once we organize and analyze the pieces of it. And I will just leave, Madam Manager, my comment on the table.

Let us be meticulous and careful about what plans or what items can accept reduction because you don't want something that does not work because you have reduced it in time or dollars. Let's be meticulous, and that is what we are doing. And let's make sure that we are meticulous in ensuring that the final bill is an impactful bill on lives in terms of years of how long the program lasts and in terms of dollars of how much impact it will have.

We as the Congressional Progressive Caucus have been in the center and in the mix, and we will do the Nation's bidding. We will do it right because we stand for the people of this Nation, and particularly those who cannot speak for themselves. That gives me pride. I am delighted to be here on the floor with the gentlewoman to ensure that those voices can be heard.

I know working with the President we will get it done. Put it together, and let's move.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman so much for her words. I do think it is important to remember what it actually means for a family.

In New Mexico, the average cost of infant care is \$8,617. That makes New Mexico one of 33 States and D.C. where infant care is more expensive than college. The Build Back Better plan will limit that to 7 percent of your income.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) on Build Back Better and what we have been fighting for and why we must get this done.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me to be able to address something that I think is so critical and is such a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity.

There are so many elements of this Build Back Better agenda that touch us from the very youngest to the oldest to the middle class to the working class to those unable to work and those at greatest need.

I would like to speak on the aspects of the impact on our climate, the decisions that we must make.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because Congress has an opportunity to address the climate crisis, yet some Members still refuse to take this issue seriously. Climate catastrophe is no longer some distant threat. It is here, and it is now. We are witnessing it firsthand, yet we continue to ignore its very real and very deadly effects.

This year we saw the single largest wildfire in California history. We saw temperatures surpass 100 degrees in the Pacific Northwest. And we saw Hurricane Ida devastate my home State of New Jersey as well as many others.

These tragedies were not inevitable. We could have avoided them had our country made it clear decades ago that climate change is not a political issue but a real issue that we need to respond to. We now face the consequences of our past and present decisions. This could be our last chance to take long overdue action and spare our children from having to raise their children in an increasingly hostile world.

The Build Back Better Act includes crucial climate investments. But these provisions are in jeopardy as some of our colleagues seek to eliminate them.

The Build Back Better Act must include climate action. It is nonnegotiable. We need to pass the President's entire agenda, and we need to pass it now. We might never get another chance.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for this opportunity to speak on such an important issue.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would also note that when we adjust for the climate, we are also creating jobs. We anticipate there will be 763,000 green jobs available to our communities when we pass Build Back Better and address the climate crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. NEWMAN).

Ms. NEWMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative LEGER FERNANDEZ. We are excited to be here. This is a really important evening.

Mr. Speaker, do you know why?

It is because we are talking about why this is so important that we get Build Back Better accomplished.

Like a great team that the Democrats are—and I want to talk about that, if I may, with our chair's permission.

We are a team. I am frustrated with the media and anybody who is saying

that we are not a team right now. We are ready to go. Ninety-nine percent now, as of today, and I do mean that number, 99 percent of us are on the same page. We just have to get a little bit more done. So I am asking the media to report accurately. I am asking all of the Americans who are watching me to understand we are ready to go. We are a team.

I want to talk about how big this package is. It is trillions of dollars. So think of it this way, Mr. Speaker, if two trillion-dollar companies came together, it would take probably 2 to 3 years to integrate it. We are doing it in a matter of weeks and months. We are going to do it well and precisely, and we are going to get it done. So teams get things done in an orderly fashion, and we are going to get this done.

But let me talk about something that is really frustrating to me and really irritating, and that is when folks talk about the labor shortage. The real issue is that we have a childcare shortage. We have a healthcare shortage. We have an affordable housing shortage. We have shortage of affordable pre-K. And there is a shortage of folks being paid properly for hard work.

This is particularly frustrating when I hear that there is a labor shortage and then our friends across the aisle block every single possible thing we can do to make that better and to boost our economy, so that is super frustrating for me.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, you can't say we have a labor shortage and then block immigration. It just doesn't work that way. You can't say immigrants are stealing jobs. It doesn't work. It is common sense. It is math. So it doesn't work.

But let me say something else, Mr. Speaker, if we do things like expanding paid leave and medical leave, if we make sure that folks have access to childcare and have free childcare, guess what?

Moms can get back to work because moms—let's be honest about it—moms are frequently the primary caregiver. We can get them back to work. Mr. Speaker, 300,000 of our moms in this Nation have been forced to quit so they can take care of their kids.

Someone mentioned something else that is astonishing, not that it is just 300,000 people who have left the workforce of the female nature, it is that in addition to that, about 70—when you take all of the sources of childcare, whether it is YMCA, moms and dads who are in other jobs and working three jobs at a time, or it is our school system, or just general daycare and childcare—about 70 percent of our childcare system was lost during the pandemic. So, of course, it is hard to get a break, because guess what?

The reason we had this amazing package set up this way that we had roads and bridges that will be repaired, and broadband delivered, as well as childcare and healthcare and in-home healthcare and all of the things on the

human infrastructure side, do you know why? Because when mom and dad go to fix a bridge, they need somebody to watch their kids all day. That is why this works so well together, and that is why we have to pass this. That is why we are doing this because it is a super practical thing to do.

Every dollar in this package will get infused right back into the economy—right back. So this is really brilliant in every way. It is very practical, and it is founded within our great principles, our economic principles.

And guess what, Mr. Speaker? It is founded in capitalism because supply and demand are working beautifully in this package, and we are going to get this done.

I thank the gentlewoman for having us tonight. It is a joy to have my friend and everything she does.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to just touch on a few points.

The gentlewoman mentioned the need for immigration. I would point out that when we pass our comprehensive immigration reform, we would have a \$1.4 trillion benefit to our economy. We need immigrants to help care for us. They help feed us. They are part of our communities, and the Build Back Better Act, as the House is looking at it, includes immigration reform.

Today, I was also reminded, during the remarks on something else, what today is. Today is sadly, and I say sadly, today is Latina Equal Pay Day.

□ 1645

I have introduced a resolution to acknowledge that it is Latina Equal Pay Day, and what that tells us is that it has taken this long, into the fall, into October, before a Latina earns the same as a White man. That is simply wrong. And the other thing we know is that Latinas in the recession, the shecession, that was caused by that pandemic, 20 percent unemployment, the childcare that my colleagues are talking about, that would help those women get back to work. That would help them when we make sure that they are also paid what they deserve for the work they do, taking care of our children, putting food on our plates, and just taking care of those we love.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY), somebody who I have always looked up to and learned much from.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding and sister in service here, Congresswoman LEGER FERNANDEZ, for convening us here today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of every worker, every parent, and every caretaker that has questioned how they will make ends meet and keep food on the table for their families; the parent that has felt that pit in their stomach, the anxiousness as they look over monthly bills with the growing costs of rent and childcare; the front-

line worker, who is terrified to stay home sick and lose their job because of our Nation's failure to provide paid leave; the family afraid of being displaced from their home due to extreme weather and the existential threat of climate change; the student living in a transit desert with unreliable access to jobs, food, community; the daughter who is a caregiver to her parent who is one of 820,000 people on a wait list for much-needed home and community-based services; and our immigrant neighbor who has been unjustly denied a pathway to citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, the Build Back Better Act will help us get one step closer to rejecting the unjust status quo and beginning to build a recovery that centers on the people. As Angela Davis once said: "I am no longer accepting the things I cannot change. I am changing the things I can no longer accept."

Despite what some might argue, the needs of our communities go far beyond our Nation's roads and bridges, and we must ensure that our policies and our investments reflect that reality. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to choose between the union worker who builds our highways and the child worker who protections our babies and sets them on a pathway to a healthy life, to bring into bear their contributions to the world. I would ask every Member of Congress that they do the same. Reject the unjust, false binary choices that force us to choose between the livelihoods and well-being of the two that pit community member against community member. We have the opportunity and responsibility to finally make universal paid leave, home healthcare, and universal access to quality and affordable childcare a reality.

In my district, in Massachusetts, it costs \$21,000 per child for childcare. We have the opportunity and responsibility to address climate change to combat our housing crisis, and to finally establish a pathway to citizenship for millions of our immigrant workers. You know, those essential workers that you were all clapping for during the pandemic.

They don't need your applause. They need you to value more than just their labor, but their lives and the preservation of their families. We must rebuild stronger as a just Nation that takes care of its people. In order to truly build back better, we must truly address both the human and physical infrastructure needs of our communities. This is responsive to the needs of the people. We have to focus on impact, advance policies that will be felt by all families. Leave no community behind. This is how we set forth a just recovery and chart a new course forward.

This is the moment to repair generations of hurt and harm and what I would characterize as policy violence inflicted on our most vulnerable and neglected communities. This is our moment to legislate our values; to honor

the decisive mandate that we have from the people. This is our moment to make this Democratic majority—House, Senate, and White House—that that is more than a talking point that we are in the majority. We must affirm and codify once and for all.

Infrastructure are those things that are essential to the functioning of our very society. Care is infrastructure. Housing is infrastructure. Climate justice is infrastructure. Paid leave is infrastructure. Disability justice is infrastructure, and the list goes on.

Here is what I know. There is no deficit of resource in this country, only a deficit of empathy and political courage. Let's pass the Build Back Better Act so that we can deliver for the communities that for too long have been asked to wait. Justice delayed is justice denied. Our constituents deserve more.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman so much for bringing to light and describing those individuals for whom we are working today, but it is they who are us. We are part of their communities and they have been telling us these stories and we are responding now because now is the time for us to act.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN), who cosponsored the resolution I spoke of earlier for the Latina Equal Pay Day. We care for each other. That is why we look after each other.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I join my colleagues today in calling for Congress to pass President Biden's entire Build Back Better agenda. This is a plan that takes on the climate crisis and fights for environmental justice at a time when we have seen record heat waves, wildfires, and drought in California and across the country. It invests in things like the climate smart ports to invest in zero emissions technology that will reduce toxic air pollution in neighborhoods near our ports, like the communities of color that surround the Port of Los Angeles in my Congressional District.

The Build Back Better agenda we know will also invest in things like the construction of more than 2 million affordable homes to address the rising housing costs that have hit Los Angeles so hard and across the country, with more than 41,000 suffering from homelessness.

It is going to do things like lowering health insurance cost; invest in higher education to lower tuition for students at minority-serving institutions. It is going to cut taxes for families with children by extending the child tax credit and cutting poverty. How do we not invest in that? But today I want to focus more on climate because this is a crisis, and this is a threat that is happening as we speak. It is urgent.

It is urgent that we act boldly to respond to the threat of climate change and the climate investments in the Build Back Better Act which are crit-

ical to maintain, not cut. For example, there are two investments in the bill I have led on that are important for climate and environmental justice, climate smart ports. This includes a critical \$3.5 billion investment to reduce air pollution at ports by providing grants and rebates for the purchase and installation of zero emissions technology.

Nearly 40 percent of Americans live within 3 miles of a port and will benefit from these investments in clean air. In my district, the Port of Los Angeles is a major economic engine but it is also a major source of pollution. We have some of the worst air quality in the country and it disproportionately impacts communities of color in South Los Angeles. For decades, my constituents have advocated for zero emission solutions. This \$3.5 billion ports investment in the Build Back Better Act will deliver. It is a long-overdue investment in environmental justice, in climate action, in jobs.

So I want to urge us to fight to keep these long-overdue investments in clean air for our port communities. Environmental justice and climate justice grants, that is also in the Build Back Better agenda. There is a \$5 billion investment in environmental and climate justice grants, by far the largest-ever amount that we have invested in this.

Now, with this investment, we will empower environmental justice communities to lead projects that reduce pollution and bring climate justice solutions to communities hit first and worst by the climate crisis. This will mean climate-resilient solutions such as clean energy microgrids to keep the power on during extreme weather events like heat waves and hurricanes.

It means the community solar projects that create local jobs and save money on electricity bills, like the recent solar project in my district at the Wilmington Senior Center. It means green infrastructure to prevent flooding and to protect communities from extreme heat. These long overdue investments will give environmental justice communities the resources to fight for a safe climate and clean environment.

Of course, there are other investments, such as in-home care that will help provide care for our older Americans and those with disabilities so they could stay in their homes and get the care that they need. It will provide for things like paid family and medical leave. Imagine you are a nurse at a hospital and you help deliver babies and all of a sudden you get cancer and you have no paid leave.

How are you to go home and fight cancer, so that you can focus on that cancer fight instead of worrying about how you are going to pay the bills. That very thing happened to my sister just last November. She delivers babies at a military hospital, a Federal worker. You would think these are people we take care of, but this is happening

across the country day in and day out. People have to go ask their colleagues and their coworkers to donate their leave and their time, and that is wrong.

We need to invest in these and we have to fight to keep these priorities in the Build Back Better agenda. And it is time that these investments should be paid for by ensuring the wealthy and the corporations finally pay their fair share of taxes. Now is the time to make these once-in-a-generation investments in problems that have long been neglected. Now is the time to stand strong and deliver the promises we made to the American people.

Let's stand up for the people and the planet. Let's meet the moment and pass the entire Build Back Better agenda.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for leading this effort and thank the Progressive Caucus for being at the forefront of making sure that we are fighting for the people.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Representative for her courage. She has raised the issues of environmental injustice since the day I met her. I know she raised them and she leads them in the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, and she has now described what it means on the ground, what it means in terms of jobs, but also what it means in terms of the life that you live, the air that you breathe. Because we know that in our communities, our communities of color suffer from higher rates of asthma. And when something like COVID comes about that ravages the lungs when they have already been damaged, it hurts. And that is why we saw the level of death and despair in the communities of color, in the Native American communities and the Latino communities.

I would also point out that climate change is costly. When they don't want to spend \$3.7 trillion, or \$2.5 trillion, let's remember that failure to address climate change will lead to world instability. It is estimated that we would lose \$23 trillion, a \$23 trillion impact on our economy, our world economy by failing to address this.

I don't want to pass over the impact in terms of the creating jobs for the people in our community, for the people in America. We know that we are now coming back. The pandemic is hard. We are still pushing out of it. Today we heard some great jobs numbers. 290,000 is below what they had projected so we are feeling good. We know that the pandemic is something that we are working on, that this President has done such a great job working with Congress on that.

