

only the folks in the post office would handle it or the folks in the polling place would handle it. Now, this is a third party whom no one has any connection to nor accountability to who can randomly grab ballots and collect them. How do we not think there won't be fraud in that system?

It also takes away all voter IDs in every State, including my State, where there is not even a complaint about voter IDs on either side of the aisle because it is an incredibly fair system. It doesn't require a driver's license. It can require any piece of paper or any way to be able to show you are who you are. We have a straightforward system to be able to protect not only the integrity of the ballot but to make sure every person is not only allowed to vote but is encouraged to vote. Why would we take that away from places where it is already working and there hasn't been a complaint just because someone in Washington, DC, says we shouldn't do it?

Centralized control of voting in Washington, DC, seemed to be part of the theme of the night last night, where it was, everything would work better if it only came to DC. I tell you, I have met a lot of smart people in DC, but I can also tell you that I know a lot of smart people in Oklahoma who love their neighbors, who want to see the right thing done, who care about people in their community and in their State. And this sudden belief that if we are going to get things done right, we have to bring it to Washington, DC, and allow the folks in Washington, DC, to be able to run it, I will tell you, the folks in my State would shake their heads and say: We are doing OK. Let us take care of our neighbors at home, and don't make us sign a paper every time we want to do something and send it off to somebody we never met in Washington, DC.

This growing in size of our Federal Government is not a goal for me. Being efficient, protecting the rights of every American, protecting our national security—those are goals. They don't require federalizing everything.

I can tell you a couple of areas where last night really had some shining moments for me, though. President Biden, twice in his speech, literally reached out to Republicans and said: I understand Republicans have another idea on this. Let's sit down and talk.

That was a good moment. Quite frankly, for the last—let's say of a 100-day Presidency so far, for 90 days of that, we have gotten the Heisman from the President and his team, saying: We have got this; we don't need you. Then in the last really 10 days or so, the White House has started reaching out some. And to be able to hear President Biden last night say: We understand Republicans have a different idea; let's sit down and visit—that almost sounds like governing. That would be a great shift for us, to be able to sit down and talk these things through.

Republicans aren't opposed to infrastructure. How absurd to be able to

make infrastructure a partisan issue. We have always done infrastructure together. It is not like any of us are opposed to highways and to waterways and to clean drinking water and to broadband. There are key aspects that are core to infrastructure. Let's continue to be able to do those. Let's do them efficiently and wisely. That is all that we would ask.

I am pleased the President actually reached out and said: Let's start sitting down to be able to talk these things through, because that will allow us to be able to work together toward a better solution.

The second big moment for me last night was listening to my friend and colleague TIM SCOTT speak about his family, speak about a vision for the country, to be able to challenge the country and to be able to challenge this body to be able to do what he called commonsense finding common ground. It is a great idea.

We have different perspectives across the aisle in this building. That doesn't mean we can't sit down as Americans and be able to work them out. As TIM SCOTT reminded us, part of the story of America is a story of redemption. We can do that together.

TIM also challenged this Nation to stop politicizing race, to stop saying over and over again that because we disagree, it is because we are racist. TIM spoke to the Nation and said there are real issues of race out there, and you cheapen it when you politicize every issue and say it is because you are racist.

Let's actually sit down and disagree on issues as Americans, and let's resolve those things together. We have common ground, and we have areas of real disagreement. I had lots of areas where I disagree with President Biden, but I am willing to sit down and lay out a set of ideas that I think are a much better option. Let's talk it out. That is what we do. But let's resolve these issues in the days ahead.

And no, you are right, I am not going to give on the Second Amendment. I am not going to give on issues of life and the value of every child. I am not going to give on—I think the debt and deficit is a very important issue. I am not going to give on encouraging the value of work for every single person and every single family. There are areas I am not going to give on, but we should at least sit down and treat each other with dignity and respect, and let's talk it out.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Alaska.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 593

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. 593 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the Murkowski amendment at the desk be

agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, we talked a lot about the pandemic and all that it has brought. I would like to take just a few moments here, at the outset, before I ask for full consideration, to share with colleagues, very briefly, what we have faced in the State of Alaska with regard to our State's economy. We have probably taken a greater hit than any State in the country.

