making that dangerous trek, and for all people who live along the border and see this every single day.

What is happening with these girls? They get put in HHS and then get released. Guess where they are going. They are going to Houston, Texas, to try to be reunited with a family member.

All cities of the United States are border cities. All States of the United States are border States. This crisis has continued to spiral out of control, and we, here in Congress, as well as the administration, must come together and reform immigration and secure our southern border.

RESPONDING TO CYBERATTACKS

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

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, as I rise, gasoline is once again flowing through the Colonial Pipeline, and we are getting ready to undertake our routine briefs—those of us who sit on the Intelligence Committee and the Committee on Homeland Security—of this week's cyberattacks. Many of them will have come from Russia, from China, from North Korea, from Iran, or from some shadowy criminal group, which is often sheltered or at least tolerated by one of these countries. Many will have succeeded in stealing critical data or penetrating essential networks. Only a few, like the recent attacks on the Colonial Pipeline, will ever become publicly known.

There is a long list of things that we must do to stop these attacks. We should require private companies to tell the public, or at least the government, when these attacks occur. We should make sure that experts in places like the NSA and the FBI are working side-by-side with network operators to address these attacks, and we should have a clear policy on the payment of ransom to ransomware attacks.

But at the very top of the list is the need to fundamentally change the game by establishing a sure and swift deterrence.

Time and again, we do too little, too late.

Five years ago, President Obama responded to the Russian attack on our 2016 election, the very essence of our democracy, with the expulsion of 35 so-called Russian diplomats and the closing of a few secondary Russian facilities, and he told Putin to ''cut it out.'' Putin barely felt the slap on the wrist.

We know that, because fewer than 4 years later, a Russian intelligence agency used a supply chain attack on Microsoft and SolarWinds to penetrate thousands of networks, including those of the Federal Government. In response, the United States—you guessed it—expelled some Russian diplomats.

For the bad guys, the cost of doing business is very low indeed.

It is time to strike back using our unparalleled offensive cyber capabilities with the ferocity and precision and, yes, the proportionality that these and many other cyberattacks would have provoked had they been undertaken kinetically.

Let's hurl the full weight of the American legal, diplomatic, and cyber capabilities against DarkSide and the organizations or countries that assisted it. There is no reason why our immense power, if applied, can't result in jailed hackers, businesses sanctioned into bankruptcy, emptied bank accounts, and melted computers.

The same goes for Putin, who draws no formal distinction between the Kremlin and the private groups who supply it with propaganda, mercenaries, and hacking services. Putin respects only the Machiavellian language of force and retribution. For him, all else is tactical. So let's demonstrate the cyber capabilities we have spent billions of dollars developing. Let's make sure that he and the oligarchs who support him feel the fear and anxiety felt by millions of Americans contemplating crashed email systems and gasoline lines down the street.

The objection to my arguments has always been consistent: that as a highly networked nation, we are particularly vulnerable to a cyber tit-for-tat. In a cyber exchange, the Russians, the Chinese, or the Iranians might choose to attack our critical infrastructure, like, say, a gasoline pipeline. Yes, there is risk, but that risk must be weighed against the fully unacceptable status quo.

Hitting back isn't the only answer. It is part of the answer. In this new world, a credible deterrent must be combined with clearly articulated international rules, norms, and an understanding of our national doctrines: all the things that helped keep the Cold War with the Soviets from becoming hot.

Above all else, however, it is time to change the game and impose the meaningful costs that will finally deter our adversaries. Until we do, we are all just waiting for the next Colonial Pipeline attack.

GETTING AMERICANS BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. NEHLS. Madam Speaker, I stand here today after speaking with business owners across my district and the country. I have heard story after story of businesses struggling to get entry-level, minimum-wage workers back to work. Why is that? Because they are actually having to compete, not against COVID or lockdowns, but against the Federal Government to get employees back to work.