But still, it is estimated that the Build Back Better agenda would create 4 million jobs. That is 1.1 million caregiving jobs. That is not just a number. That is somebody that you are going to take your baby to. And you know that what we are going to do is make sure that that caregiver has the

kind of training that she needs or he needs to provide the best quality care; that because we are providing assistance, that their caregiver is going to be receiving the kind of pay that she or he deserves because they are providing the most valuable thing to you. They are caring for the most precious resource, our children. And that is what Build Back Better will do.

□ 1700

It will also create 556,000 manufacturing jobs, and those are going to be jobs with prevailing wages, good-paying jobs. That is what we need. When we talk about needing to bring manufacturing back, let's grow it here. And if you are for manufacturing in America, you have got to be for the Build Back Better Act, because that is going to create a half billion jobs. That is a lot of jobs.

But what does that job mean? It means that there is somebody who is going to go to work, who has a family, or wants to start a family, and is going to be able to buy a home. But we know that buying a home is hard. So the Build Back Better Act is going to provide assistance for those first-time home buyers. Because we know that the hardest thing for buying a home is having that down payment, and we have down payment assistance in the Build Back Better Act. That is what we are going to be bringing.

We have looked at what are the different levers of our economy that make a difference that are infrastructure, that help a community thrive, not just survive. That is what is in the Build Back Better Act, because we want our communities to thrive, not just survive.

Construction jobs, 312,000 construction jobs, doing the things that we need in America, building those bridges, building those health clinics, building those schools and those businesses. Because it takes all of that; it takes an investment in us.

And we do pay for it. There is not a dime—this is not about debt, because it is all paid for and it is paid for first by going after those who fail to pay their taxes, even when due. So, tax cheats, yes, we are going to make you pay your taxes, because that is only fair. We are going to make those corporations who have paid less in taxes than my child's schoolteacher, we are going to make them pay their fair share.

Not a single family that is earning less than \$450,000 a year—so if you are earning half a million dollars a year, then you will see a small increase in your taxes.

But if any of you are outside listening to this and saying, what will it do to my tax burden? If you are earning less than a half a million dollars a year, you are going to be just fine. In fact, you are going to have a tax refund, because we have the child tax credit in there. We are lowering taxes for working families and middle-class families.

We know that when we invest in creating jobs that pay fair wages, that include benefits like healthcare, paid family and medical leave, and retirement, we will help more people get those jobs and keep those jobs. Because when they are able to go home and help somebody they love who is ill in their family, then they don't have to leave that job. That is what we should be caring about.

So when is the time to get this done? As I say in my Nuevo Mexico, *ahora es cuando*; it is time now to get this done. Because that is right, that is good for our communities, it is good for America, it is good for our women, and it is good for our planet.

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

DEMOCRATS' PLAN TO PUT MASS AMNESTY IN RECONCILIATION PACKAGE

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, during my time this evening, my colleagues and I will be shedding light on the Democrats' illegal attempt to include mass amnesty in their multi-trillion-dollar spending package, their so-called Build Back Better bill.

Frankly, this entire bill is a disaster. It will permanently cause labor shortages, crush small businesses, raise taxes, lower wages, and expand the very worst parts of our government.

As one of the chairs of the House Border Security Caucus, a Texan, and simply as an American, I am stunned that in the middle of the worst border security crisis we have ever faced, Senate Democrats are using the reconciliation process to try and grant mass amnesty to millions and millions of illegal aliens.

We are up against more crises than any American has ever seen, too many to even keep track of anymore. But, folks, this is the worst one of all. Our open borders and the President's dereliction of duty to secure our southern border will unquestionably affect every single American in this country, every single State, for generations to come. Let that sink in.

My friends, this isn't a talking point. It is a fact. History has shown us that amnesty erodes the integrity of our immigration system, and it breeds contempt for the law on all sides. We are

seeing this happening and unfolding before our eyes in living color.

If we look back to 1986, which was the last time mass amnesty was granted, we have a clear view of what will happen if Biden and the Democrats push this plan through. Millions of jobs will be put at risk. We will see massive waves of new illegal immigration. It is happening as we speak. Our enemies will use this avenue to enter the United States and embed themselves into our society.

Listen closely: Our society, our country, our neighbors, us—America is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we learned that this year has broken all historical records for illegal immigration. The CBP arrested 1.7 million foreign nationals illegally crossing our border this year. That is the entire population of the States of Alaska, Wyoming, and Vermont combined. And it is a Federal crime. It is a misdemeanor for the first offense. It is a felony for reentry. Yet, this administration is not only not prosecuting this crime; it is actively assisting and encouraging it.

Today, the Attorney General, the official responsible for prosecuting Federal crimes, could not even give us a ballpark guess of how many are actually being prosecuted, and, I suspect, because that number is zero.

He couldn't tell us what is being done to enforce the Federal law that forbids hiring illegals. He wasn't aware of President Biden's inauguration day order to Immigration and Customs Enforcement not to faithfully execute the law.

Now, I ask you, is it just possible that the administration's refusal to enforce our immigration law might just have something to do with the fact that our country is now being overwhelmed by this unprecedented incursion on our border?

Ask any of the migrants. They will tell you the sole reason they are coming is because of the Biden administration's decision to open the border. Under Donald Trump's leadership, they say they never would have considered making the trip, because we had achieved control of our border for the first time in a generation.

Yet, on inauguration day, Mr. Biden reversed the Remain in Mexico policy, he ordered ICE not to enforce the law, and he abandoned the border wall.

This Attorney General has no idea if his department is doing anything to enforce those immigration laws. Well, Mr. Speaker, without immigration laws, we have no border; and if we have no border, then we have no country.

Gallop estimates that based on their polling, there are 42 million people living in poverty in South America and the Caribbean who intend to come to the United States now that they can.

I would ask my fellow Democrats on the other the aisle, how are American workers helped by flooding the labor market with another wave of low-wage labor? How are our children helped by filling their classrooms with non-English-speaking classmates? How are our communities made safer by making it harder to deport criminal illegal aliens and gang members? How are our hospitals made more accessible by overwhelming emergency rooms with illegal immigrants demanding care?

Mr. Speaker, no civilization in history has survived the mass migration that we are now watching move toward our border. And history is screaming this warning at us, that countries that either cannot or will not enforce their borders simply aren't around very long.

People ask me all the time now, how can this be happening to our country? Well, the answer is pretty simple, if you voted for the Democrats, this is exactly what you voted for. And if you are surprised by that, you weren't paying any attention.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

That is so, so true. Arrests by Border Patrol are at the highest levels since 1986. Ask yourself, what happened in 1986, folks? Mass amnesty. This isn't coincidental. This is cause and effect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the good gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Since January, we haven't witnessed migration, Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed an invasion; a 200 percent increase over FY 2020, hundreds of thousands of people coming across our border in July and August.

You would think that amid what is definitively an open border crisis, replete with numerous cases of sexual assault, rape, human and drug trafficking, proliferation of gang and cartel activity, that the United States would be working to stop criminal activity and protect its citizens. Not this President, not this administration, not the Democratic Party in this House. They can't be bothered. They keep on incentivizing this illegal invasion.

You can check the tape. You can watch the film. It was then-Vice President Biden in 2015 who actually said it. He went on film and said he wants unbridled, unstoppable immigration into this country. Now, I guess maybe people thought he meant legal, but it is obviously illegal.

It is crystal clear that no number of sexual assault victims, rape victims, drug overdose deaths, no number of human traffickers, can ever compare to the value of achieving the highest political objective of the left, which is creating legions of new voters.

At the beginning of this reconciliation process, we saw Democrats try to provide amnesty for literally millions of illegal aliens. What that means is saying it doesn't matter if you break the law; we are just going to let it go.

We are not going to prosecute that. Go ahead and break the law; the law doesn't matter. We are going to forgive all of your crimes.

When the Parliamentarian wouldn't let them, they went to plan B. Yet more, millions of illegal immigrants, just by moving a date. Now, they are on plan C, amnesty, again, telling them to break our laws, to millions of illegal aliens, millions of people in our country illegally.

And who is paying for it? American citizens are, every single day.

Let me talk to you about the payment quickly.

Jared Vargas, killed by an illegal immigrant in Mexico. Vargas' body was then stuffed into a closet and left there for days.

Ron Dasilva, murdered by a known gang member and an illegal immigrant.

Two brothers, Daniel and Alfonso Mendez-Lopez, stabbed and killed by an illegal alien.

In August of this year, a 43-year-old illegal alien was charged in Fredrick, Maryland, just a couple miles up from the street from here, for having a sexual relationship with a 14-year-old.

In August, also, a drunk driver and illegal alien struck and killed a 3-year-old in Flat Rock, North Carolina, as she was riding her tricycle.

Those are American citizens, ladies and gentlemen.

The people in this building take an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of American citizens, not illegal aliens.

Yet, on September 11, an Ecuadorian national, also here illegally, stabbed his wife to death and left behind their 4-year-old child.

And last Wednesday, a woman was harassed and groped for nearly 40 minutes before an illegal alien forcibly tore off her clothes and raped her on a train in Philadelphia. They went through 20 stops as up to 10 people watched and did absolutely nothing.

Continuing to incentivize people to break the law by forgiving them for breaking all of our laws is going to continue to incentivize more people to break our laws and to come here in doing so.

The American people deserve a government committed to their security. We must defeat this behemoth bill and this move towards amnesty.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my good friend from Pennsylvania and thank him so much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice to identifying this as the worst of the many crises created by this President. It is hard to identify, with so many things going in the wrong direction in our country, what is the worst crisis. But the absolute worst crisis we are facing is the crisis of the illegal invasion at our southern border.

I submit that never in the history of the country has our own President intentionally done more to harm the United States than this President has done in the first 10 months of his administration.

Here we are on pace for over 2 million illegal aliens to cross our southern border. We have had over 200,000 a month for some 2 or 3 months in a row. But the good news is, we are going to stop that 200,000 pace this month. We are expected to smash it by setting an all-time record, with 400,000 illegal crossings this month.

□ 1715

I have been to the southern border three times already in my first 10 months here in Congress, something that our President apparently has never done, Mr. Speaker, been to the southern border, and something our Vice President apparently has never done, been to the southern border.

I have been there to meet with ranchers, local law enforcement, folks who live at the border, and the Border Patrol, who are living every day with what is happening at our southern border.

Everything and everyone that crosses the southern border does so under the control of the Mexican cartels. There is no compassionate piece to our border situation, our immigration policy at our southern border, when you have drug trafficking, human trafficking, child trafficking, sex trafficking. People are coming through all kinds of terrible conditions across our border. They are making every town a border town, every city a border town, every State a border State.

I was there to witness illegals being placed on planes as we flew back from McAllen, Texas. They were being flown wherever they wanted around the country.

When my colleague from Illinois asked the lady beside her to show her the paperwork from DHS, it said: You have to report at a date to be determined in Miami; we will get back in touch with you and have you report to a court date. No specific time, no specific way in how we are going to get control of that person.

Get used to, American people, what we are seeing from the Haitian crisis at the border. The 15,000, 25,000 that assembled most recently, they are not being stopped, not sent home, but distributed into the interior of our country.

Now we find out they are even flying them during the night to places around the country at taxpayer expense. They are not trying to fix it. They are trying to hide it from the American people. They are willfully, intentionally, purposefully facilitating this invasion of our southern border.

You have to ask why. Why is this happening? Why would an administration, why would a majority party, the Democrat Party, support this invasion of our southern border? No borders.

Why would they intentionally stop the already-funded completion of the southern border wall? Just because it was started by the previous President? Why would we pay contractors not to complete the wall? Why would we allow hundreds of thousands a month to come across our border unvetted? Whether it is because of a health issue or a criminal background, or whatever the reason is, why would they allow that to continue to happen?

In the short run, it is because it is Democrat voters. In the long run, it is because they don't believe in American exceptionalism. They don't believe it is worth preserving the culture of our country, and they want to change our country to look like socialist Europe.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, the President's theme, Build Back Better, just can't pass the straight-face test. In reality, it is more like demolish America faster.

If you really think it builds America back better, your view of America is a lot different than most of the people I know.

We grew up in an America where college professors taught students how to think, not what to think.

We grew up in an America where you could express your thoughts on any subject without having the media collude with Big Tech to censor you through bullying, intimidation, or bogus so-called fact checks.

We grew up in an America where parents were encouraged to support the education of their children, not targeted by the Department of Justice as domestic terrorists for telling the school board members that they think they are going in the wrong direction.

We grew up in an America where immigrants, like most of our predecessors, our ancestors, were welcomed if they came here legally.

I can move to Mexico, but it would be impossible for me to become a Mexican. I can move to Honduras, but I can never become Honduran. I can move to Somalia, but it would be impossible for me to become a Somalian. On and on it goes.

But it is possible for people from other countries to come here and become Americans. If they work hard and play by the rules, they can build a better future for themselves and their families. They can achieve the American Dream.

That is why people risk their lives, and some have died, trying to come to this country. No other countries with the kind of policies you are trying to force down the throat of Americans are like that.

Yes, we lived in an America where most folks, unless they were plagued with affluenza, wokeness, entitlementitis, or Trump-phobia, believed they lived in the greatest and the freest country in the history of the world.

Pre-COVID-19, we lived in an America with the lowest unemployment rate in decades, the lowest African-American and Hispanic unemployment rate since they began keeping records.

An America that was energy independent.

An America with mostly fair elections.

And an America with secure borders.

Speaking about secure borders, let's be clear. There is a crisis at the border, even though the President, the Vice President, and most of my colleagues across the aisle deny it. Coming into our country illegally does not make someone a legal immigrant any more than someone breaking into your house makes them one of your family.

Most people know there is a difference between legal immigration and the illegal invasion that we are witnessing right now. Proposed mass amnesty will only encourage others to come and try illegally. It is not hard to see where you are coming from.

Based upon the false promise that he would unify America, President Biden got into the Oval Office, and my friends on the other side of the aisle gained a razor-thin majority in the House and Senate. But we all know, everybody knows, the unification promise was a lie, and their majority is going to be short-lived. So they must feel compelled to rush through a radical agenda before the midterms.

Now, people are understandably frustrated. Actually, they are very angry, and they are not going to sit back and take it much longer. Instead of the bogus Build Back Better plan and reconciliation plan, you know what they want? They want the Democrats to help put America back where they found it and leave it the hell alone.