We saw a 32-percent drop in revenue last year, 10 percent higher than any other State in the Nation. We are starting to see a light at the end of the tunnel, and that is good, but we are also facing the prospect of another devastating tourist season.

Back home, right now, people are not talking about the season for 2021 coming up. The motto is "Get through to '22." That is an awful way to be approaching our situation so they have asked for help. They realize that anything that we can do to try to salvage even a few weeks of the tourist season is going to be important to us.

So Senator SULLIVAN and I have been working on behalf of hundreds of small businesses that rely on this essential income just so they can scrape by for another year. A lot of people don't think about cruise ships as being an essential activity during a pandemic but, let me tell you, in our State, where so much of our economy is based on tourism, it is an imperative. It is jobs; it is livelihoods; and it really is what allows our small communities to keep their doors open.

In 2019, before the pandemic was upon us, we were looking at 1.33 million tourists who came to the State of Alaska by way of cruise ship. That is pretty significant. In 2020, there were 48 passengers. That is 48 passengers. That is not 48,000. So, in other words, you had an economy that was looking pretty strong and pretty good, and it absolutely went into a free fall.

Normally, the tourism industry generates more than \$214 million in State and municipal revenue, more than \$1.4 billion in payroll, \$2.2 billion in visitor spending, and the prospect was doing nothing but going up until we were hit in 2020. The vastly diminished cruise season contributed to statewide unemployment rising from 6.2 percent to 11 percent. Southeast Alaska had greater unemployment, which increased from 4.7 to 11.3—17 percent of all jobs in the region impacted.

This kind of unemployment and this kind of stress is an extraordinary challenge. So Alaskans are trying to figure out is there a way to salvage there, and there are two points here.

We are ready to welcome visitors back in the State. We are leading the country in vaccination rates. Half of

all Alaskans have had their first dose. So 43 percent are fully vaccinated, but we have got two issues that we are facing here; first is, the Centers for Disease Control has their no sail order for the cruise industry in place. We actually got some very encouraging news just last evening. CDC has acknowledged these changing circumstances with regard to vaccination. They updated their guidance for how to safely resume cruising, so that is good. That is a positive.

But we have got a second issue, and that second issue is that Canada has a ban on allowing passenger vessels to depart from or transit through their waters. We are dealing with a law that is controlling so much of this because, in the United States, we only allow domestically built, owned, and crewed vessels to operate on solely domestic trips. This is the Passenger Vessel Services Act, the PVSA.

So we have got a situation that without a stop in Canada, a cruise to Alaska is a domestic ship. Canada has effectively been available to cruise companies that offer voyages to Alaska—not built in the United States, not crewed by U.S. citizens, not permitted to sail in Alaska without making a stop in a foreign country because otherwise this violates the PVSA. So what we are trying to do, we are trying to work with the Canadians to resolve this issue. It has been tough making headway because Canada is in a different spot when it comes to their vaccines.

We have turned to a legislative fix, a temporary legislative fix. There are a lot of different opinions on PVSA and the Jones Act. I am not here to debate them today, but what I am trying to offer, along with Senator SULLIVAN, is a temporary fix that will allow the cruise ships to travel between Washington State and Alaska because what we are trying to do here—I am not trying to save the cruise companies; I am trying to save communities that are so dependent on these vessels that bring these passengers up.

For them, it is critical. If we can't get some level of relief, and we can't get folks north, they are not going to—they have been on hold now since last year. So 14 months until we get into 2022, on top of what we have already seen, these businesses won't be there.

What we are doing is we temporarily deemed that a voyage to Alaska from Washington State without a stop in Canada is, by law, a foreign voyage. So PVSA is not going to hold us back. I have worked with Senator CANTWELL, and I have worked with Senator BLUMENTHAL to address some of the issues that they have raised, and I thank them both for their efforts to work with me.

We have incorporated, in this amendment, three simple requirements—two of which the industry already adheres to—requiring defibrillators on ships, making sure that the passengers' bill of rights is publicly available, and we asked the Secretary to consider a rule-

making on how to safely return human remains in the tragic event that someone passes away on a cruise. These are simple, commonsense changes that ensure cruises are safe for passengers and the crew.

