

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 3807, the Relief for Restaurants and other Hard Hit Small Businesses Act of 2022.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4521

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 4521:

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, SCHAKOWSKY, MATSUI, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. SOTO, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Messrs. BUCSHON, CARTER of Georgia, DUNCAN, and CRENSHAW.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. MEEKS, DEUTCH, Ms. BASS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. HOULAHAN, JACOBS of California, Messrs. KINZINGER, MCCAUL, CHABOT, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mrs. KIM of California.

From the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, LOFGREN, BONAMICI, Mr. BERA, Ms. STEVENS, Messrs. BOWMAN, FOSTER, LUCAS, WEBER of Texas, BABIN, WALTZ, and GARCIA of California.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. NEAL, BLUMENAUER, DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELBENE, CHU, Messrs. KILDEE, GOMEZ, BRADY, BUCHANAN, SMITH of Nebraska, LAHOOD, and Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of sec. 10407, title XV of division H, and division P of the House bill, and secs. 2217, 2507, and 2511 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of secs. 10001, 20221, 71104, and 80401 of the House bill, and secs. 1002, 2118, 2217, 2402, 2507, and subtitle C of title I of division D of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Mr. MOORE of Utah.

From the Committee on Education and Labor, for consideration of sec. 71210, titles XIII and XIV of division H, and titles I–V and titles VII–IX of division J of the House bill, and secs. 2507, 2509, 3138, subtitle C of title I of division D, and subtitles B and C of title I of division F of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SCOTT of Virginia, MORELLE, and Ms. FOXX.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of secs. 10001, 30299C, division G, secs. 110001, and 110004 of the House bill, and secs. 1002, 2508, 3138, 3219D, 3219E, 3250, 3405, 5103, 5202–04, and 5212 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. WATERS, GARCIA of Texas, and Mr. BARR.

From the Committee on Homeland Security, for consideration of division F of the House bill, and subtitle C of title I of division D, secs. 4203, 4204, 4207, and subtitle B of title II of division D of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. TITUS, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Mr. GUEST.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of secs. 30001, 30303, 30306, 30312, 30318, 61403, 61411, 61414, 71102, 80102, 80103, titles II–VI of division I, and sec. 90104 of the House bill, and secs. 3302, 3303, 3313, 4492, 4494–96, 5202–04, and title II of division F of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. NADLER, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. TIFANY.

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of secs. 70101, 70102, 70111–18, subtitle B of title I of division H, titles II–XII of division H, and titles XV–XIX of division H of the House bill, and secs. 2507 and 2518 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GRIMALVA, McEACHIN, and Ms. HERRELL.

From the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for consideration of division E and division Q of the House bill, and title I of division D, subtitle A of title II of division D, title III of division D, subtitles A and B of title IV of division D, secs. 4493, 5202–04, and 73003 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Messrs. KHANNA, and COMER.

From the Committee on Small Business, for consideration of secs. 10691, 50107, 71208, and division R of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, DAVIDS of Kansas, and Mr. FITZGERALD.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of sec. 70121, subtitle C of title I of division H, division L, and division S of the House bill, and secs. 2507, 4114, and 4116 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DEFAZIO, MALINOWSKI, and CRAWFORD.

From the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for consideration of subtitle C of title I of division D of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. TAKANO, PAPPAS, and BOST.

The Senate will be notified of the conferees.

There was no objection.

□ 1330

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform the House that, pursuant to House Resolution 1037, the Speaker has certified to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia the refusal of Peter K. Navarro and Daniel Scavino, Jr., to produce documents to or appear for a deposition before the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol as directed by subpoena.

SOUTHERN BORDER ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Chattanooga Bar Association on reaching the milestone of its 125th anniversary.

Since 1897, the Chattanooga Bar Association has made it its mission to work for the betterment of the legal profession and the administration of justice; to take an active interest in governmental affairs; to stimulate a feeling of respect, esteem, and good-fellowship among members of the Chattanooga Bar Association; and to provide and promote legal education of the legal community and the public at large.

During its 125 years, the Chattanooga Bar Association has produced many outstanding members who have shaped the history of Tennessee and our Nation.

J.B. Frazier was a member of the board of directors during the first 5 years of CBA's existence and is the only Chattanooga elected Governor of the State of Tennessee. He later served in the United States Senate.

Estes Kefauver served as the secretary-treasurer and vice president of the association before being elected to serve as Tennessee's Third District Congressman. Incidentally, that is the seat which I presently hold.

He then went on to the United States Senate and made two bids for the Democratic Presidential nomination before being selected as Adlai Stevenson's Vice Presidential nominee during the 1956 Presidential election.

I am extremely proud, myself, to have been a member of the Chattanooga Bar Association since I began my law practice as a young man in 1986. In 1996, I became the youngest person to serve as president of the Chattanooga Bar Association, the 99th president, an honor that is still near and dear to my heart.

Throughout its 125 years, the Chattanooga Bar Association has shown our community, State, and the Nation the best of what it means to be a lawyer, to practice law, and to pursue equal justice for all.

