

The ALLIES Act builds on the HOPE for Afghan SIVs Act, as it increases the Afghan SIV cap, streamlines the application process and strengthens protections for surviving spouses and children, among other important steps.

And it does this without compromising the strict background check and national security vetting procedures or other processes to confirm eligibility.

The threat facing our “Afghan allies,” as the national security and defense community calls them, cannot be overstated.

According to the nonprofit organization No One Left Behind, more than 300 translators and their family members have been killed since 2014. Many died while waiting for their visas to be processed.

Over 90 percent of the hundreds of Afghan partners report having received at least one death threat because of their work with Americans.

One Afghan partner, who has been waiting six years for a visa decision, worries, “If the Taliban take over, they’ll easily find me and kill me. Then my wife will have no husband and my daughter will have no father.”

Another says, “I get phone calls from the Taliban saying, ‘We will kill you.’ They know who I am and that I worked for the Americans. If they find me, they’ll torture me and then kill me. It’s better if I just kill myself first.”

These courageous allies cannot wait a day longer.

As the United States prepares for and executes the strategic and important withdrawal from Afghanistan, we must do so in a way that protects those who protected us.

With that, I urge a strong and bipartisan vote for our “Afghan allies.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 535, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Mr. NADLER. 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 407, nays 16, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]

YEAS—407

Adams	Bergman	Budd
Aderholt	Beyer	Burchett
Aguilar	Bice (OK)	Burgess
Allen	Bilirakis	Bush
Allred	Bishop (GA)	Bustos
Amodei	Bishop (NC)	Butterfield
Armstrong	Blumenauer	Calvert
Arrington	Blunt Rochester	Cammack
Auchincloss	Bonamici	Carbajal
Axne	Bost	Cárdenas
Bacon	Bourdeaux	Carl
Baird	Bowman	Carson
Balderson	Boyle, Brendan	Carter (LA)
Banks	F.	Carter (TX)
Barr	Brady	Cartwright
Barragán	Brown	Case
Bass	Brownley	Casten
Beatty	Buchanan	Castor (FL)
Bentz	Buck	Castro (TX)
Bera	Bucshon	Cawthorn

Chabot	Herrera Beutler	Miller (IL)
Cheney	Higgins (NY)	Miller (WV)
Chu	Hill	Miller-Meeks
Cicilline	Himes	Moolenaar
Clark (MA)	Hinson	Mooney
Clarke (NY)	Hollingsworth	Moore (UT)
Cline	Horsford	Moore (WI)
Cloud	Houlahan	Morelle
Clyburn	Hoyer	Moulton
Clyde	Hudson	Mrvan
Cohen	Huffman	Mullin
Cole	Huizenga	Murphy (FL)
Comer	Issa	Murphy (NC)
Connolly	Jackson	Nadler
Cooper	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Correa	Jacobs (CA)	Neal
Costa	Jacobs (NY)	Neguse
Courtney	Jayapal	Nehls
Craig	Jeffries	Newhouse
Crawford	Johnson (GA)	Newman
Crenshaw	Johnson (LA)	Norcross
Crist	Johnson (OH)	Norman
Crow	Johnson (SD)	Nunes
Cuellar	Johnson (TX)	O'Halleran
Curtis	Jones	Obenolte
Davids (KS)	Jordan	Ocasio-Cortez
Davidson	Joyce (OH)	Omar
Davis, Danny K.	Joyce (PA)	Owens
Davis, Rodney	Kahele	Palazzo
Dean	Kaptur	Pallone
DeFazio	Katko	Palmer
DeLauro	Keating	Panetta
DelBene	Keller	Pappas
Delgado	Kelly (IL)	Pascarell
Demings	Kelly (MS)	Payne
DeSaulnier	Kelly (PA)	Pence
Deutch	Khanna	Perlmutter
Diaz-Balart	Kildee	Peters
Dingell	Kilmer	Pfleger
Doggett	Kim (CA)	Phillips
Donalds	Kim (NJ)	Pingree
Dunn	Kind	Pocan
Emmer	Kinzinger	Porter
Escobar	Kirkpatrick	Pressley
Eshoo	Krishnamoorthi	Price (NC)
Españalat	Kuster	Quigley
Estes	Kustoff	Raskin
Evans	LaHood	Reed
Fallon	LaMalfa	Reschenthaler
Feenstra	Lamb	Rice (NY)
Ferguson	Lamborn	Rice (SC)
Fischbach	Langevin	Rodgers (WA)
Fitzgerald	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (AL)
Fitzpatrick	Larson (CT)	Rogers (KY)
Fleischmann	Latta	Rose
Fletcher	LaTurner	Ross
Fortenberry	Lawrence	Rouzer
Foster	Lawson (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Fox	Lee (CA)	Ruiz
Frankel, Lois	Lee (NV)	Ruppersberger
Franklin, C.	Leger Fernandez	Rush
Scott	Lesko	Rutherford
Fulcher	Letlow	Ryan
Gaetz	Levin (CA)	Salazar
Gallagher	Levin (MI)	Sánchez
Galleo	Lieu	Sarbanes
Garamendi	Lofgren	Scalise
Garbarino	Long	Scanlon
Garcia (CA)	Loudermilk	Schakowsky
Garcia (IL)	Lowenthal	Schiff
Garcia (TX)	Lucas	Schneider
Gibbs	Luetkemeyer	Schrader
Gimenez	Luria	Schrier
Gohmert	Mace	Schweikert
Golden	Malinowski	Scott (VA)
Gomez	Malliotakis	Scott, Austin
Gonzales, Tony	Maloney,	Scott, David
Gonzalez (OH)	Carolyn B.	Sessions
Gonzalez,	Maloney, Sean	Sewell
Vicente	Mann	Sherman
Gooden (TX)	Manning	Sherrill
Gottheimer	Mast	Simpson
Granger	Matsui	Sires
Graves (LA)	McBath	Slotkin
Graves (MO)	McCarthy	Smith (MO)
Green (TN)	McCaul	Smith (NE)
Green, Al (TX)	McClain	Smith (NJ)
Griffith	McClintock	Smith (WA)
Grijalva	McCollum	Smucker
Grothman	McEachin	Soto
Guest	McGovern	Spanberger
Guthrie	McHenry	Spartz
Hagedorn	McKinley	Speier
Harder (CA)	McNerney	Stansbury
Harris	Meeks	Stanton
Harshbarger	Meijer	Staubert
Hartzler	Meng	Steel
Hayes	Meuser	Stefanik
Herrell	Mfume	Steil