Let's go, Brandon.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, we are not against immigration. Most of us are the children of immigrants. My own daughter-in-law is a naturalized citizen. But we have to do it the right way, and that is exactly what we are here to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, today I had a chance to ask some questions to Attorney General Garland and talk about what is happening at the Department of Justice.

What became very evident as we were having our question-and-answer today is that there are two sets of rules in America. It starts with our immigration system, where we are seeing people come across our southern border, people being imported from all parts of the world, and they are getting free things from the American people. They get food stamps. They get free housing. They get all of those things that are free, while Americans have to pay for it.

One of the questions I posed to the Attorney General is in regard to Facebook, and I think that very much highlights that there are two sets of

rules in America. Recently, Facebook Vice President William Castleberry, said: "We do allow people to share information about how to enter a country illegally or request information about how to be smuggled."

Don't you think an administration, in particular an Attorney General, would be concerned about that?

Let me read to you U.S. Code title 8, subsection 1324. It makes it illegal for any person to knowingly encourage or induce an alien to come to, enter, or reside in the United States in violation of law or for individuals to aid or abet illegal entry.

Yet, Facebook is allowed to do that. Are they a full-blown subsidiary of the Biden administration at this point? A person has to be very concerned over the last couple months that that is what is happening.

The Attorney General would not make a commitment that he is going to investigate what is illegal activity from one of the largest companies in the United States of America and, clearly, one of the most powerful companies in the United States of America.

Also what came out of our hearing today, in my State is Fort McCoy, and we have been hearing stories coming out of Fort McCoy as a result of the mass migration perpetrated on the American people by the Biden administration over the last 2 months.

We found out very early on that there was no SIV process that was going on, no Special Immigrant Visa process. They were just being waived in on parole.

We found out people could leave any time that they want to. We found out that 600 people were in quarantine with measles, COVID, and tuberculosis—just being allowed into our country.

We found out that there were people being charged with violent crimes, a man raping two young boys in that camp at Fort McCoy. We found out that a man was beating his wife to death at Fort McCoy. We found out at Fort Bliss that a female soldier was being beaten by Afghan men.

The American people wonder; they wonder why there are two sets of rules.

My good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), brought up the story in regard to the rape on the Philadelphia train that has horrified Americans. The assailant was an illegal immigrant with prior convictions related to sexual abuse and drugs. He should have been deported. However, he was allowed to stay in the United States after an appeals board determined that his prior sex crime was not serious enough to merit his removal.

I asked the Justice Department, how serious does a sex crime have to be?

These are the two sets of rules that we are seeing in America, and they are seeing it in a stark basis, with the mass migration that is coming into our country.

We have an Attorney General that is being urged by school boards across the

country to entertain the use of the PATRIOT Act on mothers and parents. We won't use the PATRIOT Act on people who propose to come into the United States of America illegally, but we will use it on our own citizens? Something is wrong, America.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, House Democrats actually rejected the Republican efforts to block amnesty for illegal aliens who are gang members or have gun charges or are sex offenders, as Mr. TIFFANY just said, or who have multiple DUI offenses. That is lunacy. All you can say is it is lunacy.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, the flow of illegal aliens into the United States is out of control. President Biden stopped building the wall, brought back the Obama-era catch-and-release policy, and rolled out an open borders agenda that is now devastating our country.

More than 1.3 million illegal aliens have been apprehended at our border since January, and the men and women of the U.S. Customs and Border Patrol are preparing for another surge of up to 400,000 foreign nationals sometime this month.

We must invest in border security now. But instead, Washington Democrats are pushing a radical \$5 trillion tax-and-spend package that will only make our borders and our border crisis worse.

This package includes zero funding for border security and grants blanket amnesty to 10 million illegal aliens while providing them with \$100 billion in taxpayer-funded benefits.

The border crisis is real. Democrats' far-left, socialist reconciliation package would only make it worse.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. BUDDY CARTER.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the massive reconciliation package that the House has been considering aims to fundamentally change our country. Normally, an effort this huge is considered over months and years instead of the expedited timeline we are on now.

That is why I am so glad my colleagues and I are taking this time to highlight how they intend to dramatically change our country and the consequences it will have.

Today, we focus on perhaps the most immediate problem we are facing: illegal immigration. This is happening as we speak.

There were over 208,000 border apprehensions in August, a 317 percent increase from the previous year. August was the second straight month with over 200,000 apprehensions. What is worse, this is not a new thing.

To quote The Washington Post, of all places, "Illegal crossings began rising last year but skyrocketed in the months after President Biden took office."

There have been over 1.3 million illegal border crossings under President

Biden. The Department of Homeland Security warns us to be prepared for, next month, the possibility of 350,000 to 400,000 illegal border apprehensions in October.

The United States has never—never—recorded that number of illegal border apprehensions in a single month.

□ 1730

So we now know that this has been a problem in the past. It is still a problem now. And it will even be worse in the future.

And what are Democrats doing about it since they are in control?

The Democrats have included a plan to grant amnesty for around eight million illegal immigrants at a cost of \$100 billion over the next 10 years. All of that money to granting amnesty instead of securing our border.

I am a pharmacist by trade, so believe me when I say that the phrase "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" is an understatement here.

We are already paying the price for illegal immigration that is harming our citizens. Over 6,000 pounds of deadly fentanyl has been seized at the southern border since February, enough to kill every American four times over.

That is dangerous. That is ludicrous. It is ridiculous.

At least 160,000 illegal immigrants have been released in the U.S., often with little supervision by the Biden administration since March.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle truly do not recognize what is happening in our country and the world.

We need leadership to navigate these serious issues we face.

Folks, I have been to the border several times, and I can tell you it is a disaster and a tragedy. Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS simply do not understand the problem or how to fix it.

However, I know that if Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS wanted to understand the cause of the crisis at the border, they need look no further than the nearest mirror.

Every State has become a border State, and rather than support our Border Patrol agents, the Biden administration has neglected them and left our communities in danger. These people face threats in their lives, abuse and manipulation from cartels and worse. These people have been inundated with illegal aliens who have come across this border.

It is irresponsible to not only neglect the safety of Americans, but this is a tragedy for those being misled that it is okay to come to America illegally.

We cannot in good conscience continue policies that cause this much harm and damage to everyone involved. Let's stop this insanity.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his input.

I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN).

Mr. HERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the co-chair of the Border Security Caucus for holding this Special Order tonight.

Just when we thought we had seen the worst of the Democrats' socialist wish list with this \$5 trillion reconciliation plan, they manage to squeeze in yet another radical, dangerous, unnecessary provision. This time, it is effectively creating an open U.S. border.

So first, let's set the scene.

This summer and fall, we have seen record numbers of illegal border crossings, reaching over 200,000 apprehensions in July and August each.

Earlier this week, U.S. authorities confirmed 1.7 million apprehensions in the fiscal year, the most ever recorded.

More than 16,000 migrants tested positive for coronavirus and were released into the United States without vaccination requirements and without any trace of where they are traveling, who they were coming in contact with. This 16,000 was on top of the tens of thousands of migrants released into the interior of the country by Joe Biden.

We no longer have detention centers at our borders, we have border distribution centers where we are sending people all over this country.

We now know that the Biden administration was covertly flying migrant children around the country. They didn't want anyone to know.

So my question for Joe Biden is this: How many children were flown out from the border and who is paying for it? The American people want to know. If the taxpayers are on the hook for these flights, we have the right to know.

This is not normal. What we have on our hands is equivalent to an invasion of our southern border. For 9 months, the Biden administration has ignored the crisis, meanwhile it grows exponentially worse. Biden stripped away all the policies that President Trump put in place to limit illegal crossings and to keep our borders safe, and now our Border Patrol has all but surrendered to the cartels.

While all this is happening, Democrats decided to exacerbate the crisis with these so-called reforms they are sneaking into the build back broke reconciliation package at the last minute. Free college for illegal immigrants; enhanced child tax credits for illegal immigrants; amnesty for 10 million illegal immigrants to the tune of \$100 billion at taxpayers' expense; incentivizing illegal entry by waiving provisions for inadmissibility, meaning that illegal immigrants will practically be guaranteed amnesty; they are removing convictions for illegal immigrants to increase their chance for amnesty. Let me say that again: The Federal Government is going to drop charges against drug traffickers and others who break our laws just so they don't have to deport them. Insane.

These policies and many more are being written behind closed doors without the knowledge or input of the American people.

Democrats who hold the majority in both the House and the Senate and thereby have a stranglehold on power in the United States, must take immediate action to secure our border and protect our American people. Instead of putting Americans first, they are ensuring that illegal immigrants are protected and prioritized above the American people, which is an absolute abandonment of their sworn duty as a Member of Congress.

Mr. BABIN. Well said. Thank you very much, Mr. HERN. I appreciated that.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BABIN for yielding.

The Biden socialist spending bill provides amnesty to eight million illegal immigrants, including illegal aliens who are active gang members, have convictions for sex crimes, and have multiple DUI offenses.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee actually said he was okay with allowing illegal immigrants to remain in our country even if they have 20 DUI convictions. Does that make our country more safe?

The Biden-Harris open border policies have allowed over 200,000 illegal immigrants to cross our border each month with a caravan of 400,000 on the way. This is equal to the population of Minneapolis. They are about to cross our border in the next few weeks.

Tragically, the Biden administration has allowed 125,000 children to be trafficked into our country by criminal cartels. These children often face sexual assaults by cartel predators who are only able to operate because the Biden administration eliminated remain in Mexico and brought back catch and release.

The invasion at our border plus amnesty is truly the end of our country as we know it.

Americans oppose mass amnesty for illegal immigrants. We want strong borders and a border wall.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. MILLER. We really appreciate that.

For those of you who don't know, one of the leaders of the 1993 World Trade Center bombing was legalized through the 1986 amnesty by falsely claiming that he was a seasonal worker. After receiving amnesty, he traveled back and forth to Afghanistan and Pakistan to receive terrorist training. There is no reason to believe that terrorists would not once again take full advantage of amnesty to hurt us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN), the highest ranking military officer to serve in the House of Representatives.

MR. BERGMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding and for leading tonight's Special Order.

How do you apply an adequate objective to the shocking, clueless attempt

to jam amnesty for eight million illegal immigrants into this Democrat-owned, Democrat-grown, Democrat-processed multitrillion-dollar reconciliation bill? Again, it is a complete sham.

I think it is clear to most Americans why illegal immigration is illegal—it kind of sounds like I am repeating words here, but it is still illegal—and why any nation and our Nation needs borders.

People aren't trying to break out of the United States of America. Let's be clear why we are the greatest country in the world. Because we built it. Nobody else did.

The Democrats running our country today, however, are defying logic and the rule of law.

They are hosting an open border policy on the front end while simultaneously proposing a mass legalization policy on the back end.

The amnesty policy before us is the opposite of a solution.

We need real solutions, like when we had a wall being built and border security policies that worked.

I am here tonight because we need to stop this illegal activity on the southern border and make sure it is not rewarded by this shameful sham bill.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman said.

While the exact number of the millions of illegal aliens potentially eligible for amnesty is very fluid, data shows that historically each immigrant to the United States sponsors an average of 3.45 additional family members for green cards. So theoretically, if the estimated 13 million illegal aliens currently here in the United States were given lawful status and sponsored green cards for three or four family members, 43 million—let me repeat that, 43 million—new immigrants would be coming in. This is astounding data.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The topic for tonight, and rightfully so—when we look at the \$3.5 trillion bill with so many things that will permanently change America—is some of the most radical immigration provisions we have ever seen. Predictions by the Democrats, themselves, will be that they will affect 9 to 12 million more people in this country who are not here legally and will ultimately lead to a huge change in America.

This has nothing to do with legal immigration. Every year in this country about 800,000 people are sworn in as citizens. They are appropriately vetted, they have jobs, they are not committing crimes, and they are added to our citizenry.

I am talking about the people who are coming across the border claiming they want asylum.

I was down at the border last week to have a look at some of these people who apparently people feel will make good citizens.

One of the first things you notice, at least in the Yuma sector in Arizona, is you look at the path of people coming here, the path is littered with identification that is being thrown away by people who want to get in this country.

Now, why would people throw away identification? Normally you keep your identification because you have nothing to fear. If you are throwing the identification on the ground, it means you are creating a new identity when you come here. These are the type of people that under this bill are eventually going to work their way to become American citizens.

And it is not surprising. The Democratic Party in many other ways has made it clear the type of people we want to get are not the type of people normally sworn in.

Look at all the sanctuary cities or sanctuary counties around the country. And by having a sanctuary city or a sanctuary county to me it is an invitation to say you are going to go on public assistance.

We are sending in children without their parents. People normally would like to have an intact family, but what we are doing in this bill is we are going to encourage more parents to send their underage children to the United States not knowing what will happen to them.

Under this bill as the word gets out that the United States does not care about enforcing laws and more people come here, it will inevitably mean more illegal drugs in the country under this bill. And we are now in a position in which over 90,000 Americans are already dying every year primarily of COVID but also from other drugs that pass through the border.

The only thing in this bill that you would expect to have—given the \$3.5 trillion number, you would expect to have maybe more money spent that is immigration related—is more border patrol agents. But as in their regular budget, that is not something that they feel we need more of.

So, again, I beg the American people. I know it is easy to get lost among the \$3.5 trillion in spending, but I beg the American people to rise up against this bill because of the massive green light for illegal immigration that is going to come if it passes.

□ 1745

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, (Mr. GROTHMAN). So true.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MCCLAIN), my colleague.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for having this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I come before this Chamber to ask when will this administration address the ever-growing crisis at our southern border.

Every day that passes, from sunup to sundown, our Nation's immigration laws are being violated by thousands of illegal border crossers. For the life of

me, I don't understand why—and let me say this again—I don't understand why our Commander in Chief refuses to go and see the mess that he and his open border politics have created.

But I have seen this crisis myself so let me paint him a picture. And I am going to use a paint brush with some facts.

In fiscal year 2020, 458,000 illegal aliens were apprehended at our southern border; that was in 2020. Fast forward to fiscal year 2021, under President Biden's "leadership," the number skyrocketed to 1.7 million.

And that is not a crisis? That doesn't even warrant a "pick your head up and open your eyes and go down to the border." From 458,000 to 1.7 million, I would hate to see what a crisis would look like under his watch.

Last month, more than 12,000 illegal aliens from Haiti squatted under a bridge until President Biden's Department of Homeland Security began moving those illegal aliens into the interior of our country.