I am proud to recognize and honor the Chattanooga Bar Association as they celebrate their 125th anniversary. I congratulate the CBA and wish them much continued success in the future.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding. We will continue to engage in that.

With the permission of the gentleman from Wisconsin, I ask that he also yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD) to engage in a colloquy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin controls the time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the time from the gentleman from Wisconsin and his commitment to fighting to change this town, which, unfortunately, too many of our colleagues are unwilling to do. I am glad to have my friend from Virginia here as well.

Yesterday, we had an interesting exchange in the House Judiciary Committee. We had a number of different conversations about the issue of the ongoing threat at our border. I know that my friend from Virginia was also here on the floor of the House last night, where we had a continued conversation about the ongoing threat at the southern border of the United States.

I would imagine that the people who I represent, and the people of the State of Texas, would be horrified if they all got to see what I see every day and the exchange with my colleagues here in this body about what is actually happening at our border. What do I mean by that?

Yesterday, I had an exchange with the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee because I was acknowledging, in the context of a debate we were having about opening up visa waivers for the United States Virgin Islands, that those kinds of waivers had been abused in Guam and other territories of the United States. We were questioning why we are going to open up these waivers while our border is wide open.

I pointed out the abuses that are happening at our border and the abuses that are happening in Texas. I specifically talked about the sexual abuses, the rapes, and the tragedy of what is occurring to little girls and to people on the journey, in particular in Texas when they cross the southern border

because they are at the hands of the dangerous cartels.

I said this at the time, that the committee chairman kind of scoffed. It wasn't the first time I had seen some of our colleagues scoff with respect to the perspectives that we are offering about what we see every day and the conversations we have with people on the ground.

Why I think it merits conversation here on the floor of the House is—and I want to get the gentleman from Virginia's perspective on this—on behalf of the American people who we represent, the people of the Commonwealth of Virginia, the people of the State of Texas, the many people we represent, we are trying to articulate, for a body of representatives of those people, that their lives are being impacted and harmed by virtue of the refusal of this administration and, frankly, many of the people of this Chamber to secure the border of the United States.

In very short outline form, it comes in the form of empowered cartels, dangerous individuals crossing our border, be they criminals, be they terrorist members, or be they folks from state-sponsors of terror.

It comes in the form of dangerous fentanyl and narcotics coming into our communities, poisoning our families, poisoning our young, killing people in schools.

It comes in the form of physical property damage to ranchers, business owners, and people dealing with the dangerous flow coming across the border.

It comes in the form of economic impacts and devastation.

It comes in the form of, for example, the town of Uvalde, Texas, where you have 100 a day being dropped off. They have to deal with: What do we do? Do we ship them to San Antonio? What do we do with our schools? What do we do with our hospitals?

It comes in the form of danger because Border Patrol can't monitor the border, and people come in, known got-aways.

It comes in the form of having criminals that exist in the United States that aren't being prosecuted because, allegedly, we don't have bed space, but really, we are not allowing ICE to do its job. You had, for example, 25,000 prosecutions last year as opposed to something like 250,000 at the peak of the Trump administration.

Madam Speaker, I could go on and on and on. My point is, there is a direct consequence and direct harm to the American people: dead Americans, dead migrants, fentanyl pouring in, increased substance abuse, empowerment of cartels, empowerment of China. This is happening on a daily basis and getting worse.

Finally, now we are being told, even as the Speaker of the House has COVID—if you look at the top stories in Politico, oh, my gosh, everybody is running around. There are COVID-positive people in D.C.

Even as all of that is occurring, even as the extension of the proxy voting fraud that is occurring in the House of Representatives—by “fraud,” I mean that half of this body, or more, is signing up and standing up at this podium every day, saying, “I am not voting because of COVID,” signing documentation, and we know the vast majority has nothing to do with COVID.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in addition to not showing up here to do the job that their constituents sent them here to do, they are literally lying about the reason they are not here.

Mr. ROY. Well, I never have proxy-voted.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Same here.

Mr. ROY. There is some sort of form, and you sign the form. In that language, you say, “due to the COVID emergency,” or something to that effect. I don't want to misrepresent the exact legal language. “Due to the COVID emergency, I cannot be here to vote, so I am allowing so-and-so colleague to vote for me.”

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. I have been tempted to interrupt during the proxy voting to ask the Speaker to allow me to offer a prayer for the healing and recovery of the dozens of Members of Congress who are not at work and who are apparently too sick from COVID to show up and do their job.

□ 1345

Mr. ROY. Given that we have lines and lines of people voting by proxy, given that we have the Speaker of the House having COVID, given that Politico is writing stories about how COVID is impacting the swamp, given that you have to wear a mask on airplanes, given that we are continuing to require members of our military to get a needle stuck in their arm or potentially lose their job, given that we are continuing to require among Federal workers like Border Patrol that they get a needle in their arm or lose their job, then comes along the infinite wisdom of the CDC director and the head of DHS, Secretary Mayorkas, oh, let's get rid of title 42, literally the only thing that is actually being used to enforce the border and stop half the flow of people coming across our border.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Of course. That is why they are getting rid of it because it has been used to turn back some illegal immigrants at the border.