Steube	Trahan	Watson Coleman
Stevens	Trone	Weber (TX)
Stewart	Turner	Webster (FL)
Strickland	Underwood	Welch
Suzoi	Upton	Wenstrup
Swalwell	Valadao	Westerman
Takano	Van Drew	Wexton
Taylor	Van Dуйne	Wild
Tenney	Vargas	Williams (GA)
Thompson (CA)	Veasey	Williams (TX)
Thompson (MS)	Vela	Wilson (FL)
Thompson (PA)	Velázquez	Wilson (SC)
Tiffany	Wagner	Wittman
Timmons	Walberg	Womack
Titus	Walorski	Yarmuth
Tlaib	Waltz	Young
Tonko	Wasserman	Zeldin
Torres (CA)	Schultz	
Torres (NY)	Waters	

NAYS—16

Biggs	Gosar	Perry
Boebert	Greene (GA)	Posey
Brooks	Hern	Rosendale
DesJarlais	Hice (GA)	Roy
Duncan	Massie	
Good (VA)	Moore (AL)	

NOT VOTING—7

Babin	DeGette	Higgins (LA)
Carter (GA)	Doyle, Michael	Lynch
Cleaver	F.	

□ 1047

Mr. DESJARLAIS changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.” So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 218.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, 2021, I was unable to be present to cast my vote on the Averting Loss of Life and Injury by Expediting SIVs Act of 2021 or the Allies Act (H.R. 3985) I wish the record to reflect that had I been present for rollcall No. 218, I would have voted “AYE.”

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei	Granger	Meng (Jeffries)
(Balderson)	(Calvert)	Napolitano
Boebert (Gosar)	Grijalva	(Correa)
Buchanan	(Stanton)	Payne (Pallone)
(LaHood)	Johnson (TX)	Porter (Wexton)
Comer	(Jeffries)	Reschenthaler
(Arrington)	Jones (Williams)	(Van Drew)
DeSaulnier	(GA))	Ruiz (Correa)
(Matsui)	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Frankel, Lois	(Stanton)	(Underwood)
(Clark (MA))	Lawrence	Salazar
Fulcher	(Beatty)	(Cammack)
(Simpson)	Lawson (FL)	Stewart (Moore)
Garcia (IL)	(Evans)	(UT))
(Garcia (TX))	McEachin	Titus (Connolly)
	(Wexton)	Wilson (FL)
		(Hayes)

□ 1100

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the floor schedule for next week, and I welcome the majority leader back to the colloquy. It is good to see him spry.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 10:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. I want to make that clear. That is an acceleration from 12 p.m. We have a lot of business to do next week. We have a lot of appropriations bills, so we want to make sure that we are not meeting late, late into the night.

So on Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Wednesday, the House is expected to meet at 11 a.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will expect to meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet, as usual, at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

The House will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspensions will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider at least 7 of the 12 appropriations bills for fiscal year 2022.

Recognizing the importance of completing our work well in advance of the deadline at the end of September, I would let the Members know that, unfortunately—well, first of all, let me say, we have marked up all 12 bills, and they have been reported out of committee.

The Senate has not reported out, nor considered a single appropriation bill. And we have 60 days before the end of the fiscal year, approximately, give or take.

The House will consider a seven-bill minibus, H.R. 4502. That bill will include seven appropriations bills: the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies bill; and Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies; Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies; Financial Services and General Government; Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies; Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies; Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

There will be additional bills on the appropriations. There are, obviously, after the seven, five additional appropriation bills that will be available for consideration. Three of those bills, as I understand it, have been noticed by the Committee on Rules for amendments to be filed. So they will be ready to go next week, and I am hopeful that we will be able to move some of those bills next week.

They will be the Legislative Branch appropriation bill; the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies appropriation bill; and the Department of

State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs appropriation bill. That will leave the Department of Defense bill and the Department of Homeland Security bill.

Lastly, additional legislative items are possible. And that will be our schedule for the week to come. I expect it to be long days, which is why we are going in at 11 a.m. on one day and at 10 a.m. on two of the days, which we usually go in at 12. I would hope that that would preclude us from going very late at night, but I think everybody ought to expect that we will be here into the evening.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information as we look toward this appropriations process coming to the floor next week.

I would hope it doesn't take the same tone that it took in committee, and that is a hyper-partisan approach, which in years past, we have seen Republicans and Democrats come together to ultimately determine how best to fund this United States Government. And any bill that is going to get sent to the President's desk is going to ultimately be a bipartisan bill.