Along with Senator SULLIVAN and Congressman YOUNG, I would ask the Senate to consider and pass the Alaska Tourism Recovery Act so that cruises can gain some semblance—some semblance—of opportunity in Alaska, as they have for so long.

So, again, I will restate my motion here asking unanimous consent that Murkowski amendment No. 593 be called up and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, Senators MURKOWSKI and SULLIVAN have ably represented the very serious plight of the people of Alaska. I am very sympathetic to the economic and humanitarian situation that prompts this effort, the Alaska Tourism Recovery Act.

But I must say that the cruise line industry has a very inconsistent—that is a nice way of putting it—and deeply inadequate record on consumer protection and worker safety. We worked out a number of amendments that are incorporated into this measure. They are basic protections during the pandemic and a negotiated compromise, and I thank my colleagues from Alaska for doing it in a way that really is a win-win for everyone, and that is the measure that is before us now.

So I will offer no objection. I understand that our colleague Senator LEE has an objection—I am not sure what they are at this point, but if he does, I look forward to working over the recess with my Alaska colleagues to see if we can reach agreement with Senator LEE and resolve his objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, it would be a gross understatement to say that Alaska tourism and, indeed, tourism around the country is suffering and has been throughout the pandemic.

The cruise industry, which accounts for more than 50 percent of all tourists visiting Alaska every year, has been particularly decimated not only due to the pandemic but also because of an arcane law passed by Congress back in 1886.

This law, known as the Passenger Vessel Services Act, or PVSA, states that no ship that is foreign built, foreign owned, foreign flagged, or foreign crewed may transport passengers between two U.S. ports or places. So instead of operating continuously in U.S. waters, ships and cruise operators departing from the United States are forced to make stops in foreign ports in

order to remain in compliance with this 130-year-old law.

In other words, we are literally shipping our tourism and our economic activity abroad to other countries and, in the process, we are destroying countless opportunities for our own coastal cities, States, and towns.

Now, you don't have to take my word for it. You can google this and see it for yourself. Cruises from the United States, if they leave from the United States, must make stops in Canada, Mexico, or Pacific Island States in order to avoid incurring the wrath and the heavy penalties of the Passenger Vessel Services Act. Instead of welcoming tourists and the dollars they spend into American ports, we drive them to Canada, to Mexico, and to Pacific Island States.

Does this law even succeed on its own protectionist terms? Does this law protect American shipbuilders? It decidedly does not. It decidedly does neither, in fact. Just to be clear, this is a point of differentiation here. I have made no secret about the fact that I don't like the Jones Act. The Jones Act is a separate beast from this. They are both beasts. I dislike both of them intensely. I would repeal both of them today if I had the chance. I understand, at least, with respect to the Jones Act, what the arguments are as to why we would want to keep them intact. I strongly disagree with them, and I believe U.S. consumers pay for them dearly, especially in places like Puerto Rico and in places like Hawaii, in parts of New England, and in other places where they have more limited access to the goods that they might otherwise have access to in the absence of the Jones Act.

There is a big difference between the PVSA and the Jones Act. At least with respect to the Jones Act, there are other considerations, and those considerations do not exist with respect to the PVSA.

Now, it is important to keep in mind, again, the difference between the Jones Act and the PVSA, which is that with the PVSA, we are dealing specifically with passenger vehicles, passenger vessels. I am directing my remarks today to those passenger vessels in the large passenger vessel category; that is, those with at least 800 passenger berths or more.

With respect to those, this is very significant because the United States has not built a single large cruise ship in over 60 years—not one, not a single one. With respect to large passenger vessels, this law is literally protecting no one.

At least with respect to the Jones Act, people can point out: Well, perhaps it is helping to nurture the U.S. shipbuilding industry. Again, I think that argument overlooks the fact that we are laying that burden on the backs of poor middle-class Americans in places like Puerto Rico and Hawaii and New England and Alaska and other

parts of the country. But at least I understand that, when there is an industry at issue there. It is an industry that is being greedy, and it is an industry that, really, is engaging in crony capitalism. But I understand the argument.