Mr. ROY. Is the gentleman aware of this?

Did we take a trip together to Del Rio, Texas, a month ago?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. We did. Where just a couple months ago you had “Bidentown” with some 20,000 illegal Haitian immigrants gathered under the bridge. We learned a lot while we were there, and I thank the gentleman for leading that trip.

I also want to say thank you to my friend, the Congressman from Wisconsin, for allowing us to do this, and Congressman ROY for allowing me to join him.

But we had the 20,000 illegal Haitian immigrants gathered in “Bidentown” under the bridge which they quickly—they weren’t concerned that the immigrants were coming in the country illegally. They were concerned about the image and the embarrassment of 20,000 of them in “Biden’s village” there under the bridge, so they wanted to distribute them into the interior of the country as quickly as they could to hide it from the American people.

The gentleman will remember at first they tried to keep the media from covering it. And then what they did was bus them into the country to wherever they wanted to go. They flew a few back to Haiti, but most of them they distributed into the country.

But we learned when we were in Del Rio—and my friend may have already known this—I learned it that day when we were there that there were 1,000 a day coming just through that corridor. Sadly, that is just a fraction of the 7,000 a day who are coming across the southern border along Arizona, New Mexico, Arizona, and, of course, Texas.

But to this President’s policies now, what is the response?

We want to try to double or even triple that by rescinding title 42.

Mr. ROY. Does the gentleman remember that we stood at the river in Del Rio, and we were there at the spot where many thousands of Haitians had crossed last September? Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. ROY. Is the gentleman aware of whether or not the Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro Mayorkas, or, for example, the White House Press Secretary, Jen Psaki—quickly en route to a deal with MSNBC—President Biden, or any other member of the administration who went to the microphone and accused Border Patrol agents—lifetime public servants serving on our border—of whipping human beings in the river; is the gentleman aware of any of those individuals apologizing to them and ensuring that they have been reposted in their jobs on horseback in Del Rio?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. I’m not aware that they have apologized.

As a matter of fact, at least the President and the Vice President, to my knowledge, have never been to the border to see what is happening.

Again, my friend led one of the trips I was on. I have been to the border four times in my first 15 months here in Congress so that I could see better and experience in person the crisis at the border, to see the human toll, to see the environmental toll, and then to see exactly where that was happening.

These are Border Patrol officers who were trying to stand in the gap, to be on the front line, and trying to do their job despite the efforts of this administration to prevent them from doing their job, and putting their lives, literally, at risk.

The previous time I was at the border—not the Del Rio trip—but the pre-

vious time I was in Arizona, there was actually a shooting of a Border Patrol officer while I was there. And yet here we have—as my friend has said—the Department of Homeland Security Secretary besmirching, smearing, and demeaning his own employees knowing full well that is a lie, knowing full they are just leading those horses as they do and trying to protect us American citizens from what is happening at the border.

Mr. ROY. To make sure the RECORD is clear, I think the gentleman from Virginia is correct that neither the President nor the Vice President have been to the border in what I would call the spots where it matters.

I believe the Vice President of the United States did take a trip where she hopped through El Paso, met with a number of folks away from the border, went to the border for a quick photo, went back to El Paso, and hopped on a plane en route to California. I believe that transpired some time last year.

But never to Del Rio, never meeting with people right down on the river, never down to McAllen, never to Laredo, never talked to any of the people being affected directly by what is occurring at the border. Neither the so-called border czar—the Vice President—nor the President of the United States have been to the border.

To be clear, the Secretary of Homeland Security has only been there, I think, a couple of times. And when attending I do not believe he was received particularly well by the line Border Patrol.

Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. That is right.

They say they want to identify the root causes. I can tell my friend what the root causes are. The root causes of the massive surge across our border, if you will, the invasion at our border: is the cessation of the Trump policies that were working. It is the enhancement of the catch-and-release practice. It is ending MPP. It is stopping building the wall. And it is promising amnesty and an open border during the 2020 election for illegals to come. That is why they were coming with their Biden T-shirts on. It is not mandating E-Verify. It is allowing the economic incentive to come. It is allowing individuals to come and be apprehended and provided free social services, free healthcare services, free education, and to be flown or distributed wherever they want to go around the country at taxpayer expense with no specific court date to even appear to have their case heard.

I want to compliment the gentleman’s Governor from yesterday. I hope that he will follow through on this. I hope this will actually happen. Perhaps the gentleman from Texas has some thoughts on that. He announced yesterday that he is going to bus these illegal aliens right here to Washington, D.C., so our Democratic majority and our Democratic administration who are willfully and purposely facilitating

this invasion at our southern border through their policies can accommodate these illegal aliens when they are brought here.

I call on my Governor from Virginia and Governors throughout the country to do the same thing.

Mr. ROY. I appreciate the observation by my friend from Virginia about what the Governor of Texas is having to do to stand in the breach and to stand up in order to protect Texans in the complete and total absence of the Federal Government to do its constitutional duties: to defend the sovereign Nation and to deal with immigration which he refuses to do.