The problem doesn't stop with people coming in illegally. Illegal drugs from the border are coming to a town near you. And we are already seeing it. Again, let me use some facts:

In fiscal year 2021, Border Patrol agents at the southwest border seized 900 pounds of fentanyl. That is what they seized. Doing the math, that is enough to kill nearly 200 million people. That is nearly two-thirds of the country.

To all of my colleagues, I beg of you, I implore you, we must fix this crisis at the border, but you can't fix a problem you don't think exists.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, (Mrs. McClain). I really appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Donalds), my friend.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from the Lone Star State, Dr. Babin.

Mr. Speaker, I have been on this floor already a couple times this week talking about the 4.3 trillion or the 3.5 trillion—or maybe what they are saying on CNN now—maybe \$2 trillion. Who knows how many trillions of dollars is in this bill. But I am here today to speak against a provision that I find to be just as disastrous as some of the others, including the one that will allow the IRS into the bank accounts of every American.

It is a provision in this bill that allows for mass amnesty through budget reconciliation. Something, by the way, that the Senate Parliamentarian has already said is out of order but it is still in the House provision. It is important that the American people understand this.

How disastrous of a policy is that? It is because those are the things that the Vice President of the United States said she was looking for. She was looking for root causes. Well, here is the number one root cause. When this body decides to green-light in a package

that there will be mass amnesty in a spending bill, that tells the drug cartels, it tells the coyotes, it tells anybody who has been waiting south of our border to emigrate into the United States illegally to come on down, because they are the next contestant.

When you do something like that, you are giving a signal to the entire world that we do not take our own border seriously. There has been a fight in this Chamber to complete border wall construction for 30 years but what people need to understand is that the number one entity that has been asking for a border wall is Border Patrol themselves.

You see, the American people will never build walls in their house with wide open gaps. That is just silly. But in Congress, we think that is okay. That is why Congress has not taken their responsibility serious enough to complete the border wall, so Border Patrol has every tool at their disposal to secure our southern border.

Immigration is critical to any nation, let alone a nation like ours. We need legal immigration in our country, but it must be legal. It cannot be out of control. And what is in this budget reconciliation bill would allow for the most reckless and the most wide open and the most insecure border our country has ever seen. And that is actually something that our Congress needs to not do.

We need to stand up for our border agents and the American people. We need to secure our southern border and take that provision out of this bill, amongst others.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman (Mr. Donalds). I appreciate that very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Fitzgerald), my friend.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, amnesty is not infrastructure, and I know this seems obvious to many Americans, but I know for some of my colleagues they are trying to redefine. And what is tucked away right now in the \$5.5 trillion spending package are provisions that would give amnesty to over a million illegal immigrants.

I have been to the border. Some of my colleagues that I have been able to visit the border with are here this evening.

Eye-opening experiences in McAllen, Texas. And in the travel back to Houston to fly back to Wisconsin, I saw a plane that was full of refugees with brown envelopes and destinations written in black magic marker. And I just wondered who could possibly be sponsoring all of these individuals and where would they end up.

We know that there is 11 million illegal immigrants living in the U.S. today. Not only does this provision pose a risk to national security, but studies have found that it is going to cost us trillions of dollars in payouts in increased entitlement benefits.

Mr. Speaker, what I witnessed, and I think what I have experienced back in Wisconsin, has put us in a position where unless we act now, unless we act swiftly to get a handle on the southern border, we will no longer have the borders that bind us Americans. And I don't think the urgency could be any more clear and any more in front of us right now.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. Fitzgerald. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Van Drew), my friend and colleague, and a dentist as well.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and fellow dentist for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise that Democrats, led by President Joe Biden, are abusing the budget reconciliation process to pass an extremely partisan, socialist spending spree that will fundamentally change our Nation forever.

One of their many dangerous provisions is to provide amnesty to more than 8 million illegal immigrants. And for those that didn't quite hear me or didn't quite believe it, 8 million illegal immigrants. Even though the Senate Parliamentarian already ruled that to do so would violate the rules of the reconciliation process.

Additionally, the majority party outright rejected offers from Republicans to bar gang members, sex offenders, and other violent criminals from receiving amnesty. As I have stated before, literally you have to believe that many Democrats are actively trying to destroy our great Nation.

With record-breaking levels of migrant crossings, drug smuggling, and child trafficking, the majority is still somehow finding new ways to weaken and undermine our great America. Let me be clear to you. I love immigrants. America needs immigrants, and immigrants need America. But it must be done legally. We are a nation of laws, and those who enter America must go through our legal process.

True story, just the other day, I received a call from one of my constituents who emigrated to the United States from Eastern Europe. With her husband, she went through America's legal immigration process because she loves our country and she respects our country. She called me, literally crying in utter disbelief with our current immigration situation and also the current state of affairs in the United States of America.

She came to the United States, worked hard as a hotel employee, and eventually saved enough money by working double shifts to purchase her own business with her husband. That is the America that I know. That is the America that we all love; not this reckless concept of open borders with zero accountability.

For how long are Democrats going to pursue these radical ideas. Is this really what America is becoming? A place where people can uncontrollably flow

through our borders and do whatever they want? Dammit, that is wrong.

Think about our communities. Think about our children. Think about our grandchildren, who are going to have to suffer the consequences of these radical Democratic policies. They have proven that not only do they not care about our institutions, but they do not care about our laws or protecting our great America. God help us.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. VAN DREW. I appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), my friend, and also fellow cochair of the House Border Security Caucus.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman (Mr. BABIN), my colleague on the House Border Security Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard a lot about numbers today. I want to just tell you a little bit about some of the faces and individuals. I have been from the Rio Grande Valley to San Diego, and back again, this year. I get down to the border incredibly often; just down again last week, down two weeks before that, down a few weeks before that. And that is kind of way I live, because I live in Arizona and it is affected and it is impacted.

I was down in RGV, the Rio Grande Valley, and you can go there in the area of La Jolla. And you sit at the river, the Rio Grande River runs, and you can go and you wait—this little fork in the road. We parked the car. I had a CBP agent with me, had a couple Members of Congress. It is nighttime. We are looking out and we see about 40 people literally emerging from the river. They are dressed great.

But you know what? Most of them are kids under age 14, I would guess. A little girl 7 years old, she is with her brother, 5. There is no mom. There is no dad. There is no aunt or uncle. There is no one there to take care of them. The coyote brought them across the river and deposited them.

Do you know what would happen in the United States for us who are citizens, who are legally here, if we had a 4-, 5-, 6-, 7-year-old child and we put that child in the hands of a criminally-violent person? That is what a coyote is; they are working for the cartels. And we sewed into their britches a name and a phone number, or a city. We put that child there; and then we were up in Detroit, or LA, or Phoenix. And that coyote, the person we gave that child to, then turned the child over to the Border Patrol to reunite with us.

Upon reunification, we would be charged with child abuse. But our government is the logistics arm of the cartel, and we don't do that. We reunite that child and we allow that mom and that child to remain in the United States of America and we don't bring criminal charges. And we don't remove from this country. Instead, we release with all the benefits of our social welfare safety net, our education system, our healthcare, the free phones, the

housing—all of that. That is what we do.

And down in Yuma, just recently, how about this, I am standing there with some of my friends. We are standing literally next to the fence. But the fence ends, and there is a space of several hundred yards. And literally, we are getting pictures of us standing in front of this hole in the fence.

Here comes a fellow. He is walking up, and so we stop and talk to him.

□ 1800

Where are you from? Cuba. Where were you before that? I came from Russia. I went from Cuba to Russia and then I went to Spain and then to France and then to Mexico City, and then I got myself to Mexicali. I took a bus from Mexicali to Yuma—actually, Los Algodones, which is right across the border, and he walks dry across the dregs of that point of the Colorado River.

I say: What are you doing here? I want to be in America. He wanted to be an American.

We say: Well, why don't you sit right here? There is water. There is a station where you can clean yourself up a little bit. Border Patrol is going to be along in just a second.

That person is not an economic refugee. There is no credible fear. He is traveling and wants to come to the United States of America.

Do you know what is going to happen to him if they don't title 42 him, which they are not doing many title 42s anymore? He is probably already in the country somewhere. That is where that fellow is. He was an engaging fellow, but, nonetheless, illegally in this country.

Mr. BABIN. I thank my good friend from Arizona. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 90 seconds remaining.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friends for bringing attention to this unbelievably important issue. Every one of us, as well as my colleagues who couldn't be here tonight, could talk about this crisis for days. Since our time is limited, I want to close with this.

Our very existence as a democratic republic, as a nation, hangs in the balance. The overwhelming majority of Americans reject the idea of mass amnesty. The border crisis, including the abuse, assault, drug trafficking, abduction, danger, murder, fraud, and death that comes along with it will only get worse.

We cannot afford to risk the lives of migrants or Americans by granting a mass amnesty. We will continue to fight against this for as long as we need to.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

CRISIS AT SOUTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for holding this time with my colleagues to talk about what is going on at our southern border and talk about how important it is that we do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona for his steadfast leadership on border issues. I know that the gentleman was squeezing in some time there, and I am happy to engage in colloquy or yield him some time to continue to talk about this important issue, if he would like.

One thing that I noticed you were saying in the time from my friend from Texas, you were talking about being down at the border, being next to the fence, a fence that works, by the way, where it is up, and then there is a hole or an unfinished fence or where the fence ends.

I noticed that my friend from Arizona was recently standing next to a large pile of metal, steel. I wondered if he might describe for the American people what you were standing next to so they can understand what is actually happening.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was standing next to many piles—I couldn't even fit them into the camera shot—of bollard fencing panels taller than me, \$2 million worth of those bollard fences right there.

A little further down from where we were, there is another set of bollard fencing, but they aren't welded together yet. They are not panels yet. They are getting stolen, by the way.

Where we were was by the temporary headquarters of the contractors who were there to put up the fence. You know what? They keep going to work every day. You know why they keep going to work every day? They got a contract, and they are getting paid to go there. But they can't put the fence up because President Biden says you can't put the fence up.

Mr. ROY. I think there is a theme for this administration, and this administration's theme is paying people not to work. In this case, they are paying people not to build a fence, despite the fact that the taxpayers of this country have paid for a fence that would actually do the job of stopping the flow of people who want to come across this country and, in many cases, bringing fentanyl, bringing dangerous narcotics, harming the American people, and harming themselves. Yet, we can solve the problem but refuse to.

Mr. BIGGS. That is exactly right. Think about this, too. It is inhumane, right, because we entice people to come here, and we know that the cartels,

they control. I can't emphasize this enough. I was startled when I heard this. The cartels control every person coming across the border.

Let me tell you what that fellow from Cuba, the Cuban national, said to me. He said: Look, I will wait here for the Border Patrol to come pick me up. Will I be molested while I wait?

Think of that. What kind of country are we that we entice people to come here, and they put themselves in the hands of some of the most ruthless criminal gangsters ever.

There are two internecine wars going on between the Gulf Cartel and the Sinaloa Cartel right now. The brutality is phenomenal. It helps you to know that they are not humane. These people that are coming over are paying \$700 in the Haitian group, most \$4,000 to \$7,000. They are putting their lives in the hands of these very violent criminals.

Mr. ROY. Would it surprise the gentleman from Arizona that one of the reasons that the Haitians got a different deal was they came up through Del Rio and they did so purposefully? Why did they target Del Rio, you might ask?

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are clearly sitting over here inquisitive, with their interest of what is happening at the border. While they continue to advance policies that create an open border, they don't seem to actually care about the open border because I haven't seen any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when I go down to the border.

In fact, the last one I remember going down to the border was my colleague from New York who went down wearing a pantsuit, standing outside of a fence doing a photo-op, crying about kids in cages—cages created by the Democratic administration, indeed, to try to deal with the fact that we had so many people coming in across the border. Yet, it was fake. It was staged. And then they lied about kids drinking out of toilets.

The actual reality on the ground at the border is dead migrants. I am sure my friend from Arizona knows of dead migrants in Arizona because we got dead migrants in Texas. So my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who pat themselves on the back for how compassionate they are about migrants and Brown people, go talk to the Brown people in south Texas about what they are seeing and what they are finding. Talk to the ranchers.

I would love to hear if you have similar experiences. The ranchers who find a migrant either dead or dying from the heat and exhaustion, seek to get them water, call 911 to get them help, try to help their fellow human being. They are dealing with that.

A hundred bodies in Brooks County, Texas, stacking up this year. Body trailers. The sheriff down there has to deal with this. \$3,000 per body for autopsy. \$5,000 per body for burial because they can't get the families.

Where are my colleagues? Where are our colleagues on the other side of the aisle? Going around trumpeting and talking about how their policies of open borders are great for migrants. Well, say that to the dead migrants.

I assume my colleague from Arizona has seen similar stories.

Mr. BIGGS. That is correct. We have seen it all along the border, whether it is Arizona, Texas, the New Mexico boot, California. The heat is so great, except for right there at San Diego, but it is even hot there. When it gets 120 degrees in the desert and they are coming across, they got one gallon of water that they got somewhere along the pike, and that is it. It is unrelenting, unrelenting heat. We see this.

Here is another question. You got it in Del Rio?

Mr. ROY. Yes.

Mr. BIGGS. And that was not organic?

Mr. ROY. No.

Mr. BIGGS. It was organized. It was organized.

Down in southern Mexico right now, you have a group of 95,000-plus forming up, mostly Haitians forming up, waiting. They have announced that this Sunday is their departure date. We think a good share is going to go to Yuma this time because we have a 7-mile gap in our fencing down there.

Mr. ROY. As my friend from Arizona knows full well, the cause of this is the purposeful and willful disregard for enforcing the laws of the United States at our border. Our laws actually require the enforcement of the law at the border.

The Secretary of Homeland Security is willfully disregarding, for example, as my friend knows, the Secure Fence Act, which among its provisions passed in this body on this floor is to guarantee that we have operational control of the border. That is law.

The Secretary of Homeland Security literally stood in Del Rio, looking at individuals standing in America, going back across the Rio Grande and buying tacos, bringing them back over and selling them to Haitians on American soil. He saw it with his own eyes. He turned to the cameras, and said: Our border is secure.

He looked at the American people and lied, just like the White House press secretary lied when she said Border Patrol agents were whipping Haitians when what they were doing was actually trying to do their job that the President of the United States and the Secretary of Homeland Security is purposefully, willfully trying to deny them the ability to do.