Unfortunately, that is not the bill that is going to be coming to the floor. There are a lot of very extreme radical elements that were put in that bill, but there was also something very alarming, and that was a break, a departure, from over 40 years of bipartisan agreement on what is known as the Hyde amendment.

Henry Hyde, in the 1970s, was able to get agreement between Republicans and Democrats to say on all the things we may disagree with, let's at least agree that taxpayer funding should not be used for abortions. And overwhelming majorities of Republicans and Democrats have supported that going back to 1976.

This appropriations bill guts the Hyde amendment. And why this Democrat majority decided to break from decades of bipartisan agreement on Hyde is perplexing. But I would hope, among many other things, we would be able to have that full debate on the House floor; that amendments like restoring Hyde would be made in order, not a closed process, not a very narrow process where the goal would be to push a hyper-partisan bill out of the House that won't become law, which means it would be a very futile exercise that we would be participating in next week, but, in fact, to work in a bipartisan way on those things that we can come to an agreement on about how to properly fund the government.

I am not sure if that is being anticipated with the seven bills that are coming in this bloated bus, but I would hope that the majority, as the Rules Committee looks to determine which amendments would be made in order, would go to an open process and let things like the Hyde amendment be debated, and frankly, to be supported in the bipartisan way that it has always enjoyed going back over 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, maybe the gentleman could shed light on that, and I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. He is certainly accurate that the Hyde amendment has been in our bills for a very long period of time. What I think is not completely accurate is that it has been a bipartisan support, has enjoyed bipartisan support, and that there were Democrats who obviously supported the Hyde amendment.

And I realize that this has made it controversial, having been left out of the bill. I don't know what the Committee on Rules is going to do; we will have to see what they do. But in any event, I want to tell you that a large number on our side of the aisle believe that a constitutionally protected healthcare matter for women ought not to be determined by their financial ability.

So there is controversy with respect to Hyde. There is also controversy with respect to Federal employees as well, that I know well, because I chaired that subcommittee. We give to Federal employees the healthcare benefit, but then we say they can't use it for some things. Actually, that money is their money; it is not our money. It is given in compensation for their services.

But in any event, so there are controversies, I would tell the gentleman, and I am not sure exactly what the Committee on Rules is going to do and, therefore, don't want to speak for it.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, hopefully, like I said, we get the opportunity to have that open debate process so that we can bring amendments like restoring Hyde to this floor.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask about something that is going to be coming up next week, and that is this January 6 Commission that the Speaker created is expected to meet next week.

Yesterday, we saw an alarming departure from Congressional tradition, and that is Speaker PELOSI unilaterally made a decision to remove minority members from that committee. You go through the history of Congress, and prior to this year, never has the Speaker denied the minority the ability to choose who they are going to put on committees. And not only did it happen yesterday with multiple members, a ranking member of a standing committee was removed, an officer in the United States Navy was removed from that committee, without explanation.

That, first of all, undermines all credibility that this committee will have. It is clear that now it is an attempt by the Speaker to just completely politicize that committee. Why the majority chose to abuse power in that way and deny minority rights in that way is perplexing, but it doesn't bode well for the institution, and it surely doesn't bode well for the impartiality and the credibility of this committee.

I don't know if the majority is looking at reconsidering that decision, but

obviously, it is unprecedented. And if the gentleman wants to explain that, I will be happy to yield.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman can explain it. I think, frankly, your party is hoist on its own petard. We brought to this floor, with Mr. KATKO and Mr. THOMPSON agreeing on the process, offering to the House an equally divided five-and-five commission; the five Republicans being totally in the ambit of the minority leader. We brought it to the floor; the subpoena power being equally divided between the parties and having to cooperate in accomplishing the issuance of the subpoena. And very frankly, although there was some discussion of it, there was no doubt that the staff would have been resolved. The question of being equal staff on the Republican and Democratic side would have been resolved in the Senate.

I see the gentleman shaking his head. I can tell him, I know it would have been resolved; period. And the Republican Party objected to that commission, equally divided, five and five, with the minority leader strenuously lobbying against it being passed in the United States Senate. It was not passed in the United States Senate.

Press asked me, If it is defeated in the Senate, what are you going to do? I said, We are going to move forward, of course. And that is what we are doing. We are moving forward.

Now, the makeup of that committee, three of the persons who were appointed by the—excuse me—were recommended by the minority leader were accepted by the Speaker. And I am not going to spend a long time going into the quotes of the two or their premise, but all I can say is when asked the question, Ms. CHENEY, who I know you folks have kicked out of leadership because she tells the truth.

Mr. SCALISE. That was not the reason that Ms. CHENEY was removed as chair.

Mr. HOYER. Well, that is certainly one of the statements, however.

Mr. SCALISE. It had nothing to do with the statements that were made.

Mr. HOYER. That is one opinion.

Mr. SCALISE. An opinion we don't share because it is not accurate.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I clearly know we don't share that view, but it was referenced that, well she may have told the truth but she ought to stop telling the truth.

And that was one of the references that were made as you replaced her as your third in line because she—from our perspective—and I think from a large perspective of the American people—told the truth, and she continues to tell the truth.

And she was asked the question: What do you think about this non-partisan investigation? She said, I am absolutely confident that we will have a nonpartisan investigation that will look at the facts; that it will go wherever the facts may lead. There are three members from the minority lead-

er proposed that the Speaker did not object to. She has objected to two members. And the rhetoric around this from minority leader and from those two members has been disgraceful. Thus, this must be an investigation that is focused on facts. And the idea that any of this has become politicized is really unworthy of the office that we all hold and unworthy of our Republic.