I would note that the Governor and the legislature has appropriated \$3 billion in Texas. I don’t know when we are going to get that paid back by this august institution when Texas is doing the job of the Federal Government, but, okay, we are a border State. Texas funded \$3 billion, and we have used that to take our DPS agents and DPS troopers and move them down to the border to be able to back up Border Patrol. As the gentleman knows from our experience down there in meeting with DPS, he has been engaging in policy and building fences and other stuff, and now he is engaging in a policy shift where there is going to be some action with respect to vehicle inspections at ports of entry. I applaud that.

I would note that I would go so far as to say, I would support the Governor shutting down I-35.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Absolutely.

Mr. ROY. I would just shut down the port of entry. I would look at the rest of America and my colleagues around this Chamber and say, Do you like your cheap goods from Mexico right now when we have got high inflation and we want to go attack China?

Guess what?

I-35 is shut down—shut down—until you secure the border of the United States.

But I appreciate that the Governor’s step is a step in that direction to say, We are going to have vehicle inspections.

I hope they are long, slow vehicle inspections. I hope they cover every car from beginning to end and take plenty of time doing it.

Secondly, using boats and having some sort of ability to deter crossing, there was some plan to do that, I haven’t read the details of it. I hope it is sincere and robust.

And then the third part is what the gentleman from Virginia mentioned, taking some of these who are dumped off by Border Patrol in Texas, putting them on a bus, and shipping them to the front door of this building. I support that.

There are a couple of caveats. There is one metric, and one metric alone, that I will hold everybody in this Chamber accountable to, the Governor of Texas accountable to, and the President of the United States accountable to: Stop the flow now. That is your job.

That is your duty under the Constitution. That is what the law requires you to do.

That is why we have the Secure Fence Act. That is why we have laws on the books requiring you to follow the legal processes.

Do not allow the false name of asylum and compassion to be used as a rule to swallow the constitutional duty to secure the border.

I would give the same speech to the Governor and to my colleagues in the legislature in Texas: You have a duty to the people of Texas to secure the border under Article 4. There is an invasion, and the Federal Government is not doing its job. You have a duty to hold that line.

So that is the metric by which we should grade the actions of the Governor, the actions of this body, or the actions of the President.

I will see if the gentleman would agree.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Absolutely. And the four times that I have been to the border in the last 15 months, I have never seen a Democrat there. I have had Border Patrol, Texas State Police, sheriffs, and law enforcement who are working there at the border—not just Texas, but Arizona as well—where they tell me they never see Democrats at the border.

We only need seven Democrats to join our discharge petition to get a vote on maintaining title 42, but we can't get one Democrat, one majority Member, to do this. One would hope that just in the States of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California—the border States—that we could get, just in the State of Texas, in particular, that we could get Democrats to say, Hey, don't mess with Texas.

We are going to join our fellow Republicans, and we are going to support Texas' efforts to stand in the gap and do what the Federal Government will not do in violation of the Constitution and protecting the State from invasion.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I really appreciate my friend from Virginia pointing this out.

Let me note that we are sitting here on April, I believe, 7—actually, it is a couple of good friends of mine birthday. I am just glad I said that out loud.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Happy birthday to my brother Steve who is 55 today, April 7.

Mr. ROY. I will not mention that these two guys happen to be known publicly. They are a couple of twins who are good buddies of mine and their birthday is today.

But I sit here, and I say on April 7, it was a year ago almost to the day—I would have to go look at the date of the filing of our discharge petition down at the desk here in the Chamber—that I filed on behalf of us who wanted to do it.

Our friend YVETTE HERRELL had legislation to require the enforcement of title 42, the health provision that al-

lows you to turn people away because of communicable diseases which, of course, we are dealing with during COVID. She had a bill that she filed last February. Now, keep in mind, that was only a month into the administration. But we knew full well what was happening because immigrants were showing up to the border with Joe Biden T-shirts and with "thank you to President Joe Biden" shirts. So we knew what was coming. We knew that the Members of this Chamber and Democrat friends in the administration would say: Oh, well, I don't know if we need to use title 42 enforcement. I don't know if we need to use migrant protection protocols and return to Mexico, because, frankly, we knew they would be fine with a flood across our border.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. ROY. So we filed a discharge petition of that bill.

Now, I want a little history here for 1 minute. We introduced that discharge petition, and we got our normal group of Members who like to fight for freedom. We had 30 or 40 of us get on that discharge right away. And then it was a slog. It was a slog for the better part of a year. We tried in the summer, we got it to 75. We went on Tucker Carlson. We said: Hey, here are the people who have signed it, and here are the ones who haven't.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Naming names.

Mr. ROY. Suddenly, that list grew to 125.

Then what?

We went back on Tucker. We went back: Hey, here is what the list number is.

Suddenly, that number grew to about 160. We got it up to 195, and then it stalled. Then 2 weeks ago, when all of the title 42 news started breaking that the CDC director in all her infinite wisdom—I'm not going to go down that rabbit trail at the moment—and the Department of Homeland Security Secretary said, Oh, yeah, we are not going to do title 42 anymore.