Would my friend agree?

Mr. BIGGS. I agree with you 100 percent. If they would enforce our law, we wouldn't need to be standing here. We had the Attorney General today come in.

Mr. ROY. We did.

Mr. BIGGS. We asked him some pointed questions. How many prosecutions? Is it still illegal? Yes, it is still illegal to come into the country.

Are you prosecuting anybody? Well, I suspect the answer is, no, they are not prosecuting anybody, but they are not detaining anybody either. The law, under title 8, says you must detain unless there is some legal exemption from detention.

The vast majority that are coming across, the Haitians—we heard about 10,000 to 12,000 that Secretary Mayorkas admitted to. They only removed 2,000, and the real number was between 26,000 and 30,000 that actually flowed through Del Rio, Mr. ROY.

What happened to the other 20-some-odd thousand? Well, they are now released into the interior of the United States of America. That is what is happening. This catch and release program is another contravention of our law.

Mr. ROY. Isn't it a perversion of our law for the administration to tell the world: Come to the United States. Claim asylum.

Let's be clear. This is what is happening almost explicitly. The administration is saying to the world: Come to the border of the United States. Claim asylum. We know and you know and every everybody knows well over 90 percent of you do not have a valid claim for asylum.

They are seeking economic benefit. They are seeking jobs. God bless them. I would, too. I have no problem with their desire to come here. But the rule of law matters.

You have an administration saying: Come on here. Claim asylum. What we will do is we will parole you. What does parole mean? Oh, well, you can just come in here and you can work. You can have a job. You can get benefits. And we will just pretend you are going to come back under notice to appear or notice to report. Or we are not going to parole you. We are just going to send you out, and say, notice to appear or notice to report. Oh, by the way, we might just release you and not give you a notice to appear or notice to report, and we just are going to let those numbers flow into the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, 1.7 million apprehensions this year; 300,000 or 400,000 got-aways this year; hundreds of dead migrants along the Rio Grande.

Where are my colleagues? Where are they? They have a duty under the Constitution, a sworn oath to uphold the Constitution to enforce the laws of the United States, and the administration. Here in Congress, this Chamber is MIA in holding the administration accountable to do their job, and I would like to know why.

Mr. BIGGS. When you say that, I am reminded of the surge of 2019. That surge in 2019 happened. I know you went down to the border multiple times.

Mr. ROY. Yes.

Mr. BIGGS. I went down to the border multiple times. I took codels down to the border so folks could see how bad it was. That was my President.

Mr. ROY. Yes.

Mr. BIGGS. You know what? He was trying to enact policies to stop that. They brought lawsuits to prevent stopping that.

Now that their administration has basically adopted an open borders policy, a dangerous policy for the people coming across, a national security issue for us, a national security threat for us, it is crickets?

Mr. ROY. What were those policies that President Trump and his administration put in place to actually secure the borders of the United States in 2019?

Mr. BIGGS. There are several. Title 42 came along a little bit later, though. The most effective were the remain in Mexico policy and the agreements with the Northern Triangle states. There were no incentives in these care packages that came along of \$1,400 every time anybody came in illegally.

He started building the fence. He stopped the catch and release. He ramped up the due process speed. He tried to get those folks with the false asylum claims in, get them due process, and get them removed. He was actually removing people who had removal orders.

We got 1.2 million people who had due process with removal orders in this country today, and this administration has told the ICE officers: Don't go out and find them. Don't enforce those removals.

□ 1815

Those policies were actually working, and title 42 when that came in, that finished it off.

But do you know what you had most of all, Mr. Speaker?

You had a President who said: Do not come, you are not welcome.

Mr. ROY. Right. You are not welcome to come here illegally, and you are not welcome to flout our laws. You are welcome to come here and follow our laws that we have in place for people who come here legally.

There is a waiting list, by the way.

What do you say to the people who are waiting?

Don't worry about it. Let all these other folks come in and just walk through or cross the Rio Grande endangering themselves, endangering Border Patrol, not providing resources to the Border Patrol to do their job, so they are the ones left hanging, dealing with COVID, not having resources, being alone at midnight with no cell signal, no ability to talk on the radio, and no ability to move their car up and down the Rio Grande River.

I have got a bill with my friend, HENRY CUELLAR, to have navigable roads and a fence along the river.

Why won't Speaker PELOSI bring that bipartisan bill to the floor of the United States House of Representatives?

It is for one reason and one reason only: Democrats want a political tool. They want the political reality of a wide-open border. There is zero other

defense for what Democrats are doing, instead of actually doing what it takes to secure the border of the United States.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, when you think about it, in 2018 we swore in 830,000 new U.S. citizens. In 2019 it was about 800,000. That is kind of where it sits every year.

I had a young man who worked for me; his family were immigrants from Mexico. Thirteen years it took for them to get citizenship—13 years. And if they would have crossed the border illegally with the current Democrat plan, they would have gotten amnesty.

Mr. Speaker, think about that. Good friends of ours, our neighbors, same situation, 12, 14 years to get citizenship.

And do you know what, Mr. Speaker? I have to get back to this caravan that is coming up.

Mr. Speaker, what do you think 95,000 people will do to a town of Del Rio's size, which I think is 30,000, 36,000, something like that; or Yuma which is a town the size of 80,000; or how about the town of Douglass; or Naco, about 3,000; or Douglass, about 15,000?

What happens when they come in there?

We don't have facilities. They get processed and released. That is what happens.

Mr. ROY. That is what happens. They get processed and released. And then, Mr. Speaker, when you have migrants who are coming in between the ports of entry and they come across ranches and ranchers come across them or they die in the desert, then they are left having to deal with the body. They are left having to go and have a coroner come and do the autopsy. They have to have, like the gentleman said, body trailers coming down there.

Mr. Speaker, you can't make this up. I just want to know: Do my Democrat colleagues think we are making this up?

They may not know because the Secretary of Homeland Security sure as heck isn't coming down and explaining this to us.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, we are not having a debate here on the floor of the House about anything at all much less our border.

Oh, we have time to have political show trials. We have time to have a subpoena by a sham commission in which you wouldn't even put on the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Speaker. You wouldn't even put on my friends, KELLY ARMSTRONG, JIM BANKS, no, we can't do that. So we are going to have a show trial, we are going to come out here, and we are going to have political theater.

But we are not going to do a doggone thing about migrants dying and Texans dying from fentanyl overdoses.

Why don't we talk about the danger of fentanyl?

Oh, no, we don't want to talk about that. Everybody over here has a steak dinner they have to go eat tonight.

Why don't we talk about the fact that there was a high-profile Texas Longhorns football player, today they put out a statement, the family, sadly—Jake Ehlinger, the brother of the former Longhorns quarterback Sam Ehlinger—in a statement Thursday the Ehlinger family says they learned Jake accidentally overdosed May 6 from what is believed to be the prescription antianxiety medication Xanax laced with fentanyl.

Well, do you know what, Mr. Speaker, and to all my colleagues who are not in this Chamber, that is a story that is happening every day in America across this country: 100,000 people dead, dead in this country because of wide-open borders, with China putting out this synthetic garbage and putting it into the system, and our children are dying. And the Democratic Party, the people leading this Chamber are MIA. They don't care about you, and they don't care about the American people. They only care about crass political use of the border to advance a racial identity agenda.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is right, 100 percent. Mr. Speaker, think about the drug trafficking right now. When the cartels want to bring in drugs, they flood a zone. Del Rio, they put all the Haitians there.

Mr. Speaker, 224 miles of border went unprotected—unprotected—for 8 days. They had cameras, but they didn't have any bodies to go arrest these people bringing the drugs in. We have got places in Arizona for 62 miles with absolutely the only fencing being a vehicle barrier. We have got people coming in who are going through mountains.

We have mountains filled with scouts watching and telling these drug carriers where they are coming in. They come on up, they pop out on Interstate 8 and the intersection of Interstate 10 just south of Phoenix. It is the number one drug trafficking corridor in the country. They spit this stuff out all over the country, and now they are moving into pills. They are moving into pills, counterfeit pills, and we have no idea—they are made by some dude down in a garage.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, some dude is cooking it in Mexico, they are shoving this stuff up from Mexico. There is a guy cooking the Xanax in the same place they have the fentanyl, and people are now getting those pills in the United States, they are dying, and we are just sitting here.

I have got the same Interstate 10 going right through San Antonio, the same Interstate 10 going through Boerne where we just stopped a car with nine immigrants in it, two bound up in the trunk. The car was being driven by a cartel employee, an American citizen, taking them to a stash house. That is the story of your current open border, Mr. Speaker. And, again, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are completely MIA.

Mr. BIGGS. Just on that, I have got to comment on this because when the

gentleman said he had an American citizen, the driver, as an employee of the cartel, we see that all up and down the border, and they want to get youth to do it as well because they are not going to be prosecuted.

Mr. ROY. They are recruiting.

Mr. BIGGS. They are recruiting youth because they are not going to be prosecuted as adults. They are going to get off easier.

Mr. ROY. I wonder if the gentleman might indulge, I had planned a couple of things that were border related, but I also have another topic that he might be interested in. I want to set the stage for something I hope is viewed positively because I believe right now what we are seeing is as Sam Adams put it:

You don't need a majority, but you need tireless minorities being willing to set brushfires of freedom.

What we are seeing across the country are people willing to set brushfires of freedom.

A couple of different issues. Right now we have a President of the United States who has set forth an unconstitutional, unlawful, illegal, and tyrannical vaccine mandate that companies have to bow down to the altar of this White House and do what he says. And I say: No, they don't; and the Governor of Texas says: No, you don't.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker? Southwest Airlines decided to play footsie with this tyrannical order, and the pilots said, no; the employees of Southwest said, no; a lot of their customers said no; and people like me and others called them to task.

Guess what Southwest did, Mr. Speaker?

They backed off a bit. They have now said: We are not going to fire people; we will give them unpaid leave.

I said to Southwest: That is not good enough. You need to let them work. You need to let them carry out their livelihoods. But God bless us, that is a move in the right direction.

Delta Airlines said: Well, we are not necessarily going to do that mandate.

We have got In-N-Out Burger saying: Do you know what, Mr. President? We are not going to do that.

God bless these corporate entities that are saying: No. No. No. We are not going to bow down to whatever the President says because he doesn't have the power. He is not a king. You can't say that we are going to get vaccinated when we believe there is natural immunity or we believe there might be a myocardial issue for our kids, when we believe it is in our best interest to decide what we are going to do for our families. Under no circumstances are we going to bow down to what a dictator in the White House is trying to tell us to do, and I wonder if my friend from Arizona agrees.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I agree 100 percent. We have other places where the employees are fighting back. You have got the Chicago police union. God bless them.

Mr. ROY. Amen.

Mr. BIGGS. Guess what is happening, Mr. Speaker?

The mayor there is trying to put pressure on them.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker? Indiana cities are offering jobs to those Chicago police officers. If they come here, we are not going to mandate that.

Mr. ROY. Yes. We need some cops in Austin, Texas, to fill the holes when those liberals in Austin decided to get rid of the cops. We need some more. Come on down.

Mr. BIGGS. That is what you are seeing, Mr. Speaker. I just got a tweet just 20 minutes ago, 30 minutes ago. We are seeing one of our big companies, one of my big defense contractors in Arizona had an employee walkout today. They don't want this.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker? If you want a vaccine, go ahead and get the vaccine.

Mr. ROY. Amen.

Mr. BIGGS. But doggone it, it should not be mandated by a tyrannical government. And this is the tip of the spear on a fascist-style government, in my opinion.

Mr. ROY. We have a few others: General Electric employees in Greenville, South Carolina, walked out over the vaccine mandate. A New York hospital will stop delivering babies as workers quit over a vaccine mandate. Nearly 1,900 Washington State employees quit or were fired over the vaccine mandate because they said no. And a trooper tells Governor Inslee to kiss his—fill in the blank—in his final signoff before a vaccine mandate, and they put their boots out on the steps in protest. Seattle first responders fired for vaccine noncompliance march on city hall to turn in their boots. Parents in California protest student COVID-19 vaccine mandate, keep kids home. A vaccine opponent protest outside a hospital following shot requirement for employees. And a Wyoming teenager—God bless that Wyoming teenager—was arrested after refusing to wear a mask on school grounds.

That is the America I know. That is the America that doesn't bow down to the tyranny of a federal government that has no constitutional power to tell them what to do and tell them how to live their lives. That is the America that is going to preserve a republic for our kids and grandkids worth passing down to them.

Mr. BIGGS. Amen. People say, looking around, they get so depressed and frustrated when they see the horrible and horrific impacts of the policies coming out of this administration, not the least of which is the curtailing of their freedoms.

Mr. ROY. Amen.

Mr. BIGGS. The gentleman from Texas talks and reminds us of all of this, and we are seeing it. Like my friend, I keep a folder in my computer of story after story of people fighting back saying: No. We are not going to kowtow; we are not going to bow down to this tyranny.

It gives me hope, and it gives us the optimism to carry on and keep up the fight because this country was born on freedom, and it is going to continue. We will see a comeback of freedom.

Like Ronald Reagan said, it may not be in your genes, but you have to fight it. For every generation it is a new fight to keep freedom, and this is our fight today.

Mr. ROY. Amen. We have got frontline doctors who are out there making sure that people can get access to ivermectin. We have got people who are working around all the barriers of these pharmaceutical companies that are saying: No, you can't get this stuff.

Americans want to take care of their loved ones despite a government saying they can't get the treatments that save lives.

I had a woman today break down in tears. She came up to me, and I hugged her. She was crying because her 52-year marriage to her husband—he passed away in August. He was fighting COVID, and he was beating COVID, but he couldn't get ivermectin. They couldn't get to it. They were denied access to it, and they couldn't get monoclonal antibody treatment. She said to me: If I had been able to get him to Florida, I would have saved his life, and I would still have my husband.

Now, I don't know the facts of that, but I hear that from thousands of Americans all the time. They are being denied the ability to get treatment and being denied the ability to get care because we have got a top-down dictatorship coming out of Washington trying to coerce and tell the American people what their healthcare should look like.

But it is not just healthcare. It is critical race theory. It is all of the garbage being taught in our schools about wokeness and telling people that we should be racist because that is what critical race theory is. It is racism, and it is nothing other than that. We have got American people, parents, going into school boards and saying: Enough. We are not having it anymore.