So I don't blame you, and I probably would have taken the same reaction as you have taken. But very frankly, from the Speaker's perspective, and from others, this needs to be a commission that does in fact commit itself to going where the facts lead and determining the who, what, where, when, and why.

I have some very strong feelings as to why the insurrection, or as some say, the tourist visit—on your side of the aisle, Mr. Whip—the tourist visit that resulted in the death of a number of people, terrorizing Members of this House who thought their lives were in danger because people were trying to break into the House Chamber.

The rationalization of that activity has been rampant by many on your side of the aisle. We have some strong feelings on this, and we are going to get to the facts. And the American people will make the ultimate judgment, obviously. And we want to see that commission, again, hoist on your own petard, the overwhelming majority of you voted against a commission. Five Republicans appointed by the minority leader—appointed by, not recommended by—and five Democrats; subpoena power shared, and notwithstanding the fact that some of you, apparently, don't agree. I guarantee you, it would have been equal staffing. That would have been resolved. That was not a really big issue.

It was a make-up issue to vote “no” in the United States Senate because, in our view—so you understand—Donald Trump didn't want the commission.

□ 1115

So, Donald Trump was saluted, and we didn't get a commission, which was a commission that almost exactly to the jot and tittle, as Mr. KATKO said, what the minority leader asked for.

So, you don't like the result now. I get it. But I believe, as Ms. CHENEY said, this is going to be a factfinding select committee. Witnesses will say what they are going to say.

By the way, one of the people that was rejected by the Speaker may well be, and maybe both, witnesses before the select committee. I don't know that. Nobody has told me that. But that may be the case.

So, we are going to proceed. I know there is disagreement. That is not surprising. But you looked the opportunity that you asked for in the eye and rejected it, so here we are.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, that wasn't the opportunity that we asked for, and I think the majority leader knows that the minority leader put a number of issues on the table that he

wanted included in that review, and those were rejected. They were rejected by the Speaker, and they were rejected by the majority.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. The majority leader will have an opportunity, but there were a number of things you said that I think need to be cleaned up because they are just not accurate.

If you look at the Members that were kicked off from the minority side yesterday—still no explanation given, by the way—that includes a ranking member of a committee and an officer in the United States Navy who was removed yesterday by Speaker PELOSI with no reason given in an unprecedented way.

Maybe Speaker PELOSI and maybe this majority don't want to see all the facts come out because those two Members who were removed yesterday were raising very serious questions that ought to be answered, whatever those answers are. Whatever those facts are, they were publicly raising questions.

Maybe because they raised those questions that might be uncomfortable for the majority, they were removed from the committee with no explanation given. That had never happened before in the history of this Congress.

Again, if you want the facts, don't sit there and say that you want the facts if you are going to remove people who are trying to get facts, who are raising serious questions that should be answered. They raised them publicly, and they were going to raise them in the committee. Maybe because they were going to raise those tough questions, they were removed by the Speaker, Members of the minority who were removed by the Speaker.

I don't know if that is the new precedent that the majority leader wants to see in the future. But I will tell you, since the gentleman likes quoting LIZ CHENEY, I will read this quote from LIZ CHENEY: “Speaker PELOSI and the Democrat majority have no business determining which Republicans sit on committees.” That is from LIZ CHENEY, if the gentleman wants to quote.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, is that a quote about Mrs. GREENE?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, that is a quote about Mrs. GREENE, but it is a general quote about whoever it is. You could go down your list.

By the way, there were Members of the majority who are on that committee who voted on January 6 to reject electors. Maybe not this year's January 6, but as the gentleman knows, every Republican President this century has had Democrats on this House floor object to electors being seated, including multiple members of the January 6 committee on the majority side. They weren't removed. In fact, they were appointed by the Speaker.

Yet, two of our Members, who raised very serious questions about facts that should be answered, wherever those answers lead, were removed because

maybe the majority doesn't want all the facts to come out. Maybe they only want a certain narrative to come out. That is not an investigation. That is a kangaroo court, if that is the approach that is going to be taken.

But the action taken yesterday by the Speaker, the unprecedented action, undermines the credibility of that commission, and it is a shame for the institution because the Members we appointed were going there to find the facts, to help participate in finding the facts.

Clearly, that is not the interest now of this committee. That was exposed yesterday in the Speaker's unprecedented action.

It is not something that this institution, whether it is Republicans running it or Democrats—and as the gentleman knows, that pendulum swings both ways. But never before this year had a majority removed Members that minority leaders submitted for committees. It is just not what has happened in this institution. But, now, it seems to be the norm because maybe some people that are asking tough questions are asking too tough of questions that this majority doesn't want to be answered, kind of why this majority won't have a hearing on the origins of COVID.

In fact, it was Mr. JORDAN, along with myself and others, who has raised serious questions that have been backed up by many medical experts around this country that COVID-19 very likely started in the Wuhan lab and was leaked out. Medical experts from every walk of life have looked at the genetic makeup of this COVID-19 virus and said it couldn't have been transferred from bats to animals to humans. In fact, it was likely modified genetically in the lab in Wuhan.

Yet, there is not a single hearing that has been held by this majority on whether it was gain-of-function research, possibly funded with taxpayer money. All of those questions should be raised, but maybe the majority doesn't want those facts to come out.

We should want the facts to come out wherever they lead. So don't pound the desk and say you want the facts when you remove people who are asking questions to get at the facts. It shouldn't be a one-sided question and argument.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the legislation we passed said the Speaker would appoint all the members. These Members were not kicked off; they never got on.