All of a sudden, people around here said, Whoa, well, that will be a thing.

I knew it was a thing a year ago, and my friend from Virginia knew it was a thing a year ago. The gentleman has been to the border four times in his brief tenure. I live 100 miles from the border. Well, my District is 100 miles from the border.

So we get this discharge petition. Now, we have got it. We have got 210, I think—give or take one—signatures on that, all Republicans. Not one Democratic colleague has yet to sign it.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Not one.

Mr. ROY. Yet there are four Democratic Senators—Senator MANCHIN, Senator MARK KELLY, Senator KYRSTEN SINEMA, and Senator JON TESTER—who have all said, Hey, we shouldn't be getting rid of title 42.

Can my friend from Virginia explain why not one Member, even from a border State, of our Democratic col-

leagues will sign that discharge petition?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. There is no excuse for it.

If this President was doing everything else right—just use your imagination and just allow for a moment—if he was doing everything else right and some of his other policies were working—let's pretend some were working—what he has allowed to happen at the border as the head of the Democratic Party, never in the history of the country has our own President done more to intentionally harm the United States in what he has done in his first year. So it is no wonder that not one Democrat will join us in standing up for border security.

How did that become a partisan issue?

As you know, we were in an off-the-record meeting with Secretary Mayorkas so I can't share what he said. I can share what I said.

I asked him: What is the end game?

Here we are going to take it from some 7,000 a day—it is estimated 18,000 a day—that means every 3 days you will have the equivalent population of my home county, Campbell County, Virginia, 56,000 people, in 3 days we will have that many illegal border crossings.

By the way, in my hometown of Lynchburg, Virginia, right outside Campbell County there, we just had a murder conviction of an MS-13 gang member who came across illegally. Again, demonstrating that every town is a border town under this President. Every State is a border State under this President.

□ 1400

I appreciate you leading on this issue, Mr. ROY, so passionately and so consistently and so faithfully. Specifically, you helped lead that letter that we sent to leadership of both the House and the Senate on the Republican side, just 2 or 3 weeks ago, saying no Republican should support any government funding that does not secure the border.

So what did we do with the potential leverage that we had that was before us, if all Republicans would refuse to fund a government that doesn't secure the border?

Mr. ROY. Well, like any good Republican Conference, we did nothing. We did nothing. We let the moments of leverage just pass right on by and did nothing.

Yet, I sat here on the floor, while I had some of my Republican leadership colleagues saying: We got all this great stuff. Can you believe what we got? We got the Hyde amendment.

You are supposed to get the Hyde amendment. It has been law for 35 years. Just because Democrats say they are not going to use it, you say: Don't worry, we got the Hyde amendment, and then you pat yourself on the back.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. \$1.6 trillion, less than 1 percent of which was for

Ukraine support. Some justified their vote for that because it was supporting Ukraine. So 99 percent of the bill had nothing to do with Ukraine. Yet, 54 Republicans, one-fourth of our body, voted against that \$1.6 trillion spending, with no leverage, no concessions, nothing really gained. We didn't secure the border; we didn't end the vaccine mandates; we didn't unleash American energy independence.

Mr. ROY. \$1.6 trillion, \$1 billion of plussed-up spending, \$14 billion for Ukraine, without a single debate here on the floor of the House about how much money we should spend and what we should get out of it.

No change to the mandate of vaccines being stuck in the arms of our men and women in uniform, Border Patrol, or the requirements for healthcare workers. No change on border security, none; no requirements whatsoever on border security. That is not getting a win.

Now, here we sit. The gentleman raised an important question.

We have got about 5 minutes, to be respectful of our friend from Wisconsin's time.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Who also didn't vote for that bad bill, by the way.

Mr. ROY. Correct, and he understands what the swamp is all about.

The gentleman brought up the impact—I think that this is one of most important things we can say here in closing. The gentleman brought up the impact in Lynchburg, Virginia. People think this is just a border issue, and I come down here because it is Texas. Yeah, we are taking it on the chin. I have ranchers who are crying. I have people who are victims of crime. I have migrants in my district who are abused, all under the false name of compassion, about open borders.

We have got to sit back and find dead bodies of migrants on ranches, get a morgue brought down to put 115 dead bodies in, in one county. My Democratic colleagues are like: Whatever. Who cares? It is just some problem we have just got to deal with.

That is the reality. But it stretches throughout the country.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. ROY. If the gentleman will oblige, if he agrees with these numbers, we are looking at about a million illegal encounters in just 6 months of this year. We have seen more than six times as many daily apprehensions since Mayorkas took office. In March alone, there were 97,000 southern border encounters, through half of the month. Of those, 51 percent were removed under title 42.

So it tells you half are being removed for title 42, and they are about to end it. Mayorkas has used title 42 as the basis for almost every one of those removed. So what would it look like, this past year, without title 42? Title 42 has been used, I think the gentleman would agree, more than 1.7 million times during this pandemic.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. That is right, for 2 years.