With respect to the PVSA, we are not protecting anything because we do not make large passenger vessels in this country and haven't for over half a century. And so by taking away opportunities for American jobs in dockside maintenance and repair, in ports and coastal cities, in hotels and restaurants, and in the travel support sector, this law, the PVSA, as applied to large passenger vessels, harms American workers, and it redirects the demand elsewhere.

It also harms consumers who have fewer options—fewer cruises that they can take, higher prices for those cruises that are offered. And as we have seen during the pandemic, it has left us subject to the will and whim of foreign powers.

Make no mistake, the PVSA is not “America first.” This is the encapsulation of “special interests first” or even, you might say, “Canada first.” Perhaps this is the reason that the Canadian Government lobbies Congress to keep the PVSA in place. Think about that for a minute.

This unfortunate situation has been exacerbated by the pandemic, during which Canada has closed its ports to cruise ships, making it, effectively, impossible for Alaskan cruises to carry on. But the only reason why Canada wields this tremendous authority over us is because of our own law—our own law that they are lobbying us to keep in place because they benefit from it, but they are shutting it down, making it impossible for Alaskan cruises for the time being.

Without the necessary foreign port call, cruises simply cannot travel to Alaska. Without relief, the Alaskan tourism industry will evaporate, harming Alaskan dock workers, repairmen, those in the hospitality services, and more.

Just the same, think about all the jobs that aren't created that could otherwise exist, that could exist tomorrow if we just got rid of this 130-year-old law that serves no purpose—the jobs, the vacation opportunities, especially in port States, not just Alaska but Florida, Louisiana, Texas, New York, and many, many others, places where cruise ships already depart but are severely hobbled as to their itineraries because of this law, the PVSA, that serves no one—no one, perhaps, except these foreign powers.

The CDC's outdated no-sail order has made these matters so much worse, and we have to address those as well.

Alaska already lost last summer's season. That is tragic. I can't imagine Congress would force them to lose yet another season now. Yet that might already be the case, you see, because unless they start moving those ships up

there right now, there can't be any cruise ship season for Alaska this summer.

Now, my two colleagues from Alaska, thankfully, introduced a bill to help correct the issue by exempting certain Alaskan cruise lines from the PVSA for the duration of Canada's border closure, a bill that I was happy to support in order to provide short-term relief for Alaska, even if it didn't provide the reform needed for the long term, as we desperately need.

Unfortunately, the bill that is now before us has deviated from that purpose. It now has poison pill provisions that add duplicative, unnecessary, and unrelated regulations that will harm, not help, the cruise industry.

Look, I remain ready, willing, and eager to negotiate the terms of this, but we have to provide relief. It is not just about an industry. It is not just about any one State. It is about the access the American people have through their businesses or their own travel interests. We should be able to do this. It makes no sense to anyone. No one could plan a road trip and say that we can't go to a neighboring State unless we can touch back to a foreign country in the meantime. Nobody would fly to an adjacent State or across the country if, in the process, they had to fly to a third-party country merely in order to comply with some arcane Federal law—no one, except, of course, the very wealthy, who could still afford it. Most Americans can't.

And the Americans who can least afford this law—this law that serves no one, perhaps, except the foreign interests I mentioned, including, but not limited to Canada—the people who really suffer for that, are America's workers. Shame on us if we don't fix that.

Look, I remain hopeful, optimistic, and ever-willing to negotiate this. I have lots of amendments to offer up. In deference to my colleagues from Alaska, I am going to hold off on counterproposing those right now. But I am filing them, and they are ready to go. I hope we can negotiate our way through this. If we can't, shame on us. The PVSA is bad. It is bad news. We need to let it go.

For these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The objection is heard.

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, Madam President, my colleague Senator MURKOWSKI did a good job of explaining some of the economic challenges—actually, the dramatic economic challenges—facing our State: small businesses, families, workers by the thousands who are really hurting right now because we lost the tourism season last year due to the pandemic and are on the verge, possibly, of losing another one, which could be devastating. That is the purpose of our legislation, to focus on lifting the challenge and bringing relief so that we can bring tourism back to Alaska. We are open for business.