LIZ CHENEY was asked whether that was the appropriate thing to do, and her response was—you had her quote: "I agree with what the Speaker has done."

Now, the reason she agreed—yes, they have raised questions, and on your side, you wanted to raise questions. You wanted to look at everything but January 6. Maybe January 6 as well,

but you wanted to look at this incident, that incident, the other incident, the incident over here. Are they relevant incidents? Sure, they are; but not to January 6.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, but why not look at all of them?

Mr. HOYER. Clearly, when you were in charge, you didn't look at some of the incidents that happened while you were in charge that were similar in nature. Very frankly, I think those incidents ought to be looked at, but not by this commission because they were incidents that did not involve insurrection; did not involve stopping the work of the Congress of the United States; did not terrorize Members of this House.

Now, I know that some of you have had pictures taken of you in this House. You looked pretty terrified to me. You thought there was something serious happening. This stuff that this was a tourist visit is absurd.

The issue of dissembling is not new. President Trump put that in an art form. If he didn't like what was going on here, he created something over here with a tweet or a comment or an action that he took. That is the shell game.

The issue is: What happened on January 6? What was the insurrection about? Why were people coming into the Capitol saying: Let's hang the Vice President of the United States—not of our party.

People shake their heads. I am not sure why they are shaking their heads. They saw it on television. They see it on the tapes over and over and over. They see people being convicted. I happen to think the sentences are too short. It was treason. It was treason based upon a lie.

We need to get to the bottom of it. What the Speaker has done is make sure that we are going to get to the bottom of it, notwithstanding the fact, and I will repeat again, all of you had the opportunity to vote five—five—shared subpoena, and the leader was empowered to appoint anybody he would want.

The legislation that passed this House said the Speaker would appoint—the Speaker. Did she consult with the minority leader? She did. Did she disagree with two that he appointed? She did, and she did not appoint them. That was in her power. And I agreed with her, and LIZ CHENEY agreed with her.

Why? Because that would have been dissembling, not looking for facts. Mr. JORDAN has said over and over again that he believes the election was stolen. Court after court after court after court said no proof. No proof.

So, we are where we are, and we are going to proceed. We are going to proceed, and if the Speaker decides to retain the three and name two others, so be it.

We are going to proceed. We are going to proceed, and we are going to get the facts, and we are going to get

those facts known to the American people. It is going to be widely covered. There are going to be a lot of witnesses. We are going to find out the who, the what, the where, and the why.

For the first time in history, Americans, Trump signs waving, stopped the business of the Congress of the United States—an insurrection and, from my view, a treasonous act. So, we are going to proceed.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, if the facts were what the majority wants, then the majority wouldn't be afraid of certain Members asking tough questions that maybe the majority doesn't want.

Since the gentleman brought up Mr. JORDAN, I will tell you a question that Mr. JORDAN has been raising publicly. One of the questions Mr. JORDAN has been raising is: Why weren't the Capitol Police better equipped when there was intelligence prior, weeks prior to January 6, that there may be large crowds, that there may be threats? Why weren't the Capitol Police more equipped? Were National Guard offered to the Capitol that were rejected? And at what level, if that is the case, were they rejected?

Maybe he was starting to ask those questions. Maybe he should have just sat back and not raised those questions until after the committee started, but he started raising those questions.

By the way, they are important questions to be answered, but he won't be able to ask those questions about why the Capitol Police weren't better equipped because Speaker PELOSI yanked him off the committee when he was selected by the minority leader.

You can talk about the power of the Speaker and brag that that is her power, but just because you have the might doesn't make it right. What she did was an abuse. To say, "I am just going to choose who on the Republican side I am going to allow, but, boy, if some other Members are going to ask tough questions, I have the power to take them off," that is not what power is used for.

This House, this democracy, we should want the facts. If some Members are going to ask tough questions, you should want everybody to be asking tough questions. If the facts lead there, you go there. If the facts don't lead there, you go somewhere else and ask more tough questions.

If some Members are going to ask tough questions that the majority doesn't want to be asked, that undermines the credibility of that commission to remove them from asking those questions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman believe that the three Members that the Speaker accepted and was willing to appoint would not have asked those questions?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, they haven't said publicly whether they

would or not. Mr. JORDAN sure did. Again, maybe he was punished for raising tough questions in advance of the hearing instead of waiting.

But in the end, those were questions. Sheriff Nehls, who was also one of our selections, was right there with these brave Capitol Police officers, holding down the House of Representatives so that the Chamber wasn't breached. Sheriff Nehls was right there.

But, again, if the integrity of that commission is now undermined because Speaker PELOSI chose to remove people who were going to ask tougher questions, then, ultimately, it proves that this is not a commission set on finding the facts. It is a commission set on establishing a narrative regardless of the facts. That is a disgrace, for this institution to go down that road.

There is still time to reconsider. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the majority to reconsider how they use or abuse the power that is vested upon them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

□ 1130

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Your side had an opportunity to support the Capitol Police. Your side had an opportunity to support law enforcement. Your side had the opportunity to increase the capability of the Capitol Police to respond to insurrectionist, violent, and criminal agents.

Your side had that opportunity, and what did it do, to a person?

It voted "no," and we passed it. We passed support of the Capitol Police. We passed support to strengthen our defenses. We passed legislation to try to make the Capitol more secure and our Capitol Police safer. We passed that legislation with not a single one of your votes. It went to the Senate, and it sits. You read what that is doing to the morale of the Capitol Police along with some of your comments about the Capitol Police.