Mr. ROY. In fact, under Secretary Mayorkas at DHS, we have seen more than 2.2 million encounters, and everyone who wasn't turned away under title 42 was released.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Into the interior of the country.

Mr. ROY. That is 700,000 releases last year.

Now, what about this: In fiscal year 2021, the Border Patrol encountered 10,700 criminal noncitizens. 3,662 have been arrested thus far in 2022. The combined timeframes include roughly 85 convictions of manslaughter or homicide; 604 sexual offenses; almost 3,000 convictions of illegal drug possession; and based on reports, at least 14 who are on the terrorist watch list.

In just the first 5 months of fiscal year 2022, Border Patrol encountered 525,000 people, other than Mexicans. In just the first 5 months of fiscal year 2022, Border Patrol encountered 421 Chinese nationals. In just the first 5 months of fiscal year 2022, Border Patrol encountered 7,191 Russians out on the southwest border.

I say all of that to say this: When we don't secure our border, when we turn Border Patrol into a processing organization, we leave our borders wide open for got-aways. Then we have dangerous narcotics and fentanyl pouring into our communities, we have people dying, and we have gangs.

Can the gentleman speak to the deaths and the gangs and the crime and the impact in Virginia, 1,500-miles away from where we are even talking about?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Yes. The illegal drugs that are pouring in across the country, fentanyl and other dangerous drugs, at record levels, is the reason why we had 100,000 overdose deaths last year in this country. In 2021, the number one cause of death for individuals between 18 and 45 was not COVID; it was overdose.

On the border trips that I have been on—again, a couple of those with you—when you meet with the folks who live there, who live on the front lines, and they talk about these illegals, they will find the carpet shoes. We saw them. You see the carpet shoes and the camos. Once they get picked up by their crime cartel contact and picked up to go wherever they want to go in the interior of the country, you find the carpet shoes and you find the camos left behind.

You will have those folks who live there tell you they are coming onto their property, they are knocking on their doors, they are threatening them and making demands of them. These folks who live on the border are finding dead bodies. The previous trip I was on in Arizona, they said they apprehended 30 Chinese nationals on their property.

They are from 160 different countries, not just Central and South America, as if that wasn't enough. But to your point, 160 different countries are mak-

ing every town a border town and every State a border State.

It is a dereliction of duty on behalf of this President's administration. It is a threat to the national security of our country, to the sovereignty of our country, to the health and security of our country, and to the financial security of our country. I appreciate your leadership on this issue.

Mr. ROY. I thank the gentleman from Virginia. I am at just over 29 minutes, so I would tell the gentleman from Wisconsin that I am going to wind down here in the next minute. I appreciate his time, his leadership, and his indulgence.

I also want to thank the Speaker and the staff for being here while we are continuing to talk about this important topic.

I will just close by saying, this is a massive national security issue. This is a massive issue of the most important relevance to the safety and well-being of the people that we represent.

Why this body is not engaged in just a complete, full, and robust review, hearings, oversight, and legislation to ensure that we protect the sovereignty of the United States and enforce the laws of the United States, is beyond me.

The people's House has an obligation. Article I has an obligation to check Article II and to demand that those executing the laws actually do so.

I respectfully submit to the Speaker and to my colleagues on the other of the aisle:

When are we going to do our job?

How many dead migrants found on ranches is enough?

How many dead Americans from fentanyl overdoses—fentanyl poisonings, to be more accurate—is enough?

How much money flowing into the hands of dangerous cartel organizations, transnational organizations, turning Mexico into a narco-terror state, is enough?

How much do we have to suffer, as a people in this country, as a State in Texas?

Again, the migrants who seek to come here are getting sold into the sex trafficking trade, getting abused and dying in the heat along the southern border, how much of that do we have to tolerate before my colleagues on the other side of the aisle wake up?

Madam Speaker, I appreciate gentleman from Wisconsin for all that he does in representing his constituents and for his indulgence.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I would now like to address several issues today and maybe give it a little bit of a different spin or a little bit of different observations than people are getting from some of the other congressmen.

I was glad today to vote to suspend normal trade relations with Russia and, hopefully, reduce the number of oil imports we are getting from that country.

Every day, you cannot help but be touched by the reports from Ukraine and what is happening to the civilians there.

Nevertheless, I am a little bit concerned about the public statements coming out of Washington. I believe we should all be working to end this war and wind up with a free Ukraine.

Nevertheless, to end this war, we will eventually have to get to the bargaining table, and I am afraid that statements being made by both sides will make it more difficult to reach an end result. The sooner the war ends, the more lives of Ukrainian troops will be saved, the more lives of Ukrainian civilians will be saved, and, quite frankly, the more lives of Russian troops will be saved.

To negotiate a final deal, both sides must realize and respect that deal, and both sides must feel that they came out of the negotiation with something.

I sure hope we are not in the current position we are right now 3 or 4 months from now. I would encourage all of my colleagues, and also the President of the United States, when they make public statements, to ask themselves: Are we getting closer to ending this war by my statements, or are we not getting closer to ending this war?

I suppose politicians always think about politics. But I sometimes think statements are made for political effect rather than reaching the serious goal of ending this conflict.