We have got Texas Carroll Independent School District; parents in Southlake recently fought back and won; Fort Worth Independent School District; Colleyville, Texas; New York, Clarkstown School Board; Georgia, Atlanta where parents are coming in, and they are saying enough. We believe in America, and we believe in the content of one's character and not the color of their skin. We don't want to listen to this garbage dividing us further by race.

Mr. BIGGS. One of the only good things about the COVID outbreak was that parents got to see what the kids were learning for a change, and when they saw it, they said: This is not what I want my kid to learn. And they started standing up.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker? It is working.

But do you know what is happening?

Right now, we have got an Attorney General who has basically said: We are

going to stop those protests, we are going to stop that communication that is First Amendment messaging that you give as parents to the school boards.

That is not the American way. That is the tyranny, and that is the fascism we are fighting about. That is what you and I were fighting with the Attorney General today about. And doggone it, we have got to stand up, and those parents need to be able to stand up, express themselves, and express their protest.

Mr. ROY. I always notice that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle snicker when we say things about critical race theory. They laugh at it. But they never want to debate the actual substance of the garbage being taught. They never want to actually look at the curriculum, look at the books, and look at what is being taught.

The Virginia Department of Education administered a training to teachers that included a presentation instructing them to embrace critical race theory and engage in race conscious teaching and learning in order to—this is a quote—reengineer attitudes and belief systems.

□ 1830

That is what it is about. Its roots are in Marxist ideology, and we know it. It is clear. It is evident, and we see it in Loudoun County right now where we see what is unfolding in Loudoun County, which is all about critical race theory, parents getting angry, and then a school board stepping right over the rights of a dad to be able to go down and protest to the school board because his daughter was raped in a bathroom by a dude wearing a skirt. And they want to then go down and say, oh, well, we are just going to say this is domestic terrorism.

And what happens? The Attorney General of the United States gives the FBI the power to go after parents because parents are protesting against this stuff because they know the power is in the people. We the people.

And you know what? The American people are on to this stuff, and the American people are going to stop it because that is the way we do things in this country.

Mr. BIGGS. That is where it is. That is where the fire is starting, right there at the level of the people.

And if we are going to save this country—I tell people all the time—it is going to come from the grassroots. It is going to come from the people. It is going to take off into the local jurisdictions in the States.

If you think that you are going to save this Nation with the United States Congress, you are sadly mistaken. It is the States. It is the individuals. It is the families. It is the people who love this country, and they are going to keep fighting us back. I am with you 100 percent on that.

Mr. ROY. Well, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his comments. I believe my time is winding down.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ROY. Well, I appreciate the Speaker for his indulgence. I appreciate my friend from Arizona.

I would just point out that what we learned today was highly troubling. What we saw with the Attorney General, what we learned today when we saw that the White House was colluding—we saw this in evidence in emails—colluding with the National Association of School Boards to include language in the memoranda that then got the Attorney General to go target parents with the FBI. We saw that. It was evidence. The AG admitted today in our committee, he said, because of that memo, I created this effort by the FBI. We saw that. It is happening. The American people are onto it.

The American people, if you are listening to me, you stand strong. You say no. Say no to vaccine mandates, say no to mask mandates, say no to all the nonsense coming out of this critical race theory garbage. Stand up for your kids. Go to school boards, turn over the school boards, and fight for freedom.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

HOUSING IS CENTER OF ECONOMIC STABILITY AND PROSPERITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on my Special Order, and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, last month, the House Financial Services Committee Democrats unanimously passed the housing title of the Build Back Better Act to provide \$327 billion in critical investments needed to affordably house America and invest in neighborhoods across the country.

With the inclusion of my committee's housing title, the Build Back Better Act will create over 3 million affordable and accessible homes. It will fully address the needed repairs in public housing so residents can safely live in their homes with dignity.

It will help an estimated 750,000 households afford their rent or exit homelessness through expanded hous-

ing choice vouchers. It will address the racial wealth gap by helping first-generation home buyers access homeownership. These investments will help the schoolteacher experiencing homelessness; the children exposed to lead and other harmful toxins in their homes; the elderly neighbor who can't afford their prescription medications on a fixed income because the rent and mortgage is too high; the millennial who cannot rely on the bank of mom and dad for a downpayment to purchase their first home; and the millions of families that hang in the balance of imminent eviction or foreclosure due to the pandemic.

Just today, my committee heard from several witnesses on the importance of the housing choice voucher program and how transformational it can be for a family to receive this assistance. Harvard Professor Raj Chetty testified about his research showing that children whose families received a housing choice voucher to move to low-poverty neighborhoods later in life earned 30 percent more than children who remained in high-poverty neighborhoods. Another witness testified about how the voucher program helps his clients escape homelessness and achieve housing stability.

Housing is at the center of every household's economic stability and our Nation's prosperity. Without these investments in resilient, healthy, accessible, and fair housing, the Build Back Better Act will not improve the lives of families across the country, as we have promised it will.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to try, in the best way that I possibly can, to describe what is happening in the Congress of the United States of America. This build back mission, this act, is the vision of the President of the United States of America. President Biden has taken the leadership for job creation. He has taken the leadership to deal with some of the equity issues in this country. He has taken the leadership to do everything that can be done to ensure that we invest in the human potential of the citizens of this country.

He is doing everything that he can to deal with the pandemic, and he is unearthing and revealing the softness in our economy, in our society, prior to that pandemic, and this is difficult work. This is not easy.

Of course, eventually, we had to deal with the fact that we have some who were resisting the mission of the President to build back better.

At one point in time, I know there was some talk about a \$600 trillion bill. And, of course, we have heard most about a \$327 trillion bill. So at this point in time, we don't have the cooperation in order to realize the President's mission and vision about what it takes in order to support the citizens of this country in a way that will help to change their lives.

However, this is transformative. This is the kind of legislation that the President of the United States has developed and worked with because he

understands what it takes to strengthen the economy, to create jobs, to open up opportunities, to deal with rental assistance, and all of these issues.

Unfortunately, there are two members of the Democratic Party on the Senate side who do not agree. It has taken us a long time to understand what it is they want, what it is they don't want. But in the final analysis, they do not, at this point in time, support the President's vision.

However, those of us who chair committees worked very hard on our portion of the Build Back Better Act. I, as the chair of the Financial Services Committee, worked very hard with our staff in order to identify what is absolutely needed in order to support housing in a real way in this country. Housing issues that have been disregarded, that have not been paid attention to, housing issues that have gone unattended to for so many years, in that, of course, we dealt with public housing and the fact that they were in great disrepair, and they needed the resources necessary to fix those elevators; in order to get the lead out of the paint; in order to make sure that the stairways are safe.

I am reminded of the fact that Ms. VELÁZQUEZ from New York called me from one of the public housing developments last winter when there was no heat in the entire development.

So this money is desperately needed for the capital investments that we need to do in public housing. But not only do we deal with public housing, we deal with the fact that there are people who work every day but cannot afford the rents. We deal with people who are paying 50 percent of their income for rent. We deal with people who are on the ground in makeshift tents every day, homeless all over America.

One of the issues that has become very important to me is the choice voucher issue. So in addition to the \$80 billion that we advocated for public housing, there is another \$90 billion that we advocated for the vouchers. This includes not only choice vouchers. It includes project-based vouchers so that we can develop more affordable units.

Of course, we recognized what the cities wanted, what they have been dealing with, and what they believe will improve their ability to assist those who are trying to get safely housed. That is the HOME program that the cities love. That is the CDBG program and those programs we funded. In addition to that, I want you to know that Barney Frank and I worked for years in order to come up with the National Housing Trust Fund. So we had \$36 billion that we put into that.

Now, given that we don't know what the top line is in the Build Back Better Act, and we don't know exactly whether or not our Senators on the opposite side—on the Democratic side or the opposite side—will honor this vision and this leadership of the President. So without knowing what the top line is,

we know that probably we are all going to have to take cuts in all the areas that we have worked so hard for.

I am certainly prepared to accept our share of that responsibility. I know that cuts have to be made, but they have to be made fairly. And so there was a rumor that there was going to be zero dollars advocated to these choice vouchers and project-based vouchers, and, of course, that made me very unhappy. That caused me to have great concern. I have been working, organizing press conferences, working with the advocates, working with academicians and everybody to help the administration and everybody else understand that we cannot do without adequate vouchers for the people who are in such desperate need of rental assistance.

Everywhere all over the United States, particularly in Black and Brown communities, people have been waiting for years to be able to get these vouchers. And so we have a time now by which we are going to be funding some of what is needed in housing, and at the top of my list are the vouchers.

I want everybody to know that I have been talking with members of our Caucus and I have been talking with members of the Congressional Black Caucus. We are not backing away from getting a substantial number of vouchers funded. I am not going to back away. I am not going to be shy about it.

As a matter of fact, I will let the world know that I and others that I have organized will not vote for any bill that does not have a substantial number of vouchers in it so that we can deal with the longstanding issues of a lack of decent and safe and secure housing in our communities.

I don't need to say any more. All I need to let people know is, I am fair. I accept cuts across many of these areas that I have worked so hard for, but I do not want my number one issue in all of this housing to be undermined, neglected. And I do not want the people of our districts who expect their government to come to their aid when they are coming to the aid of others in so many ways—and I respect the fact that in our Caucus and in the Progressive Caucus, we have about five different kinds of interests that we want to see supported. I, tonight, am talking about housing. But I respect the agenda of the Progressive Caucus and the five areas that they have identified. But for me, housing is number one.

I will now call on those who are participating this evening.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER), who is also my friend and chair of the Financial Services Committee's Subcommittee on Housing, Community Development and Insurance.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Madam Chair for yielding. Let me begin my comments by thanking the gentlewoman, as I have done in front of you and away from you, because I

think you have placed housing on the front burner in this country right now, and it could not have come sooner.

Let me just say that—because I was disoriented because of the earlier speakers and then got a really bad headache, but I am going to still be able to share these comments—I probably did not grow up like many of the people in a contemporary United States. I grew up in Texas just outside of downtown Dallas, and I had no idea that we were poor.

□ 1845

Never mind the fact that we had an outhouse about 30 or 40 yards down a hill by a little creek. Never mind the fact that we didn't have windows in our house. Actually, we did have windows, but my father or somebody had put tin over the windows to keep the winter cold out. The good blessing there was, in Texas, the weather is quite mild in the winter.

But I lived in a shack, and there were six people in it. There were two rooms. My three sisters slept on one side of the room, and I slept on the other side of the room. The kitchen was not really a kitchen. We had what was called an icebox, and the iceman would bring a big block of ice every 2 or 3 days for 50 cents.

So I guess somebody could say, well, his parents weren't working and that is what happens in this country when people don't work. It may be interesting, at least for some, to know that my father attended Prairie View, did not graduate from Prairie View, came back home and started his own business, Cleaver's Cleaners. And in a town where there was rigid segregation, he could only do the people in the neighborhood, and that didn't provide enough income.

But he kept us in this house as comfortably as possible. In fact, one night, I asked my mother if I could share something that is called hoe cakes, big biscuits. She would make syrup, and I loved it. It was like heaven. I asked her if I could share those with the people who lived on the big street. We lived in an ally, and there were big mansions that are still there today, and I wanted to take some over and give it to the rich kids, because my mother said they didn't have any hoe cakes.

But we lived in a house. And my father, who turned 100 on July 16, paid \$20 a month on a shack, probably was worth maybe \$250. So I grew up in that house.

We then moved to public housing. My father worked—and, in fact, I don't know how he made it, and I don't know how he lived to be 100, because my father worked three jobs. He worked at the First Baptist Church, a huge church, still is a huge church that is known all over the country. And then, on Saturday mornings, he cleaned up the T. A. Litteken's Construction Company office building. Then on Saturdays, he would serve parties. He did that for years and years and years and years.

I hope he is watching this tonight, because I want to say thank you to him, because I don't know how he did all of that. Because my mother did not go to school, college, he felt like it was his responsibility to send her to college.

So we moved to public housing. And as I have said publicly, my father lied to the officials at the public housing, the Rosewood projects. He would not tell them that he had another job, because to do so meant that he would have to increase his rent.

So he saved every dime he could get, every dime, and bought a house in the White neighborhood and had it moved on a Saturday night to the east side of town where African Americans lived.

This was his dream. My father had the house fixed up. We moved into the house. I had my own bedroom. I thought we were rich. I mean, we actually had an indoor bathroom. I remember, I spent one night just flushing the toilet, just playing with it. It was like heaven. Then my mother started college when I was in the seventh grade. My father insisted.

My father was willing to do whatever he had to do to build his family. But the key to all of it was housing. That separated us from a lot of others. Housing, it is the most significant thing a human being can have. It makes them a part of the American Dream.

My daddy is somebody—and this rose so high—that his lawn was put on display in the local newspaper. The lawn of the summer, that is what he wanted to do.

Madam Chair, I appreciate everything you have done and said to bring us to this point.

I want to say to anybody watching, if you live in the United States, the most powerful, the richest Nation on this planet, you have no business sleeping outside with 700,000 people who do it every single night in this country. You have no business being unable to afford a house in the United States, because the average price now is almost \$400,000.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES), my friend.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would not be here today as a United States Congressman were it not for affordable housing and the opportunity it gave me and my family. So the fight is deeply personal, and I am honored to stand in the trenches with Chair WATERS and Chair CLEAVER as we fight for affordable housing at a critical moment.

We cannot build back better without realizing the vision of housing as a human right and without realizing the vision of housing as infrastructure. We cannot build back better without making America affordable to all Americans. Housing is not an afterthought; housing is foundational, not only to who we are but to who we become.

We know from the research of Professor Raj Chetty that ZIP Code is

often destiny and that where you live determines your access to opportunity. It often determines the quality of the schools you attend and the services you access.

We know that housing is not only foundational but also intersectional. It intersects with climate. In New York City, we saw not one, but two record rainfalls. And as our city has become less and less affordable. More and more Americans are living in illegal basement apartments that were heavily flooded by the remnants of Hurricane Ida, and those Americans died at the intersection of the housing crisis and the climate crisis.

Housing intersects with public health. As our city has become less and less affordable, more and more New Yorkers and Americans are living in overcrowded apartments. And we saw those overcrowded homes become Petri dishes for the spread of COVID-19.