So you had that opportunity.

I will say to the Speaker, Republicans had that opportunity. Just as they rejected the five and five, they rejected support of the Capitol Police.

Seventeen of them voted against giving them a Gold Medal.

Why?

Because the insurrection was mentioned in the resolution, and, of course, there was no insurrection. It was a tourist visit, as they ambled politely through the Halls of the Congress saying how appreciative they were of the efforts being made by their Democratic Representatives.

If you saw it that way, if you believe that, it is impossible for me to understand why.

So I tell the whip, Mr. Speaker, that the Republican Party has had two opportunities to have an even, fair commission. They rejected them, apparently, according to what the whip says, because we didn't want to look at Seattle, we didn't want to look at this

city or that city or the other city or this, that, and the other.

By the way, President Biden made it very clear that those who committed criminal activities were not demonstrators, they were criminals. Biden said that, and I agree with him.

What they didn't want to look at is who recruited the crowd that came in here, who riled that crowd up, and who deployed them to the Capitol of the United States for the specific objective of stopping the steal, and what he meant, of course, is our acting.

His Vice President, whom he talked to on numerous occasions about stopping the election, concluded that that was not legal, that was not within his authority, and so he acted consistent with the law. That really annoyed Mr. Trump.

So here we are. We should have had a bipartisan commission. We should have moved that forward, and, yes, we should support the Capitol Police by adopting the supplemental.

By the way, the Senate supplemental is more in terms of dollars than the House supplemental. So it is not a question of we spent too much money to do this to make the Capitol safe, to make the Capitol Police armed, to give them the opportunity to get the intelligence that they need to proceed.

But what a distraction that the Capitol Police weren't prepared.

The question is not: Were they prepared?

The question is: Why did American citizens try to commit insurrection and treason in the Capitol of the United States and stopped our work?

Not for very long. We came back, we did our work, and we got it done to the benefit of our country, our democracy, and our image around the world. Our democracy was resilient.

Nobody was angrier, I will tell you—and I think Mr. SCALISE, you were there—Mr. Speaker, nobody was angrier about what was happening that night than MITCH MCCONNELL, the leader of the Senate, who said he believed subsequent to his voting against impeachment, but notwithstanding that, he believed the President bore responsibility, as the minority leader said, not all responsibility, but bore responsibility.

So we are going to look at this. You can talk all you want. Your leader has now decided he is going to withdraw the three and not participate. We regret that. But it is not going to stop us. It is not going to stop our getting at the truth. It is not going to stop our having the American people know the who, what, where, when, and why of the first time since 1812 when a foreign power invaded our Capitol that the Capitol of the United States was invaded by people who were seeking to undermine the democratic processes under our Constitution.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that as that commission starts, it will not include other Members, Republican Members, who wanted

to ask some of those tough questions in terms of supporting the police.

I don't think the gentleman has seen any stronger support for police than on this side of the aisle. I have been maybe more vocal than anyone about support for the United States Capitol Police because I wouldn't be here alive today without the bravery and heroism of the Capitol Police, and I think we all stand with them.

Ultimately, when you look at the supplemental that came through the House in May, there were a number of Members on the Democrat majority side who voted against that supplemental who have been vocal about defunding the police.

And, in fact, we have been trying to bring up H. Res. 352, which expresses support for police in opposition to this crazy, radical idea of defunding the police, where in many of these cities that have actually defunded the police, they have seen rapid increases in crime.

Even more—and I know I have held roundtables with sheriffs from the New Orleans area, as many of my colleagues have met with law enforcement—they will tell you the biggest challenge today, in addition to the growing crime wave, they are seeing is a demoralization around the country for police because they see these efforts to defund the police and they see elected officials speaking out publicly against police. It is not coming from the Republican side. I think the gentleman knows where it is coming from.

Why won't this bill be brought to the floor to just express support for police?

The fact is that the majority on the Democrat side will not bring a resolution to express support for police, H. Res. 352, by Ms. MALLIOTAKIS and others, at a time when we are seeing around the country not only a demoralization but an increase in resignations. People are leaving the great work of law enforcement because they see in those communities that have defunded the police a lack of support. Most sheriffs will tell you they are having trouble recruiting new people right now because of the attacks on police all around the country that we saw from the summer where cops were murdered, shot, beaten. Yet a resolution to express support to let them know that we have their back still won't be brought to the floor by this majority.

I hope the gentleman would look at bringing H. Res. 352 to the floor so that we can actually express to all police that we support them and that we do have their back.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You had an opportunity to support the police and you voted with those who wanted to defund the police. All of you had an opportunity, just a few weeks ago while we had a bill on the floor, to support, to fund the Capitol Police to make them safer, more effective, and better able to enforce the law,

and you all, to a person, voted “no.” You had the opportunity, and you voted with those who you say on our aisle didn’t want to do that. But it passed.

Why did it pass?

Because the overwhelming, overwhelming, overwhelming majority of Democrats—it is the only reason it passed—voted to support the police, our Capitol Police. I will tell you that is also true of our Members in terms of supporting law enforcement at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Are there some who say some things?

Yes. There are some people who say some things on your side—I have quoted a couple of them—that I am sure you don’t support. But having said that, the proof is in the eating of the pudding. We had a bill on the floor that supported the police. You voted against it, every one of you.

Mr. Speaker, you can talk all you want about supporting them, but, very frankly, the bills you are going to be voting on next week support the police. They are not defunding.

Unlike the Trump budgets. If you look at the Trump budgets, who cut law enforcement funding?