I would also like to follow up on what is going on on the border and the danger that we may soon end title 42. I think for the future of the United States, the most important thing going on—what is going on in Ukraine is important. The most important thing is what goes on at the border.

We all know that around the time President Biden took office, about 20,000 people a month, and sometimes well under 20,000 people a month, were crossing the border, for a variety of reasons. The major one is, I think the current administration isn't really thrilled about enforcing our laws. We have gone from having under 20,000 to 80,000 or 100,000 people a month cross our southern border, people who are not vetted, people who we, in many cases, would not want here under any circumstances.

There is a danger that in May, that 80,000 to 100,000 figure is going to jump to 400,000 or 500,000 people a month. People are not being vetted, and people are coming from all around the globe.

I will be there next week. When you get down there and you talk to the Border Patrol, you will find people not only coming from Mexico but more people from Central America, people from the Caribbean, people from South America, people from sub-Saharan Africa, people from eastern Europe, people from countries that are currently hostile to us are being waved through after they get a minimal amount of paperwork. We do not need to increase that to 300,000 or 400,000 or 500,000 people a month.

The last time I was down there, I noticed that there were a lot of photo IDs of people from Central America and South America being thrown away before they checked in. What does that tell you? It means people don't want us to know about their past. They are running away from their past as they enter our country.

I remember the statement of John Adams: "Our Constitution is only fit for a moral and religious people." We have to make sure we are getting a moral group of people crossing our southern border, not to mention we have to make sure we are getting people who respect our laws.

We, right now, swear in over 800,000 people from around the world every year. That is fine. They are appropriately vetted. I encourage all citizens to watch as people come here legally and are sworn in.

Our economy cannot accept another 400,000, and we know a given number of these people, perhaps, have a criminal background and are not going to help our country.

□ 1415

Not to mention, no country as successful as ours, can accept an unlimited number of people. We are not prepared for them. They have not been adequately trained in the way of the American ideals, the importance of our Constitution, why we have our Constitution.

Furthermore, having been down there, the more people you let in, the more it strengthens the Mexican drug gangs, and those gangs make \$3,000 or \$5,000 or \$9,000 or \$20,000 per person who comes across here. We are strengthening their power. We are making them wealthy. Why would we want to expand the current fiasco south of the border?

Last time I was down there, the Border Patrol told me about fights between Mexican and Chinese gangs on our side of the border. How do these people from these gangs get here? They cross the border illegally. Is it helpful for the United States to have open warfare between Chinese and Mexican gangs? That is what we are getting more and more.

Our poor, underappreciated Border Patrol, more shots directly at them. And what does the administration do? Rather than strengthen the border, we propose legislation giving them free college, college that American citizens have to go \$30,000 or \$40,000 or \$50,000 in debt to get.

Rather than hire more Border Patrol to enforce the border, we hire more people to investigate the Border Patrol. I am not sure what psychological problem we have going on here. It is the same psychological problem that looks at, say, a city like Milwaukee that is approaching 200 homicides a year, and saying we have to investigate the police, or we have to make it easier to sue the police.

That same mindset at the southern border says we have 100,000 people here

who shouldn't come here every month? I know what we will do, we will hire more people to investigate the Border Patrol and make sure they are not doing anything wrong. They think the Border Patrol are the bad people.

Another problem, and I don't know whether this has occurred to President Biden's advisers, I don't know whether you wanted a war in Ukraine, but I don't believe that war would have started if we wouldn't have had an open borders policy. What do you think countries like Iran or China, or Russia make of us having an open border and not enforcing our border laws? Normal countries don't do that. They think it is because we have such a weak President who will never do anything. It invites trouble.

I have felt for a year-and-a-half or 2 years that the open borders policy was inviting mischief; and that is what we have now, mischief that I don't believe would have happened had we tried to enforce our border laws.

Please, Mr. President, keep title 42. Fire the Vice President from her position as border czar. That is another problem we have.

As mentioned, next week I will go and tour part of the border in San Diego and Yuma. I have been in many other parts in the past. But I go down there to learn more directly from the Border Patrol. As is common from all agencies, you learn a lot more from the people doing the work than the bureaucrats at the top, and I look forward to coming back and reporting whatever grim statistics I gather from talking about the Border Patrol and their suggestions to save our country.

I hope all Americans listening and paying attention are contacting their Representatives and Senators about what is going on on the border. I personally believe one of the reasons that President Biden is threatening to remove title 42 is because the news is dominated with what is going on in Ukraine, and now is the time you could get away with really opening the floodgates. But if we are going to save our country, we have to enforce the borders like we would in any normal country.

By the way, an excuse for removing title 42 is saying that they feel that COVID is no longer a threat. If you look, over 500 people a day on most days are dying of COVID. It is still a problem. Right now, or at least the last time I was down there, they didn't even feel they had the legal ability to test people as to whether or not they had COVID. As long as that situation is out there, I beg you to keep title 42 in place. It is bad enough having 80,000 to 100,000 people crossing here every month who we have not vetted.