In my home State of Texas, you can make up to $535 in unemployment insurance, but add in the additional $300 per week payments that came from Federal COVID relief, and that is $835 per week not to work. That equates to nearly $21 an hour. That is exactly why Texas and 20 other States have opted out of Federal COVID unemployment insurance benefits. But there are still States where business owners are being forced to compete against the Federal Government for employees.

My own brother, Tyler, who owns a construction company in Wisconsin, told me business has picked up for him. What a blessing. Now, he is trying to hire additional employees to grow his business. He has just got one problem: Folks are telling him they are making more sitting at home at $17.50 an hour. They tell him if he wants them to work, he is going to have to pay them $25 an hour.

Situations like my brother Tyler's were hardly an unexpected consequence of paying workers more not to work. So expected, it seems as though when Democrats failed to get their minimum wage hikes through the Senate in February, they used the Federal unemployment insurance program to accomplish the same result, albeit temporarily.

While there are many who are still struggling from the effects of COVID, whether it be from health effects or the effects of lockdowns on their business, millions more are taking advantage of the unemployment insurance system and sitting at home playing Xbox instead of working and being productive members of society.

On top of a labor shortage driven by the Federal Government paying people not to work, President Biden is proposing historic levels of spending and raising taxes on our job creators. His multi-trillion-dollar proposals, like his $2.3 trillion American Jobs Plan and $1.8 trillion American Families Plan, will cost thousands of jobs through tax hikes amid an already struggling market.

What message does raising the corporate tax rate send to job creators when they are trying to rebuild in the aftermath of the pandemic? It sure sounds like we are telling them to take their business overseas or hire less.

To bounce back from the Biden administration's dismal job reports in April, which showed just 266,000 new jobs added, certainly underperforming the Dow Jones estimate of 1 million new jobs, we need to be stimulating economic opportunity and growth with less taxes and less regulation, which will create good-paying jobs that encourage people to get back in the workforce.

What won't fix our struggling economy is throwing money at the problem, which seems to be all the Washington swamp knows how to do. The liberal tax-and-spend model is failing our economy and failing the American people. Gas prices are up, homes are more expensive, and the per pound cost of copper is more than double what it was just 12 months ago.

We are not going to spend our way out of this mess with $1-trillion programs that do nothing but serve liberal

special interests. We do it by letting the free market flourish through lower taxes, lower regulation, and more economic freedom.

This model worked under President Trump, who delivered record lows in unemployment for Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and women, and it will work again, if only the Biden administration will put the American people first and not special interests.

ELECTION CONTEST DISMISSED

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, last week, we passed a resolution dismissing the last House election contest of the 2020 cycle, in the 14th District of Illinois.

Before this resolution came to the floor, the Committee on House Administration approved it with unanimous bipartisan support.

I am incredibly honored that my community chose me to represent them in Congress again, and I look forward to a productive term.

But I am not here to take a victory lap. This is an important moment, not because of which candidate won, but because the constitutional rights of my constituents were upheld, despite my opponent's efforts to disenfranchise the very people he sought to represent.

Much like the previous President, my opponent ignored voters' voices by declaring himself the winner days before the results were in. Once the votes had been tallied, he again joined the former President in making baseless allegations of fraud and conspiracy.

After a careful consideration of the merits of his case, the committee found that my opponent's many arguments about supposed irregularities failed to add up to a credible claim to the result he wanted.

Exhibiting the utmost disrespect for his own would-be constituents, he even went so far as to attempt to invalidate thousands of ballots, under a technicality that the Illinois Supreme Court had already deemed invalid under both the State and Federal Constitutions.

Specifically, the court warned that the standard my opponent sought to apply in this case would allow corrupt officials to deliberately toss out ballots of voters whom they had reason to believe voted otherwise than they desired, which is exactly what he attempted to do.

By passing the resolution dismissing this baseless contest, the House upheld the results that were verified by seven county clerks, including four Republicans, and certified by the State of Illinois.