Trump budgets.

Check me on that, and then come to the floor and say: HOYER is not telling the truth. Check me.

You had an opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the minority had an opportunity to support the police. They all voted “no.” The Senate is doing the same. It is a shame because it is undermining the morale of the Capitol Police. You have seen that reported in the newspapers. This is not me saying it. They don’t understand why.

Mr. SCALISE is absolutely right. The Capitol Police have kept him, in particular, and others who were attacked by a crazed, apparently left-wing, but crazed bad person, he may be mentally defective, but he did a very bad act, and he was targeting Republicans. We all stood up when Mr. SCALISE was in the hospital and thanked the Capitol Police for protecting him and others on that site. That was a terrible, terrible, venal criminal act. The guy was probably a Democrat. I don’t know. We have called him out for being that. That is what we ought to all do.

On January 6, some very bad criminal people acted in this Congress and in this Capitol against our democracy and against our Constitution, and we want to study it. We want to get the facts so it doesn’t happen again and so we know who is fomenting this insurrectionist psychology and who rationalizes it on this floor now.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I will just point out that President Biden himself a year ago said he supports efforts to divert money away from police, which, by the way, is the same thing as defunding police. If you are diverting money away from police, then you are defunding police. But, again, there is a resolution that has been sitting out there for a while now express-

ing support. I hoped we would bring that to the floor and express that support.

There are also a number of other issues dealing with inflation. We are seeing a dramatic increase in inflation across this country. Everything someone buys when going to a grocery store, we are paying more for things like eggs and milk. If you try to go on a summer vacation right now, you are paying over 40 percent more for gasoline. You are seeing it across the board, and that dramatic increase in inflation is a tax. It is a tax on hardworking families.

This chart shows for the gentleman so many of those things. Used cars are up 45 percent, if you can even find a car to buy because there is such a shortage when the government is paying people not to work.

The borrowing, by the way, and spending of trillions of dollars—which are some of the items that are going to be coming to the floor next week and beyond, trillions more, much of it deficit spending—is part of the reason we are seeing inflation: gas 45 percent up, home prices 15 percent up, milk 5 percent, laundry machines 29 percent, if you can get one. You might have to wait 6 months to get a washer and dryer.

All of this is a tax on hardworking, middle-class families.

What we should be doing is bringing legislation to the floor to confront these problems, not to keep spending trillions and trillions more in deficit spending and higher taxes that ultimately would lead to more evaporation of middle-class jobs which is what the majority is bringing, but I would hope that the gentleman would look at working with Republicans on legislation to start addressing some of these problems that are affecting household families all across the country.

□ 1145

Republican, Democrat, Independent, doesn’t matter, they are seeing this problem, and they would like to see this Congress confront it, not make it worse with more deficit spending, with more multitrillion-dollar spending bills and higher taxes that will ship more jobs overseas, shutting down energy production in America.

While the President is signing or authorizing agreements with Russia to use pipelines to ship their energy to other countries, he is shutting down pipelines in America so that we can use more of our natural resources, again, leading to higher prices across the board, things that are adversely affecting families.

I hope we can bring legislation to confront these challenges to the floor, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We have brought them to the floor. We are going to continue to bring them to the floor, and we hope Republicans support them.

We created 3 million new jobs; more jobs in our first 5 months than any administration in history—the gentleman forgot to mention that figure—double the monthly rates of the 5 months prior to that under the Trump administration.

The average number of new unemployment insurance claims has been cut in half. Last week, that number was about 400,000. The same week last year, it was 1.5 million under the Trump administration. Small business optimism has returned to its 2019 average. The economy grew at 6.4 percent in the first quarter. Independent projections from CBO, the IMF, the Federal Reserve, the World Bank, OECD, and many others all forecast America this year reaching the highest level of growth in nearly four decades.

Furthermore, as the gentleman knows, the Director of the Federal Reserve has opined that he thinks, yes, there is a surge in inflation. Yes, we are concerned about it. The Federal Reserve is watching it. We are watching it. We want to keep inflation in check.

The gentleman referenced that we are paying people not to work. Let me remind the gentleman, we had four bills which did similar things which were passed in an overwhelming bipartisan fashion last year, overwhelming bipartisan fashion, and none of them would have become law without the signature of President Donald Trump.

Now what happened? Donald Trump left, and bipartisanship left with him; not because he was so bipartisan, but he thought that what we were doing was good for the people, and therefore, I think he thought, good politics. I think that is accurate.

The fact is that this economy is now doing exactly what we want it to do. It is growing. Now it surged. There is no doubt about that, and that surge has resulted in inflation hiking at a higher rate than we would like, including the products that the whip mentioned, Mr. Speaker.

We need to contain inflation because it does rob those particularly on fixed incomes. But the multitrillions that were spent last year, one of which, the CARES Act spent—was almost a unanimous vote in this House—\$2 trillion. So we did that because we believed that the magnitude of the challenge confronting us by COVID-19, both to the health of our people and the health of our economy, demanded such a robust response.

One of our Members who had been vaccinated—some Members hadn’t been vaccinated—has come down with it. Now, hopefully, the vaccinations that he has will moderate any adverse impact of this delta virus. But I would say to the gentleman, it is a little bit like the commission, that we want to focus on the bad news, not focus on the good news. The gentleman wants to focus on other news, not the central news of the insurrection, and I understand that strategy.