Housing is essential. Housing stabilizes the essential workforce that stabilizes the rest of us. According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, there is not a single county in America where an essential worker earning minimum wage could afford a two-bedroom apartment, and there are only 7 out of 3,000 counties where an essential worker earning minimum wage could afford a one-bedroom apartment. If you are an essential worker earning the Federal minimum wage of \$7.25 an hour, you would have to work 72 hours a week in order to afford a one-bedroom apartment.

The central cause of my life has been public housing. My mother taught me that the most important lesson in life is to never forget where you come from. I come from the Bronx, and I come from public housing.

In New York City, we have the New York City Housing Authority, commonly known as NYCHA, which is the largest provider of affordable housing in the continent of North America, housing a population of about half a million Americans. Half a million is larger than most large cities in the United States. If NYCHA were a city unto itself, it would be the largest city of low-income Black and Brown Americans in the country.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we are on the verge of making history. We are on the verge of going from FDR's New Deal to LBJ's Great Society to Joe Biden's Build Back Better. But the fundamental difference between FDR's New Deal and Joe Biden's Build Back Better is racial equity. FDR's New Deal was racially exclusionary, and the Build Back Better Act must be racially equitable.

We cannot build back better without advancing the cause of racial equity, but we cannot advance the cause of racial equity without rebuilding NYCHA, without rebuilding America's largest city of low-income Black and Brown Americans. We must rebuild affordable housing.

Infrastructure is about more than roads and bridges. It is about safe, de-

cent, affordable housing. Safe, decent, affordable housing represents roads and bridges to the American Dream, and I stand here as living proof.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), who is also the Chair of the Financial Services Committee's Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is always a preeminent privilege to be in the company of Chairwoman WATERS, especially when she has taken up a cause that is not only worthy but noble. I greatly appreciate what she is doing tonight.

I would say this, housing is infrastructure, and housing is infrastructure for a multiplicity of reasons.

I neglected to say "and still I rise."

And still I rise to talk about housing is infrastructure. Housing is infrastructure.

If we traverse the highways and byways across our country, in our urban areas, we will find persons who are sleeping under overpasses, sleeping under bridges, sleeping along the roads, the roadways.

Overpasses and bridges have become housing. The infrastructure itself now has become housing. It is my belief that if an overpass can become housing, which is infrastructure, then the housing itself can be infrastructure. It is time for us to fully fund these housing programs.

I would mention but one that I think is very important to us, and that is the housing choice voucher program. This is an important program, because I had my staff to compile some statistical information for me, and here is what they have called to my attention. We need to know who actually benefits. Over 40 percent of these voucher recipients are households with children, 29 percent are the elderly, and 36 percent are nonelderly people with disabilities.

This myth that people are, for some reason, deciding that they will just make their way through life on the backs of others, is something that I call inanity. It is close to insanity to say this when you examine the empirical evidence.

We also find that, yes, the wait time is long, averaging 2.5 years nationally. Many of the lines are closed, with the 50 largest housing authorities having wait times of a year or more and some up to 8 years.

Madam Speaker and Madam Chair, there is much more to be said, but the time is limited. I would simply say this, vouchers have shown to reduce homelessness, help people pay rent, reduce poverty, help children exit the welfare system, help persons find and keep employment, help children do better in school, help people with disabilities maintain their health, help people achieve greater economic mobility, help people build wealth, and help families enter the middle class. It is time to fully fund the voucher system.

□ 1900

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the American people to express my support for the maintenance of effort of the robust housing provisions of the Build Back Better Act that is before us as a body.

I would like to thank the chairwoman of the Financial Services Committee, a champion for all of us in the United States of America, but particularly for the poor and disenfranchised.

I rise on behalf of all our American families who are directly impacted by our affordable housing crisis, and I rise today, Mr. Speaker, because despite the proposed solutions Democrats fought to secure in the bill to address our housing crisis head-on, they are at risk of being eliminated, negotiated away from the revised package.

The housing crisis in America is real and growing exponentially each and every month. Housing insecurity is very real in the lives of far too many American families.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my constituents in central and south Brooklyn who continue to struggle due to the lack of affordable housing and for whom overdevelopment of market-rate units has created a gentrification juggernaut that has swollen the ranks of the homeless in New York City and across this Nation, working families stuck who can't afford to stay in their apartments but can't afford to leave their towns.

The effects of gentrification and COVID-19 have truly compounded this crisis, causing many to be evicted from their homes and experiencing homelessness at a rate we have never seen, all due to the lack of real and sustained investment in affordable housing.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I believe our time has been exhausted. I yield back the balance of my time.

BUILD BACK BETTER ACT WILL PERMANENTLY CHANGE AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend some time addressing the Chair and America on the American Rescue Plan or, actually, on the Build Back Better Act, which is kind of a follow-up on the American Rescue Plan.

We know the result of that original big-spending, government-printing act was a big increase in inflation in the United States, apparent to one and all. This is a follow-up bill to that, which will further require the Federal Reserve to print more money, driving up the cost of gas, of food, of housing everywhere we look.

But I am not going to address just the cost of this bill tonight. I am going to address the way I believe it will permanently change America and the vi-

sion the Democratic Party apparently has for America in the future.

In this bill, we are adding 87,000 IRS agents. For quite a while, when I would give talks about this bill, I would talk about 8,700 because when my staff told me it was 87,000, I felt I had to correct them. Nobody would want to add 87,000 IRS agents. But I stand corrected. I was wrong.

In this bill, we are adding 87,000 IRS agents, enough to fill up a massive American football stadium. Being from Wisconsin, I think of Camp Randall Stadium, where the University of Wisconsin plays. I think of Lambeau Field, where the Packers play. Somebody wants to hire that many IRS agents.

It is not in the bill, but it is in conjunction with a proposal I think the Biden administration has, to monitor every \$600 transfer of funds. What type of country would have this many IRS agents and want to know if you spend \$600 on who knows what—giving to the politically incorrect church; giving to a politically incorrect nonprofit; giving money to a fringe, eccentric sibling; whatever.

It sounds like something more you would think of in East Germany when East Germany was around rather than the United States. But that is apparently the vision of the party that put together the Build Back Better Act.

As was just mentioned in this bill, we are adding money for more low-income apartments. Now, that sounds good. President Biden also recently increased the food stamp allowance.

There is an author of mine that I suggest Americans read by the name of Theodore Dalrymple, an English author who was a doctor dealing both with English prisons and English slums.

He talked about the empty lives that people who live what I will refer to as the welfare lifestyle that England had. He attributed that empty life to the fact that in England—and maybe they backed off this by now, but at least England 15 years ago, no matter how irresponsible you were, you always got a free apartment; you always got free food; and you always got free medical care. In other words, there was no responsibility when you got up in the morning to really accomplish anything because you would always be able to exist.

We are close to that right now, but I am afraid the majority party wants to go all the way there when I look at this proposal. I hope the majority party stops and thinks in addition to the cost, more importantly, psychologically what will it do to the people of America if, when you graduate from high school or don't graduate from high school, if you want to, particularly if you have a child, you can live a lifestyle in which you can be completely irresponsible. You will always be able to eat and always be able to have a nice air-conditioned, heated apartment, which will probably have more square feet per person than the

average housing in Europe, much less around the world.

This will, again, change America for the worse. Psychologically, it will give people nothing to live for. By the way, since it is usually targeted at people with children, it also will create a sad situation we have already created in this country in which men will have less responsibility for taking care of their children.

When you have no other responsibilities in life, it can lead to, first, an empty, depressed life; and, secondly, it can lead to—what?—idle hands are the Devil's workshop.

There are other things in this bill that will also change America. We are aiming for universal 3- or 4-year-old kindergarten, I guess you would call it. As a sidelight, this bill says that the people in these daycares, which is kind of what they are, need a college degree. That is a little bit of snobbery that we should put an end to, the idea that if I have a college degree, I am always better off than somebody who doesn't have a college degree.

If you are applying for a job, we treat the hardworking, intelligent, commonsense person without a college degree as being, for some reason, less worthy of a higher paycheck than the lack of commonsense person who may not have a strong work ethic who does get a college degree. That is just a sidelight. A bad provision there.

But another provision about this that is bad is you are taking the care of the 3- and 4-year-olds out of the parents and giving it exclusively to the government. Now, a given number of parents may prefer it, but I think throughout most of this country, the raising of the children has been primarily the responsibility of the family.

I know the Marxist element in the other party does not want parents and, in particular, fathers too involved in their children's upbringing. But I feel this will again permanently change America.

I should point out, if you look at the studies, American schools sometimes have bad test scores. But our test scores are pretty good in the fourth grade. In other words, our problem in this country isn't that the children are doing poorly when the parents take care of them. Those test scores for children in American schools are falling in middle school and high school. So the problem is later on. It is not with the 3- and 4-year-olds when the parents have responsibility.

I should also point out that we are, in this bill, increasing Pell grants. Now, there are two problems there. Pell grants are grants going toward what we will refer to as low-income people, but they don't go to middle-class people.

I am already getting complaints in my district from Pell grants in the past as couples, married couples who thought they were being responsible in raising their children, they find out their children might be going \$30,000 or

\$40,000 in debt to get a college degree. But if the parents hadn't been working or hadn't been working as hard, those parents' children are eligible for free college.

I know I am sure it always feels good to give more away, but put yourself in the place of the middle-class American family that is working to raise their child, a married couple, and you see somebody else next door not working very hard, and as a bonus, their children get free college, where the responsible middle-class kid winds up \$30,000 or \$40,000 in debt. Another example here of complete unfairness and perverse incentives.

When I go back home, one of the major concerns of businesses is they can't find anybody to work. Now, I would hope everybody sometimes tours their businesses and is familiar with that. Obviously, hiring 87,000 new IRS agents is going to take 87,000 people away from the private sector.

But another interesting proposal in this bill is we have a new expanded civilian conservation corps. In other words, we are taking more people away from the factories, the construction sites, the retail outlets that they so desperately need to hire them for the government, make them dependent on the government, but above all make sure they are not available for the private sector. Another big mistake.

I mentioned the Pell grants and the fact that in a way they are a little bit of an insult to the middle-class kids who have to go further and further in debt. But another interesting provision about these Pell grants and another way that they clearly want to change America in this bill is you are eligible for the Pell grants if you are here illegally. This is not a mistake. I am not making this up.

I am on both the Education and Labor Committee and the Budget Committee, where we tried to take this provision out, and the Democrats on those committees proudly defended the provision. They really believe that if you come here, you are entitled to free college, whereas if you are a member of a middle-class American working family, your children should go \$30,000 to \$50,000 in debt to get a college degree. I mean, it is almost beyond belief, but that is another one of the features of this bill and one of the reasons why I really hope it fails.

Another feature of this bill, be it natural gas or methane, is increasing taxes, driving up the cost of energy in the United States. The environmentalists in this country may be interested to know that already the high cost of energy in the United States, and even more Europe, is causing more and more foundries, and I assume other factories as well, to go up in India, which is a much, much, much bigger pollution problem than the United States.

So when you drive up the cost of energy, which is so very important for American factories in general and our foundries in particular, what this bill

would do is ship more American manufacturing jobs abroad and increase the overall pollution in the United States as we have energy production go from the new, clean power plants in America to the much dirtier power plants in India, China, and from around the world.

Other things in this bill that are a little bit irritating: After much effort, the Republicans, when they were in charge, required Social Security numbers for the child tax credits. Why did we require Social Security numbers? To make sure people are not filling out tax returns and getting tax refunds they aren't entitled to. I don't know why anybody would not want Social Security numbers so we can check to see if somebody says they have five children, they really have five children and get the money back.

For whatever motivation—I can't even imagine what the motivation would be—in this bill the wonderful Democratic Party is saying, no, you don't need Social Security numbers to get refunds for your child tax credit, which will not just increase a form of welfare. This will increase a form of welfare cheating. Why you would do this, again I can't imagine.

□ 1915

One other provision in this bill, not a fiscal provision, the Democrat Party is trying to allow, I would say, 8 to 11 million people currently here illegally to become legal.

First of all, you are rewarding people who broke the law to come into this country. And secondly, when you make 8 to 11 million people legal who were previously illegal it is like putting a sign on the United States, which the drug cartels who are involved in all this illegal immigration, will show around the world: Come to the United States. We are not enforcing our immigration laws.

Perhaps the majority party is not aware that already the drug gangs in both Central America and Brazil are taking out TV ads inviting people to come into the United States.

Why do they do that? Because if you're in Central America, they may charge you 5 to \$7,000 to come here. In Brazil they may charge you \$10,000 to come here. And because there is money to be made for the drug gangs, they advertise, encouraging people to come here.

Now, when we do something like, in essence, legalize people who are already here illegally, don't you think the drug gangs are going to educate the people in Central America as to what we are doing? Of course they are.

So not only are you inviting people or creating people who are illegal or who were previously illegal, but, worse, you are giving a green light to anybody hanging out in other countries, now is the time to come to America.

By the way, when I am down on the border, another thing I hear is the cooperation from the Mexican Govern-

ment has been less and less over the 6 or 8 months as we try to control our border, not only to keep illegal people out but to keep the drugs out, as well.

Our Border Patrol notices a little less cooperation from the Mexicans, and I can see why. They believe they are getting less cooperation because if the United States itself doesn't care about its own border, why should Mexican law enforcement risk their lives protecting the border and protecting the integrity of the border if the United States itself doesn't care?

So here we have another provision which advertises the United States doesn't care about their immigration laws. I am sure the Mexican Border Patrol, the Mexican military is aware of it, and what will they think of it? Why should I risk my butt preventing people from coming here if the United States itself doesn't care?

So, again, I encourage America to wake up. We are permanently changing the type of country that this is if this bill passes as is.

So I encourage Americans to contact their legislators. Please don't pass this bill.

Now, I will make two more brief comments for the press corps, if they are even paying attention to this.

Like all Congressmen, I frequently get contacted on issues and asked whether I can look into it. Of course, agencies don't like to respond to requests from individual Congressmen, particularly Congressmen in the minority, but I think the press corps, which is so incredibly powerful, more powerful than they imagine, can get answers from bureaucratic agencies the way perhaps Congressmen cannot. And I am going to mention two requests here.

I had requests from people of both parties, both Republicans and Democrats, as to what is in the videos when we had the attacks on this building on January 6. For whatever reason, those videos have not been made public. People would like to know what was going on. I would hope the press corps would apply a little bit of pressure to the appropriate authorities and make those videos public. Because from what I can tell, in my district both the on-the-ball Republicans and the on-the-ball Democrats wish we could see those videos. And I think if the press applied a little bit of pressure, we would see those videos.