You know, we have been able, in Alaska, to weather the health impacts of this virus in a way that we are proud of in Alaska, with one of the lowest death rates per capita—any death, of course, is horrible—but one of the lowest death rates, one of the highest testing rates per capita with regard to this vaccine, the highest vaccination rates per capita, which is a minimiracle if you look at how big our State is. But the economic impacts have been devastating, as Senator MURKOWSKI laid out. Our commercial fishing industry, our oil and gas industry, our tourism industry—these sectors of the Alaska economy, which are critical, have lost thousands of jobs.

So this bill, the Alaska Tourism Recovery Act, is something that is very narrowly focused. It is very narrowly focused. It is to give our State a fighting chance this summer with regard to our tourism sector.

Now, I very much appreciate Senator BLUMENTHAL and Senator LEE, with regard to their passion and focus on the issues that they have raised tonight. Some of the safety regulations on cruise ships, the PVSA Act—these are issues that they feel very passionate about, and I appreciate that.

As they know, what we are trying to do here, Senator MURKOWSKI and I, is not tackle those issues so much as to tackle the issue directly before Alaskans, and that is how to salvage a summer tourism season.

So despite what you have witnessed here on the Senate floor, I want to say I appreciate their willingness to continue to work with us. The clock is ticking, but we do have Senator BLUMENTHAL's and Senator LEE's strong commitments to work with us to resolve these issues—both the ones that they care about and, certainly, the ones that matter to Alaskans—very soon.

To our fellow Alaskans, my message is, don't give up right now. Here on the Senate floor, despite what you have seen, there has actually been momentum and movement, and I am confident we can get there, and even with the CDC—even with the CDC.

Some of you might recall that I was here on the floor last week with Senator SCOTT of Florida, trying to move our legislation relating to the CDC's role here. We are starting to see progress with them. So we are going to continue to fight and continue to try to move this.

Do not give up, Alaska, on our summer tourism. We haven't. To the contrary, we have made progress. We are not there yet.

Finally, to our Canadian friends, we are going to continue to work with all of you as well. You can be part of the solution to help Alaska, to help Canada, in a cooperative spirit, as you are seeing here on the Senate floor from all of you on a number of these issues. It would be very much appreciated.

I anticipate and look forward to reaching out to my colleague and

friend, the Minister of Transportation, and others in the Canadian Government to try to make sure we can get this spirit of cooperation that will benefit both our State, our country, and your country.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I just want to make clear after Senator LEE's statement, No. 1, that I appreciate my colleagues from Alaska being as cooperative as they have been.

These issues are a matter of vital consumer protection and worker safety. We are talking here about defibrillators and a requirement that there be certain minimum numbers on these ships. We are talking about bodies, tragically, having to be returned if there is a death on one of these ships. We are talking about some rights for consumers that the industry itself has approved and that we are just incorporating into this amendment and enabling the Department of Transportation to enforce. So I want to make clear that these are reasonable and, in fact, in my view, very minimal protections—a first-step, another step.

I appreciate the agreement that we have been able to reach with our colleagues from Alaska on them, and I am disappointed that our colleague from Utah has objected. But I will do my best to work with them in trying to resolve Senator LEE's objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, to just wrap up this discussion, I really appreciate the comments from my colleague Senator SULLIVAN because I think you have really keyed in on where we are today.

The Alaska Tourism Restoration Act is such a narrowly defined in scope initiative to, again, create this very brief period of time to allow for what is left or what will remain of a tourist season to proceed. But we are faced with bigger issues, and these issues clearly evoke great passion and debate, whether it is consumer protection or to Senator LEE's concerns that he has raised overall about Jones Act and PVSA.

So those are significant issues that will be debated in committees as we move forward and further debated on the floor. But I think, at this point in time, the recognition from our colleagues from Connecticut and from Utah that this effort that we are trying to make in Alaska to redeem a small segment of our tourist season—those who come to us by cruise ship—that just perhaps the strength of cooperation you see here today will be that level of encouragement for the ships to start coming north in anticipation of clearer and more beneficial guidance, working with CDC.