The next crisis that I would like to address today is an ongoing crisis. It has been a problem in this country for 50 years, but I think things keep getting worse. And that is the decline in which Black Lives Matter would refer to as the Western traditional family. Again and again, bills are introduced

around here to provide benefits, and the traditional nuclear family is left out of those benefits; be it an increase in the earned income tax credit or flooding more money into low-income housing, increases in food share, increases in Pell grants, increases in childcare.

All of these programs an average married couple are not eligible for because in the traditional family, usually at least one parent and sometimes two are working. In order to be eligible for these programs, you have to put yourself in a position in which you are considered in poverty, and if you are in poverty, you are eligible for governmental assistance.

I had a woman in my district who had two children who were both \$30,000, \$40,000 in debt from going to college complain why did her sister's kids get free college while her own kids are stuck paying off their debt? She was proud of her children; she was proud they were current on their student loans, but it didn't seem right to her that her niece, who was raised in a nontraditional family, or what Black Lives Matter would consider a traditional family, her niece got free college paid for by the government, whereas her kids had to work to pay off the student loans.

I hope in the future, as we dole more money out of this place, we stop discriminating against and showing hatred for the traditional family. I will point out, that I think over time more and more Americans are catching on to the idea that materially they can get benefits that they wouldn't get if they didn't get married.

I will point out some statistics on SNAP benefits. Between 1996 and 2016, a 20-year gap—and these are both years in which the economy is doing well, so I am comparing apples to apples—the number of people on SNAP jumped up from about 25,000 to 44,000. Taking those two years, about a 50 to 60 percent increase in the number of people on SNAP.

Now, we have to make sure people can eat. I realize all people can go through a tough time in their lives, where there are some people who may have mental problems or such, that makes it very difficult to hold a job, but when you have a 50 to 60 percent increase in 20 years on the number of

people who have arranged their life that they are eligible for SNAP, people better wake up because we are destroying the traditional family in America.

I hope in the future the majority party, as they put together more budgets, or if the Republicans ever get the majority, when they get the majority, that they would begin to look at this problem. It is not a new problem that gets press like a surge at the border will get press or a disaster in Kyiv will get press, but it is an ongoing problem as we eat away at the traditional nuclear family of this country, and it is being eaten away by the programs that are passed by this Congress. I hope if the Republicans take control, even though it is not a sexy issue because it is an ongoing issue, I hope they do something about this hatred or discrimination against the traditional family.

Now, I will make one more point, I make it as much as I can, before I leave this podium today. One more time I am going to talk about vitamin D. In part I am going to talk about it because there was an expert in vitamin D who I ran into last night from Maryland who, again, brought up that he felt he had a cocktail which was about 100 percent successful in curing people from COVID if they get it.

If any of the Speaker's office is paying attention, I would be happy to give them the name of this individual. Maybe it is something that should be given to the Speaker.

But the new cocktail, in part, is based on substantial amounts of vitamin D. A week and a half ago I talked to Dr. Dror of Israel who commented on the importance of being vitamin D sufficient. In his Israeli study, with a small number of people, he found that people who were vitamin D deficient were 11 times as likely to die of COVID if they were hospitalized as people who were not vitamin D deficient. He was using a very low threshold, 20 nanograms per milliliter. Eleven times more likely to die if you were vitamin D deficient.

I don't know what is wrong with our Department of Health and Human Services on this. I talked to Secretary Becerra. It is something that the American public should have been educated on 18 months ago. I personally have known nine people who have died

of COVID. I always wonder how many of those would still be alive today if they had done half as much to push vitamin D as they did with all the other advertising, pushing masks, pushing social distancing, what have you.

But with 500 people dying a day, it is still something that should be publicized. I have written a letter to Secretary Becerra; and 14 times less likely to wind up with serious COVID once hospitalized. Among people hospitalized, of the people who didn't have enough vitamin D—under 20 nanograms—25 percent died. If they had over 20 nanograms, 2.3 percent died who wound up hospitalized in Israel. Kind of dramatic numbers. News you can use.

Those are some of the comments or issues of the day that I think the press should be paying attention to. I thank the indulgence of staff for giving us the hour. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Beyer:

H.R. 5681. An act to authorize the reclassification of the tactical enforcement officers (commonly known as the "Shadow Wolves") in the Homeland Security Investigations tactical patrol unit operating on the lands of the Tohono O'odham Nation as special agents, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6968. An act to prohibit the importation of energy products of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7108. An act to suspend normal trade relations treatment for the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 10:30 a.m. on Monday, April 11, 2022.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 11, 2022, at 10:30 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2022, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ISRAEL, GERMANY, AND THE UNITED KINGDOM, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 14 AND FEB. 22, 2022

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	2/15	2/17	Israel		1,110		(3)				1,110
Hon. Adam Schiff	2/15	2/17	Israel		1,110		(3)				1,110
Hon. Ted Deutch	2/15	2/17	Israel		1,110		(3)				1,110
Hon. Barbara Lee	2/15	2/17	Israel		1,110		(3)				1,110
Hon. Bill Keating	2/15	2/17	Israel		1,110		(3)				1,110