But there is a lot of good news happening in America. There is some bad news, too. Part of it is because people haven't gotten vaccinated. The gentleman's State has that problem; Mississippi has that problem; South Carolina and some other States have that problem; my State has that problem. Not to the extent of some other States, but all 50 States are seeing a surge. So giving up and getting off the field at this point in time is not appropriate.

I think that we are going to find that the President's program that he suggests, as he says, and I agree, will have a generational impact for decades to come in making sure that our economy continues to grow; that our people are educated; that we expand the middle class; lift people out of poverty, as we did with children who are now 50 percent of them are going to be lifted out of poverty. That is good news for America. It is good news for all of us. Those kids are going to be better educated and make more productive contributions to our society.

So I hope a number of Members will support pieces of legislation that will carry that vision of the President into fruition, and we will work toward that end.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, as we look at those bills coming to the floor next week, frankly, they would make those problems worse. I know when we talk about the inflation side—we talk about inflation, because it is the thing we hear the most when we talk to our constituents back home, because regardless of the statistics, the data is little solace if you see your dollar going for less further, less far. In fact, you see your dollar not going as far because whatever you are making, you are spending even more money than you were spending before and waiting longer to get things because of these policies.

In fact, the spending itself is part of the problem that is leading to inflation. People get that. And so they look at these multitrillion-dollar spending bills and they are starting to ask the questions: What is really in those bills? If it is not things to help my family, because I am paying more with all of this new spending, what is in it?

We just found out today there are millions of dollars in the bill that is coming to the floor next week specifically just for one entity, Planned Parenthood of Mar Monte, San Jose, California; Planned Parenthood, the largest provider of abortions in the country. So not only is Hyde being discarded, the mutually agreed upon, bipartisan, and not just Henry Hyde with a few other people. Henry Hyde passed this in the 1970s under a Democrat majority. Democrats and Republicans said taxpayer funding shouldn't be used to provide abortions, and it had always been sacrosanct in spending bills that this Congress passed, Republican and Democrat, since that time until now.

So not only are they gutting Hyde in the bill, but they are putting millions

of dollars into Planned Parenthood by name. This is what drives people nuts when they see that kind of spending and a disconnect because they are paying more money for regular household goods. And instead of us confronting that on the floor, they see this kind of spending that is generational, because it is the next generation that will have to pay for it. Because as much as it seems this majority wants to raise taxes to spend more money, even all the taxes that would run more jobs out of this country don't cover all of this kind of radical spending.

I would hope we go a different direction. We surely will be opposing that kind of radical spending and it surely won't be helping those families who just want answers, who just want to see relief from the problems that they are facing.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It was not radical spending in 2020, because Trump signed the bills. Trump left, and it became radical spending. That is situational ethics, Mr. Speaker. I will leave it at that.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, the final point I would like to bring up to the leader, we are seeing something that is actually very encouraging in Cuba; that is, the people of Cuba taking to the streets to demand freedom; something that has been decades in the making. I would hope that we see all government leaders, Republican, Democrat, executive branch, legislative branch, all expressing our support for the Cuban people who seek freedom, because I think one of the most heartfelt signs that I know I saw, and so many of my colleagues saw just a week ago, were not only people taking to the streets to call for freedom, they were carrying the American flag in Cuba.

We see this all around the world. It is one of the things that for all of our differences brings us together, and that is that here in the United States Congress, we are not only working to promote freedom in this country and to preserve it for future generations, but this freedom that we work to preserve inspires people all around the world. Whether it is Cuba, or in Iran which we saw years ago, or any other country, when people seek freedom, there is really only one flag that they wave, and that is the United States flag.

Our colleague, MARIO DIAZ-BALART, whose family fled Cuba, like so many of our colleagues, some first generation. CARLOS GIMENEZ, former mayor of Miami-Dade, personally fled Cuba seeking freedom—and talking about the American Dream—he is a first generation who fled a socialist nation who is now a sitting, voting Member of the United States Congress, who now wants to express support for the Cuban people.

So there is a resolution, H. Res. 527, that expresses our solidarity standing with the people in Cuba who are seeking freedom. I would just ask the gen-

tleman if he would look at bringing that bill to the floor. The people in Cuba are trying to get that freedom, and they are being heavily oppressed. Many may even be being murdered right now as they have shut down the internet. They shut out the media, because there is no freedom of the press.

We are hearing stories that are very alarming. If we can express our support that we are standing with those people in Cuba who do seek freedom as well, I think it would be a strong signal. I ask the gentleman if we could bring that to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. As he knows, the President of the United States has strongly expressed support of those who are seeking freedom and liberty in Cuba. He said that shortly after the demonstrations occurred. He has maintained that position. I share that opinion with him, and we are discussing what action we might be taking here in this House.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. Hopefully, we can work together to get that brought to the floor and express that support in unison and that would send a strong message.

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

HONORING GOLD STAR FAMILIES

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to bring American troops home from Afghanistan, it is important to recognize those who weren't able to make it home.

With that in mind, I rise to honor our Nation's Gold Star families, mothers, fathers, husband, wives, siblings, and children with a loved one who died in service to our country.

I have deep gratitude for the families who have suffered such a painful loss, families like that of Captain Joseph Schultz, who was killed in action in Afghanistan in 2011. Captain Schultz's mother, Betsy, channeled her grief over losing her only child into action, forming a nonprofit respite home for other Gold Star families, the Captain Joseph House in Port Angeles, Washington.

The Captain Joseph House, and organizations like it, provide a network of support and comfort for the surviving family members. Their work matters, and we should be grateful for it.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my gratitude to all who have lost a loved one in service to our country.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the pro-life Hyde amendment. Typically,