The other thing I am hearing from my constituents back home is they wonder about the apparent use of ivermectin in India. If you look at the popular Worldometer website, they will show a dramatic drop in fatalities in India over the last few months, just a shocking drop.

People claim it is from ivermectin. I don't know if it is true or not. But the American news media ought to wake up and cover the story and find out if it is.

If it is not from ivermectin, the American public should know it because then they have been sold a bill of goods.

If it is from ivermectin, the American public should know that because maybe we have a way to greatly reduce the number of fatalities.

So those are two requests that I have of our sometimes slumbering press corps.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 22, 2021, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-2483. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2484. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2485. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2486. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-2487. A letter from the Agency Representative, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Electronic Submission of a Sequence Listing, a Large Table, or a Computer Program Listing Appendix in Patent Applications [Docket No.: PTO-P-2020-0032] (RIN: 0651-AD48) received October 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2488. A letter from the Acting Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer, Office of

the Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation [CPCLO Order No.: 009-2021] received September 24, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2489. A letter from the Federal Highway Administrator and the Federal Transit Administrator, Department of Transportation, transmitting the 24th edition of the biennial "Status of the Nation's Highways, Bridges and Transit: Conditions and Performance" Report to Congress, pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 167(h); Public Law 112-141, Sec. 1115(a) (as amended by Public Law 114-94, Sec. 1116(a)); (129 Stat. 1353); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2490. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the 2021 annual report, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f(b)(6); August 29, 1935, ch. 812, Sec. 7(b)(6) (as amended by Public Law 97-35, Sec. 1122); (95 Stat. 638); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-2491. A letter from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulations Policy and Management, Office of General Counsel (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — VA Acquisition Regulation: Definitions, Solicitation Provisions and Contract Clauses, and Forms (RIN: 2900-AR30) received October 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2492. A letter from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of General Counsel (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — VA Acquisition Regulation: Competition Requirements (RIN: 2900-AQ21) received October 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2493. A letter from the Regulations Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of General Counsel (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — VA Acquisition Regulation: Simplified Procedures for Health-Care Resources (RIN: 2900-AQ78), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2494. A letter from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of General Counsel (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedule for Rating Disabilities: The Cardiovascular System (RIN: 2900-AQ67) received October 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2495. A letter from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — VA Acquisition Regulation: Loan Guaranty and Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment Programs (RIN: 2900-AQ76) received October 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2496. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting three legislative proposals that, respec-

tively, pertain to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) seal, the licensing of DHS intellectual property, and reimbursed assistance that DHS provides; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TRONE (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. WILD, and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5654. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to establish an Advisory Commission on Serving and Supporting Students with Mental Health Disabilities in Institutions of Higher Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LATURNER (for himself, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. ESTES, and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 5655. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require providers of a covered service to provide location information concerning the telecommunications device of a user of such service to an investigative or law enforcement officer or an employee or other agent of a public safety answering point in an emergency situation involving risk of death or serious physical harm or in order to respond to the user's call for emergency services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATURNER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BANKS, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. MANN, Mr. ESTES, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. BARR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATTI, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. KUSTOFF, and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois):

H.R. 5656. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to require providers of services and health maintenance organizations under the Medicare and Medicaid programs to provide for certain policies to be in place relating to do-not-resuscitate orders or similar physician's orders for unemancipated minors receiving services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 5657. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to make marijuana accessible for use by qualified marijuana researchers for medical purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. GARBARINO):

H.R. 5658. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report on the cybersecurity roles and responsibilities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. BROWNLEY (for herself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COSTA, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. CHU, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. BERA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PANNETTA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. BASS, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. KIM of California, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. ISSA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NUNES, Ms. WATERS, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 5659. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1961 North C Street in Oxnard, California, as the "John R. Hatcher III Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. COLE (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 5660. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust coinsurance requirements for outpatient critical access hospital services furnished under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 5661. A bill to extend flexible use of John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program funding to address pandemic-related challenges for older foster youth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mrs. CAMMACK):

H.R. 5662. A bill to prohibit the construction of any new Federal building in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. HARSHBARGER (for herself, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. ROY, Mr. ROSE, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MAST, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 5663. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from restricting direct access by health care facilities to COVID-19 monoclonal antibody therapies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan:

H.R. 5664. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to issue a notice to the public regarding each enforcement action under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 that results in large penalties or where multiple

violations or repeated other-than-serious violations are present; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. OMAR (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARSON, Ms. TLAB, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BASS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. SIREs, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. DEAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CORREA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 5665. A bill to establish in the Department of State the Office to Monitor and Combat Islamophobia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 5666. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand health care and benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for military sexual trauma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 5667. A bill to establish a Teacher Advisory Committee and a Parents and Families Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina (for himself and Mrs. FLETCHER):

H.R. 5668. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and any corresponding regulation to extend the period for Federal assistance to individuals and households; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 5669. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to authorize physicians, pursuant to an agreement with the Attorney General, to transport controlled substances from a practice setting to another practice setting or to a disaster area; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 5670. A bill to amend the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333; 54 U.S.C. 320101 note) to include all of Saratoga and Washington Counties in the boundaries of the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 5671. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish seasonal influenza vaccines to certain individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. MANN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois):

H.R. 5672. A bill to require an audit of COVID-19 relief funding; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida):

H.R. 5673. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to make technical corrections to the hazard mitigation revolving loan fund program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 5674. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 190-day lifetime limit on inpatient psychiatric hospital services under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5675. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for and support liver illness visibility, education, and research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ (for herself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. LIEU, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. WELCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. NEWMAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. TLAB, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. CHU, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. JONES, Ms. BASS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. OMAR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. MENG, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. ROSS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. VELA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CORREA, and Ms. STANSBURY):

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of equal pay and the disparity in wages paid to Latina women in comparison to men; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H. Res. 730. A resolution recommending that the House of Representatives find Stephen K. Bannon in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena duly issued by the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. WALTZ, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. POSEY,

Mr. RYAN, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. CARMACK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. STEWART, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BACON, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. BARR, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. VELA, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. BANKS, Mr. DUNN, Mr. PALMER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BABIN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRIST, Mr. BOST, Mr. GUEST, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. MAST, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. COMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. PERRY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. CARL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ESTES, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MASSIE, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. EMMER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. WENSTRUP:

H. Res. 731. A resolution to recognize the centennial of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAWTHORN (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, and Mrs. LESKO):

H. Res. 732. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that it is the duty of Congress to uphold the Constitution and principles on which the United States of America was founded and that nothing in the Constitution or Declaration of Independence is meant to be construed as racist or harmful; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. MOONEY):

H. Res. 733. A resolution congratulating the people of the Republic of Turkey and Turkish Americans nationwide on the 98th anniversary of Turkish Republic Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. CRAIG (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Ms. OMAR):

H. Res. 734. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring Ralph Samuelson, known as the Father of Waterskiing, to commemorate the upcoming 100-year anniversary of the invention of waterskiing; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CAWTHORN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BROOKS, Mr.

GUEST, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CLINE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mrs. STEEL):

H. Res. 735. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that continuous parental engagement in the schooling decisions impacting their children is to be commended, supported, and encouraged, and that current efforts to exclude parents or even label them as domestic terrorists should be condemned; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSE (for himself, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. KUSTOFF, and Mr. COHEN):

H. Res. 736. A resolution honoring the Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation on its 100th anniversary; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SOTO:

H. Res. 737. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 25, 2021, as "National Beauty and Wellness Education Day" by promoting the importance of the Nation's licensed beauty and wellness professionals and the valued role of institutions of higher education that educate students for careers in the thriving beauty and wellness sector; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAUBER (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BOST, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. CLINE, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. EMMER, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. BABIN):

H. Res. 738. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the First Amendment rights of parents at school board meetings shall not be infringed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H. Res. 739. A resolution celebrating the 20-year commemoration of the International Underground Railroad Memorial Monument, comprised of the Gateway to Freedom Monument in Detroit, Michigan, and the Tower of Freedom Monument in Windsor, Ontario, Canada; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H. Res. 740. A resolution recognizing October 2021 as Liver Cancer Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

promoting cooperative fuel load measurement and management on federal and state lands, and appropriate legislation that is based on the Emergency Wildfire and Public Safety Act of 2020, excluding any provision that exempts forest management activities from environmental or administrative review; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. TRONE:

H.R. 5654.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. LATURNER:

H.R. 5655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution (known as the Taxing and Spending Clause) which gives Congress Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Impost and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution (known as the Necessary and Proper Clause), which gives Congress Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LATURNER:

H.R. 5656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution (known as the Taxing and Spending Clause) which gives Congress Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Impost and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution (known as the Necessary and Proper Clause), which gives Congress Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 5657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 5658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: "The Congress shall have power to . . . provide for the common defense. . ."

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 5659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

ML-118. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 3, urging the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President to sign, legislation

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 5660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 5662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17

By Mrs. HARSHBARGER:

H.R. 5663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan:

H.R. 5664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 5665.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 5666.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 5667.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 5668.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 5669.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 5670.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 5671.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, authorized by Congress power to provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 5672.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5673.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 5674.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 5675.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 82: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 475: Mr. KINZINGER and Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 477: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 480: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 623: Mr. CURTIS and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 769: Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 877: Mr. PFLUGER.

H.R. 1179: Mr. TIMMONS and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1182: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1193: Ms. CHENEY and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1219: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1259: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 1297: Mr. TIMMONS and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 1332: Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. KAHELE, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 1348: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1384: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 1476: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 1553: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1577: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.R. 1611: Mr. MANN.

H.R. 1661: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1667: Mr. CROW.

H.R. 1676: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1730: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1813: Mr. TONKO and Mr. RUPPERS-BERGER.

H.R. 1911: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1946: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 1956: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 1959: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 1978: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2050: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 2116: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 2121: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 2125: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 2171: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 2184: Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 2230: Ms. NEWMAN.

H.R. 2234: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 2262: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 2366: Mr. MORELLE and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2558: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 2586: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. STANSBURY, and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 2600: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.

H.R. 2601: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 2730: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2748: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2759: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 2773: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 2825: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 2840: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2890: Mrs. CAMMACK.

H.R. 2898: Mr. BALDERSON.

H.R. 2920: Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 3085: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3088: Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 3095: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 3100: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3109: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 3180: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H.R. 3215: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 3281: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 3296: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 3312: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 3355: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DOGETT, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CORREA, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. BASS, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 3367: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 3440: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 3442: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 3443: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 3461: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 3508: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 3532: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 3537: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 3541: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 3577: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 3602: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 3816: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 3940: Mrs. HAYES and Mr. MRVAN.

H.R. 3967: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 3997: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 4042: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 4060: Mrs. CAMMACK.

H.R. 4114: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 4141: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 4210: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 4297: Mr. HILL and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 4312: Mrs. CAMMACK.

H.R. 4328: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 4331: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 4379: Mr. KAHELE and Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 4402: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 4429: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 4433: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 4469: Mr. DAVIDSON.

H.R. 4489: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 4565: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 4571: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 4594: Mr. RUSH and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 4645: Mr. OBERNOLTE.

H.R. 4702: Ms. SALAZAR, Mrs. HINSON, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 4728: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 4785: Mr. ARMSTRONG.

H.R. 4794: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 4810: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 4880: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 4996: Ms. HERRELL and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 5012: Mr. KAHELE.

H.R. 5019: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 5048: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 5131: Mr. TRONE and Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 5136: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 5142: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 5163: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 5224: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 5235: Ms. WILD and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 5255: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 5272: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 5300: Mr. LIEU, Mr. DEFazio, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 5307: Ms. NEWMAN.

H.R. 5340: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 5342: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SOTO, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 5360: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 5379: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 5389: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 5390: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 5402: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 5441: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 5444: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 5450: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 5451: Mr. CLINE.
 H.R. 5469: Ms. MENG and Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
 H.R. 5471: Mr. GOOD of Virginia and Mr. GALLAGHER.
 H.R. 5472: Mr. CLINE.
 H.R. 5497: Mr. SIRES, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H.R. 5498: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5509: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. CAWTHORN.
 H.R. 5529: Ms. SALAZAR.
 H.R. 5531: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. BOWMAN.
 H.R. 5543: Ms. SALAZAR.
 H.R. 5553: Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 5556: Mr. CRIST.
 H.R. 5572: Mrs. CAMMACK.
 H.R. 5577: Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. HAYES, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. MENG, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LAMB, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
 H.R. 5586: Mrs. LESKO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MAST, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. MELJER, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CLINE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Ms. FOXX,

Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 5591: Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. OMAR, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. NOR-
 TON.

H.R. 5597: Mr. GALLAGHER.
 H.R. 5601: Mr. MORELLE.
 H.R. 5602: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 5605: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 5606: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 5608: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 5609: Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. LETLOW, Mrs. CAMMACK, and Mrs. HARSHBARGER.

H.R. 5619: Mr. MANN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 5630: Mr. BIGGS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. CLYDE.

H.R. 5637: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 5641: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 5648: Ms. OMAR and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 5649: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 5651: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.J. Res. 12: Mr. ELLZEY.

H. Con. Res. 7: Mrs. CAMMACK.

H. Con. Res. 44: Mr. MELJER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BERGMAN, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H. Res. 69: Ms. OMAR.

H. Res. 100: Ms. STANSBURY.

H. Res. 109: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 366: Mrs. LESKO and Ms. CRAIG.

H. Res. 404: Ms. CHU.

H. Res. 443: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 445: Mr. ALLRED.

H. Res. 586: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 720: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BERA, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. ISSA, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H. Res. 724: Ms. SPEIER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record on October 12, 2021]

H.R. 4781: Mr. SUOZZI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

PT-71. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, Texas, relative to respectfully remonstrate in opposition to any legislation which would result in the United States becoming a cashless society; which was referred to the Committee on Financial Services.

PT-72. Also, a petition of Family Research Counsel, Washington, DC, relative to urging the 117th Congress continues to prohibit taxpayer funding of abortions through the Hyde Amendment and expand this principle to Obamacare and any program that subsidizes abortion; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PT-73. Also, a petition of City of Sunrise, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 21-111, supporting the people of Cuba in their demand for freedom, condemning the tyrannical communist regime in Cuba, and urging the President of the United States to support the Cuban People who bravely took to the streets; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.