It has been a lot of pieces to knit together. It hasn't been particularly easy or pretty, but I would like to think that the folks in southeastern Alaska and throughout the State will see the

benefits of this in the weeks and months ahead.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, last night, the American people heard from President Biden in his first address to a joint session of Congress. The American people heard him speak about many of the same themes he touched on in his inauguration: unifying the country, healing the soul of our Nation, healing the divisions that divide us. It sounds great, but those who have paid attention to the President's actions know that his rhetoric and his actions don't line up.

The only legislative achievement so far for President Biden has been an eye-popping \$1.9 trillion piece of spending that was branded as COVID-19 relief. It was so controversial that our Democratic colleagues didn't bother to use the standard legislative procedure. Instead, they used the budget reconciliation process so they could make it a law without a single Republican vote—hardly coming together and unifying the country.

As expected, President Biden had the audacity to brand this legislation as the reason why we have made such progress in fighting COVID-19. He touted the fact that America has provided more than 220 million COVID vaccinations during his first 100 days in office. But he didn't mention the fact that less than 1 percent of the funding in his signature legislation actually supported vaccinations—less than 1 percent. Less than 10 percent was directly related to COVID-19 at all.

If there were any doubts that this liberal spending binge was about to end, President Biden cleared that up last night too. He talked about his more than \$2.6 trillion American Jobs Plan, which relies on a very generous interpretation of the word “infrastructure,” or should I say Orwellian. He discussed the \$1.8 trillion American Families Plan, which includes everything from universal preschool to free community college, to mandatory paid leave policies and tax provisions.

You know, you have to love politicians when they talk about giving away free stuff. The folks back home know better. Somebody has to pay for it. As my friend Senator TIM SCOTT said in the Republican response last night, these policies could put Washington even more in the middle of Americans' lives, from cradle to college.

These three proposals total more than \$6 trillion—an amount so large, it is hard for any of us to wrap our head around it. That is on top of the money that was spent last year in a bipartisan effort to defeat COVID-19. The proposals equate to a spending rate of \$60 billion a day during the President's first 100 days in office.

Six trillion dollars is one-quarter of our gross domestic product. If you con-

vert our country's World War II spending into today's dollars, the three Biden spending proposals are even more expensive than what it cost us to arm and defeat Imperial Japan and Nazi Germany.

But I want to be clear. These aren't wartime expenses. These aren't even necessary expenses, in many cases. These proposals have absolutely nothing to do with our current fight against COVID-19. Two hundred billion dollars to build or retrofit “sustainable” places to live; \$225 billion for paid family leave; \$178 billion on electric vehicle chargers—more socialism for rich people; \$400 billion for home-based care. This money adds up pretty quickly.

I am not saying our country should cut off all of our spending altogether. There are necessary expenses and investments that need to be made. But this is not the time for a spending binge. We need to make smart financial decisions that will serve the next generation, not drive them further and further into debt.

The biggest question here, though, as with any type of government spending, is, How are you going to pay for it? For the Biden administration, the answer is simple: higher taxes. In fact, the President has proposed the largest tax hikes in more than half a century.

Now, economics 101 would teach you that tax increases aren't a clear and easy way to boost revenue, especially when your economy is already on a fragile footing. President Obama observed as much when we were recovering from the great recession of 2008, that raising taxes during a recovery from a recession is a bad idea. Raising trillions of dollars in new taxes will not set us up for a strong recovery; it will simply throw even more wrenches into our sluggish economic engine.

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the American economy was on a roll. The economy was booming. Unemployment was at a 50-year low. Companies were coming back on shore, moving their headquarters to the United States, in part because of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. The 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act set the stage for this recovery.

Instead of building upon what we did in 2017, the administration now wants to repeal those tax provisions in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act and double down on the old, tired talking points that America can simply tax and spend and regulate itself into prosperity.

Massive tax hikes are not the way to stabilize a shaky recovery, and I worry how much damage these increases will do if our Democratic colleagues insist on doing more partisan, party-line legislating.

The President did nothing to ease my concern about another looming problem, and that is the crisis on our border. For months, the President and members of his administration have denied what is a clear and growing crisis on the border. I hoped he might finally acknowledge the reality of the