On behalf of my constituents whose voices were heard despite these efforts to silence them, I want to thank the many election officials and volunteers who safely and successfully administered the highest-turnout election in history, during a pandemic.

I also want to thank the House Administration Committee and its hardworking staff for faithfully carrying out the Federal Contested Elections Act by rejecting this attempt at disenfranchisement.

Unfortunately, the contest in my district was just one battle in a war that is still ongoing, a war on democracy, on voting rights, and on truth itself.

It will take more than a resolution to defeat the big lie: a seditious effort to delegitimize the 2020 election and every future election.

As the so-called debate about widespread fraud that did not occur raged on, I have been shocked and horrified by the willingness of so many people to tell dangerous, flat-out lies, people who should know better, including, terrifyingly, elected officials at every level of government.

I desperately hope for a future where the fabric of reality itself is no longer under attack, because there can be no compromise here. There is nothing to compromise on. The choice is simple: truth or lies.

In the meantime, Madam Speaker, let me tell you about the reality that others have left far behind. The reality is that the American people chose Democrats to lead the House, the Senate, and the White House. In reality, Americans voted for healthcare, for childcare, and for a safe climate and environment.

□ 1030

In reality, Americans chose historic numbers of women, people of color, and LGBTQ people to represent them in this Chamber.

There are people who refuse to face this reality, like my erstwhile opponent, the former President, and far too many others in positions of great responsibility. Their denial of the truth is incompatible with the democracy we all swore an oath to defend.

A few months ago, we endured a violent insurrection here in this building, an all-too-real manifestation of this widespread assault on reality. We survived the attack, but we are still in the midst of an insidious erosion of norms and policies that threatens our democracy, including by sowing distrust of our elections and our democratic institutions.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting these attacks on our democracy by living as though the truth were true.

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BONUS

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk briefly on a topic that has come up numerous times already this morning. I just attended a meeting of the Small Business Committee in which we had an extensive discussion as well.

If you remember back when the CARES package was moving through Congress, there were a number of legislators who identified that an issue was being created that didn't need to necessarily be created, and that was additional dollars being set aside for those who would find themselves unemployed.

As a former State legislator in Wisconsin, I had kind of gone through a process back in 2008 and 2009, which basically was an unemployment insurance fund—and I would underscore the idea insurance—that was in the red. It was as a result of the number of unemployment claims that were being made in my State.

There was a nonpartisan commission that had been created to kind of oversee this process, without getting too far into the details. It had worked, where there had been some give and take. Employers and those who represented employers knew that there would be X amount of dollars taken out of everyone's payroll that would supplement or pay for the premiums associated with unemployment, and the system worked. But when the uptick came as a result of the economy sputtering at the time, it went into the red.

It is just a reminder, I think, of what we find ourselves kind of in the midst of right now. As I said, some earlier speakers referenced this. We have this $300-a-week bonus that so many people are calling it right now. And I get it; I am not trying to be too judgmental on people who actually find themselves in that position.

But what we are hearing from employers is that, as a result of the new dollars being in that unemployment system, it is doing two things. The first thing it is doing is obviously putting the regular private-sector market that employers are typically used to, and it is forcing them to kind of either increase wages to the point where it doesn't work for them. It just won't work for their small business model. They can't afford it and still be able to put out goods and services.

The other thing it does, though, is it keeps people on unemployment. So what we are experiencing in our State—and I think I am hearing that other States are experiencing the same thing, and I think we are up to 19 different States right now—Governors have made a decision to pull back on the $300 a week. It is certainly cratering these unemployment insurance pots again. They can't keep up with it.

So I am here today to just tell the constituents of Wisconsin and, really, nationwide, as we see State by State and the economy kind of moves in one direction, that there has to be a change. It is not even a partisan issue. Something has to give here in the short term, and I would certainly hope that President Biden would take a deeper look at this. I think the House and the Senate should actually move in